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This thesis is presented in two volumes, the second being an appendix to the first. Volume I contains detailed entries on the compositional history of each of the five overtures, showing which primary source has been chosen as the foundation of each edition. It examines literary and other influences which prevailed in Paris during this period, including that of Berlioz's two teachers; but the main thrust of the historical content lies with each overture. It also takes a close look at an organological issue, involving the trompette à pistons in Paris in the 1820s and 1830s.

Volume II presents the five overtures in the manner of a critical edition, complete with full critical apparatus, but without a Foreword per se, since that would constitute a précis of what is found in volume I.
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Berlioz wrote five concert overtures, of which Waverley, Roi Lear and Le Corsaire have extant autograph full scores. It is inevitable that there is more to study and consider in the course of preparing these three editions than the other two, Intrata de Rob-Roy MacGregor, whose only source is a scribal copy, and Le Carnaval romain, whose autograph is lost. Originally, it was expected to devote equal time to the three autograph documents, but it soon became apparent that this was not possible for two reasons. First, the later the overture is in Berlioz’s output, the more work it required, not so much on the detailing of the immediate circumstances surrounding it in order to pinpoint as closely as possible the period during which the work was composed - that is a standard component of the thesis - but on where it stands in relation to the whole of Berlioz’s output to that point. This would have meant becoming intimately acquainted with all Berlioz’s works up to the date of publication of the last overture, namely 1852, when Le Corsaire appeared. The impossibility of achieving this means that although the integrity of the thesis as a critical edition is intact, discussion of broader topics such as aspects of compositional development, a detailed examination of programme music in relation to the concert overtures and an in-depth study of the concert overtures Berlioz may have heard have all been taken to be outside the parameters of this thesis. Second, one issue emerged from the work undertaken on Waverley which proved to be a research project on its own. This is the matter of Berlioz’s revision of the part for trompette à pistons and the

---

1 The titles of the overtures in this thesis are as follows: Grande ouverture de Waverley, sometimes Waverley; Grande ouverture du roi Lear, sometimes Roi Lear; Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor, sometimes Rob-Roy; Le Carnaval romain, ouverture caractéristique, sometimes Carnaval romain and Ouverture du corsaire, sometimes Le Corsaire. These works are to be found in vol. 20 (in preparation) of Hector Berlioz, New edition of the complete works (hereafter NBE), general editor Hugh Macdonald, 25 volumes, Kassel 1967-. Les Francs-juges and La Tempête are not considered here because they are not strictly concert overtures. They have been subject to scrutiny by other writers in NBE volumes 4 and 7.

chapter which is the result has required, among other things, detailed examination of a broad range of trumpet and other associated methods and of many non-musical documents. It has raised several issues about the politics of musical life, and by doing so has broadened the base of a study which would otherwise be limited. There was some difficulty in deciding which chapter should appear first; that on the trumpets or that on Waverley. It was something of a 'chicken or egg' situation in which either way had advantages and disadvantages, but the background aspects involved in the trumpet chapter has resulted in that going first.

Editing seems to offer the opportunity to produce work free of subjective influence, but in the course of transforming a work from its primary source(s) into an accessible edition, choices have to be made and they are by definition, subjective. A balance between these extremes is sought, which is why the circumstances surrounding Berlioz when he was composing these overtures, both in a general sense (political, bureaucratic etc.) and in a more personal sense (emotional, financial etc.) are important; they offer facts from which the editor makes a choice and from which the reader can also make judgements, should he so choose. Unfortunately, this too, has pitfalls and is not straightforward, since it is the writer who chooses what surrounding circumstances to include and how to present them. There is no escaping the onus of responsibility by feigning objectivity; the goal is, however, a well-intentioned one: to offer as full a picture as possible. To this end, Berlioz's letters are a rich source, informative often as much because of what they omit as because of what they include. Likewise the Memoirs, the veracity of which is accepted on the understanding that the perspective is necessarily different from that found in the letters because first, it was conceived for public reading, implying that some passages were contrived to achieve certain effects and second, lapses in chronological accuracy were not contrived. Other versions of the overtures, in the form of piano arrangements, have also been included under Publication, where appropriate, since they, too, help to give the most information possible.
Quotations are to be seen as integral to the main text, rather than interrupting it, because they have much to contribute to the overall picture of the particular situation to which they refer, especially those taken from newspapers and journals. For the same reason those in French have been kept that way, since translation is a filter of interpretation which removes the reader from the original when it is not necessary. Having said that, they are a vexing problem, particularly when the extract is long, but in general cutting has been avoided. There are exceptions: where there is a standard translation, such as David Cairns's edition of the Memoirs,3 or the occasional other previously translated source where the nuances of the original French do not affect the reason for the quotation, English is used. Illustrations have been adjusted from their original size to accommodate the required format and are inserted after the page to which they refer.

The object of the readings, which appear in Volume 2, is, in general, twofold: to make available options of interpretation which appear in primary sources not used for the final edition and to demonstrate the validity or otherwise of certain sources. For this reason the listings do not include every single variant, since that would make them so cumbersome as to render them almost useless. An example is reflected in Berlioz's habit of putting a dynamic for every pair of staves, rather than for every single instrument: the omissions which are the result are not listed. The layout and basic content of the sources in Volume 2, including the diplomatic transcriptions of title pages, owe acknowledgement to those prepared by D. Kern Holoman in his Catalogue of the Works of Hector Berlioz.4

It has been difficult to retain the perspective necessary to produce a critical edition, in particular when deciding what, out of a vast amount of information, should be included in the text as part of 'the literary and historical background'.

4 D. Kern Holoman, Catalogue of the works of Hector Berlioz (hereafter Cat), Kassel 1987, volume 25 of the NBE.
By the same token, when dealing with notational matters as outlined in the last paragraph, it has been helpful to remember the advice of the General Editor of the *NBE*, Hugh Macdonald, that what may be perceived as a problem for the editor was probably not a problem for the composer: too much faith in the notation is not always the best way forward, unless it is imbued with an understanding and respect for the music and practices of the period. While the choices found here will, undoubtedly, differ from those of everyone who may refer to this study, they have been made to enhance understanding of the music and it is to this end that the historical background and circumstances of each overture contribute.
CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND INFLUENCES

Instrumental music in France did not have the same status during the first part of the 19th century as opera, which was also governed in despotistic fashion, the Académie Royale de Musique being the ultimate arbiter. The emphasis was on spectacle and easily-digested music, priorities which often took precedence over and above artistic considerations. In addition it had the reputation of being tardy and tedious in its decision-making processes concerning production. All this had a crucial effect on Berlioz's career. It takes only the minimum of knowledge about him to realise that he would have great difficulty living in harmony with an institution such as the Académie Royale, founded on this basis. On the one hand he found attitudes intractable and standards often unimpressive and those in authority, on the other hand, found his music difficult. Less obvious, perhaps, is the fact that Berlioz wanted acceptance in the theatre very badly because he recognized it as being fundamentally most suited to his musical expression. He was passionate about opera from the moment he arrived in Paris, almost to the point of obsession, and he took every opportunity possible to follow paths by which he might gain recognition in that field, even those which may seem today to be somewhat circuitous.

---

1 The principal opera company of Paris changed its name at regular intervals for political reasons: the term Opéra is also used, but it has additional meaning, often referring to the building which housed the company at any one time.


3 Berlioz's collected correspondence, Correspondance générale, is published in Paris under the general editorship of Pierre Citron and is hereafter abbreviated as CG I (ed. Citron, 1972); CG II (ed. Frédéric Robert, 1975); CG III (ed. Citron, 1978); CG IV (ed. Citron, Yves Gérard and HughMacdonald, 1983); CG V (ed. Macdonald and François Lesure, 1989); CGVI (ed. Macdonald and Lesure, 1995); CG VII is in preparation. All references to Berlioz's correspondence are to this edition. Evidence of Berlioz's efforts to get Les Francs-juges performed and the agony which Benvenuto Cellini and Les Troyens caused him can be found in his letters (in particular CG I, no. 160, pp. 324-6. For evidence of his persistence in trying to gain suitable positions see CG II, nos 459, 461 and 462, pp. 278, 280 and 283, regarding the Gymnase Musical; and nos 534, 537 and 539, pp 404, 409 and 414, regarding the Théâtre Italien, to name but two. He was denied acceptance at the Opéra even when he was the obvious choice to fill the vacant post of chef d'orchestre, CG III, nos 1123 and 1125, pp. 446 and 448.
The lack of appropriate opportunities, regularly exacerbated by the vicissitudes of French political life and the whims of Ministers and their administrators, was one of the key factors which influenced what he chose to write and his pragmatism caused him to find other means, apart from traditional theatrical ones, to express his dramatic creativity. Five of the less grand, but no less significant, items from his output expressing this need were the concert overtures, four of which have literary connections, hence the relevance of examining reactions to popular authors and their literature during this period. Both Waverley and Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor, the first and third to be written, are connected with the novels of Sir Walter Scott (1771-1832); Le Roi Lear, the second, was written soon after Berlioz read the play by Shakespeare (1564-1616). The last to be written began life as La Tour de Nice, was then called Le Corsaire rouge and finished up as Le Corsaire. It is associated with the novel by James Fenimore Cooper (1789-1851), The Red Rover, which was called Le Corsaire rouge in its French translation. It also has some Byronic associations, Byron (1788-1824) having written The Corsair: a tale in 1813 (translated over a period starting in 1818 by Galignani). It is significant that all Berlioz’s independent overtures emanated from his early life - 1831 and before, if Le Carnaval romain is excluded because of its close connection to Benvenuto Cellini. He conceived no purely orchestral works after the Grande symphonie funèbre et triomphale of 1840: by that time he had found other, more direct means of expressing his need to write dramatic music.

After a brief look at the role of literature in Berlioz’s formative years, Scott, Cooper and Byron will be discussed in turn. These three were well known in Paris by the time that Berlioz arrived there in 1822, whereas the rise in Shakespeare’s popularity followed a different pattern, discussion of which will follow, with comments about his standing and influence. The purpose of the information given here is to show how these authors were

---

4 Le Carnaval romain is the exception, because it was written as a second overture to Berlioz’s ill-fated opera, Benvenuto Cellini, but specifically (originally, that is), for concert performance.
regarded at the time and how they permeated Parisian life at that time, rather than how the period is viewed today with the benefit of scholarly hindsight. Although presenting the information as an integrated chronology of these writers was a possible option, it was rejected in favour of presentation author by author to encourage an understanding of the influence of each writer in turn. A necessarily limited appraisal of musical influences follows, given the scope of this study and the limited amount of information available in some areas of research and study. It is important, however, to mention influences from the broadest (e.g. what the considered function of the overture was, the programming of overtures, the publication of their scores) to the more specific (e.g. comments on Rejcha (1770-1836) and Le Sueur (1760-1837), Berlioz's two teachers at the Conservatoire), if only to indicate to the reader the range of factors which contributed to the musical vie quotidienne of Paris in which Berlioz found himself at the start of his career.

Berlioz was dependent on his father's literary taste during his formative years, growing up in the small village of La Côte St André, a long way from Paris and far enough from Lyon for visits there to be major outings. The views of Dr. Berlioz (1777-1848) on the troubled years at the beginning of the 19th century and the rôle of art and the artist are important for the way they shaped his son's education, not the least important factor being the Doctor's decision to educate him at home. Such literary influence as affected Berlioz in these years did not last beyond Berlioz's adolescence, with the notable exception of Virgil, but literature was of sufficient importance to Berlioz, thanks to his father, that the transition to reading both the popular and the more sophisticated authors of the day was both easy and enjoyable for him. It is well to keep these influences in perspective, simply by remembering authors who once were thought to be important but who have since receded into anonymity. On the one hand they cannot be dismissed simply because they turned out to be of less significance in the

---

literary world than fashion had initially dictated: on the other hand their influence need not be exaggerated out of proportion simply on account of their popularity at the time and their connection with someone who has stood the test of time. Claris de Florian (1755-1794), for example, inspired some early settings by Berlioz, but is hardly considered to be of any literary standing. It would be interesting to explore further the dissemination of literature, since it is known that, for example, Dr Berlioz subscribed to Michaud’s biographies; perhaps he saw fit to include selected fiction as well. No matter how comparatively well-versed Berlioz was in matters literary, the abundance of choice in Paris must have been a cultural shock to him, but one which he was more than happy to absorb, sharing his enthusiasms with, among others, his sisters.

The popularity of all things English grew to epic proportion in Paris during the first part of the 19th century, complete with lavender water and over-subscribed English language lessons. Taste and fashion in literature and the theatre were changing, and by now Voltaire’s (1694-1778) influence was on the wane, and the idiom and technique of the French classical drama as evinced, above all, in the works of Corneille (1606-1684) and Racine (1639-1699) were no longer acceptable to modern taste. When Scott visited Paris first in 1815 he was not totally unknown even then, since some of his narrative poems had been translated and published in Paris by that time. One of his first books, *Guy Mannering*, written in 1815, was published in Paris in 1816 and he was soon acclaimed in literary circles: after reading *Lallah Rookh*, Hugo (1802-1885) declared that Scott was a greater poet than Thomas Moore (1779-1852), the highly regarded Irish writer. In 1820 he was also acclaimed by the French historian Louis-Auguste Thierry (1795-1856), who after reading *Ivanhoe* said that it contained more ‘véritable histoire’ than could be found in the philosophical compilations of the day and that

---

6 In particular Berlioz liked *Estelle et Némorin*, written in 1787. He set some of it to verse, the melody of which became incorporated into the opening of the *Symphonie fantastique*. *Mem*, ch. 3, 4 and 7; pp 37, 42 and 53 respectively.

7 For more on these settings see D. Bickley, *The songs and smaller choral works of Hector Berlioz up to and including Neufs mélodies irlandaises*, M. Phil., Birmingham 1987.
Scott was 'le plus grand maître qu'il y ait jamais eu en fait de devination historique'. Six more novels by Scott, translated into French in 1820, continued to advance his popularity and in 1821 Dumas (1803-1870) wrote that Sir Walter Scott was then the reigning monarch of Paris. By 1822 the first edition of the complete works had appeared, which included Waverley, published by Gosselin in a translation by his wife. A new translation appeared in 1826, this time by Defauconpret, to whom Scott used to send proofs of his novels, so as to facilitate their prompt translation and publication. 'Scott a créé un genre dont notre époque avait besoin,' declared Le Figaro, proved by the fact that by 1830, two years before his death, more than one and a half million copies of his novels had been sold in France. It has to be pointed out, however, that it is probable that his writing lost twofold in translation because much of what he wrote was frequently subjected to censorship by his publishers in Edinburgh for being too risqué, and this in turn would lose when translated into French. Fortunately, it did not deter the spirit of his writing from prevailing and he was received with critical acclaim at every turn:

Il excite un intérêt capable de faire oublier l'heure des repas et celle de sommeil. and:

L'apparition de Waverley fit il y a quelques années une révolution dans la partie épique de notre littérature en nous montrant une vérité jusque là inconnue dans les mœurs et les caractères.

Scott's popularity is also demonstrated in the fact that more operas have been written based on his works than those of any other writer except Shakespeare, and many of these are from the pens of French librettists during this period. Examples include Scribe's libretto based on Leicester, ou

---

8 August 2, 1826.
9 In St. Ronan's Well, for example, Scott was compelled by his puritanical editor, Ballantyne, to change the ending to allow the heroine to die a virgin, contrary to his original plan. His injunction to one of his characters to 'Sit on your arse' became 'Take a seat'. The Independent, August 1995.
10 Les Débats, August 31, 1823.
11 Le Globe, June 18, 1825.
le château de Kenilworth written around 1823 with music by Auber,\textsuperscript{12} and Deschamps’ collaboration with Wailly, adapting Scott’s Ivanhoe, which was set to music taken from various Rossini scores.\textsuperscript{13} In 1825\textsuperscript{14} Fétis directed a performance of Louise Bertin’s setting of Guy Mannering and Boëlédieu wrote La Dame Blanche the success of which was largely due to Scribe’s adaptation of Scott’s novels The Monastery and Guy Mannering. Scott saw a performance of Ivanhoe during a visit to Paris in 1826 (October 30-November 6) about which he wrote:

It was superbly got up, the Norman soldiers wearing pointed helmets and what resembled much haubers of mail, which looked very well. The number of attendants, and the skill with which they were moved and grouped upon the stage, were worthy of notice. It was an opera, and of course the story greatly mangled, and the dialogue in a great part nonsense. Yet it was strange to hear anything like the words which I had dictated to William Laidlaw at Abbotsford, now recited in a foreign tongue, and for the amusement of strange people.\textsuperscript{15}

In addition adaptations of his novels found their way into theatres performing vaudeville and into the Opéra Comique as well as straight plays. He was also, not surprisingly, the object of satire as the following quotation shows:

On donnait ce soir Les Brioches à la Mode (Les Brioches à la Mode ou le Pâtissier anglais, ‘camaraderie’ en deux tableaux mêlée de couplets, par MM Dumersan et Brazier, eut sa première représentation le 8 juin 1830 au Th de Variétés.) [sic] aux Variétés. C’est une petite pièce

\textsuperscript{12} It was translated into Russian and performed in St Petersburg on October 14, 1824, with several performances in Germany (in German) during the same year. Loewenberg, \textit{Annals of opera, 1597-1940}, Cambridge, 1943, rev. 1978 by H. Rosenthal.

\textsuperscript{13} Deschamps later worked with Berlioz on Roméo et Juliette and Wailly with him on the doomed Benvenuto Cellini.


\textsuperscript{15} \textit{The Journals of Scott} (hereafter \textit{Journals}), ed. W. E. K. Anderson, Oxford 1972, Tuesday October 31. Also A. Bold, ed., \textit{The Long-forgotten melody}, London 1983, ch. 9, ‘Scott and Opera’, R. Giddings, p. 194. The only opera based on a Scott novel still in the regular repertoire is Lucia di Lammermouir, by Donizetti. It was first performed in 1835. Both Waverley and Rob Roy have been used as the basis of operas. \textit{Das Gastfreunde} by Franz von Holstein was written in 1852, but completely revised and performed under the title \textit{Die Hochländler} in 1876. Friedrich von Flotow was the first to set Rob-Roy in 1837 and Reginald de Koven set it to a libretto by Harry Smith in 1894. In general the connections to Scott in these works are tenuous. For a full study see Jerome Mitchell, \textit{The Walter Scott Operas}, University of Alabama, 1977 and \textit{More Scott Operas}, University Press of America, Inc., 1996.
dirigée contre les romantiques, mais qui ne frappe que les ridicules des imitateurs, désavoués par les imités. Walter Scott, pâtissier anglais, est pris pour le fameux baronet écossais.16

It is likely that Berlioz read about productions such as these on a regular basis, even if he was unable to see them and it could be that his plans for Richard en Palestine developed from the popularity of such adaptations in Paris at the time. In May 1826 he began an extensive correspondence with Léon Compaignon on a project for an opera 'to be worthy of Scott', based on one of Scott's Tales of the Crusades called Richard in Palestine and subtitled The Talisman.17 The project was probably abandoned around February 1827 - there are no further references to it after that date18 - but Berlioz continued to be enthusiastic about Scott, not only reading his novels, but writing the two overtures mentioned earlier in this chapter, Waverley and Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor.

He probably also read about the setback Scott received during the visit during which he saw Ivanhoe, because the Parisians were disappointed by his physical image, which was not in accord with the image of many of his dashing heroes. Vigny paints an unflattering picture, which seems to be not fully justified as the picture in Ex. 1 shows.

On entering his private room I beheld an old man entirely different from what the portraits represent him to be: his figure is tall, slight and somewhat bent; his right shoulder inclines a little to his lame side; his head still preserves a few white hairs, his eyebrows are white and cover a pair of blue eyes, small, tired, but very gentle, tender, moist, giving proof, in my opinion, of deep sensibility. His complexion is clear, like that of most Englishmen, his cheeks and chin show little colour. I sought in vain the Homeric front and Rabelaisian smile which our Charles Nodier's enthusiasm saw in Walter Scott's bust in Scotland. His forehead seemed to me, on the contrary, rather narrow and developed only above the eyebrows, his mouth is rounded and falls a little at the corners.19

17 CG I, nos 55-62, 64-5 and 67, pp. 113-131, 134-6 and 139-40.
18 CG I, no. 72, pp. 150-1.
1. Sir Walter Scott in 1821. By Charles Robert Leslie

Ex. 1
This was not helped by some adverse reaction to the publication of his biography of Napoleon in 1827: 'The descriptive powers of the author of Woodstock ... strike us as inadequate if he is to portray the ambitious Napoleon...' wrote Stendhal, and about Scott’s inability to write convincing dialogue:

Judging from the dialogues which Scott has introduced into his novels ... he seems to be better at describing his characters while they speak than at making them speak well ... as to the language put into their mouths, it would often be found insipid if it were not for the interest aroused by his vivid descriptions. This would be a fatal defect in reporting the conversation of Napoleon, which ... was never insipid.\textsuperscript{20}

The king showed him ‘the most marked attention’. Scott notes that he spoke with him when he (the king) was on the way to chapel. He also tells of various visits with Cooper, including an entry in his journal of their last night in Paris at a brilliant party, and that ‘Cowper (sic) was there, so the Scotch and American lion took the field together.’\textsuperscript{21} For some reason Stendhal chooses to say that ‘During his stay here Sir Walter has seen only diplomatic personalities ...’\textsuperscript{22} Despite any bad feeling, however, he was back in favour by 1828-9. There is a more flattering portrait than Vigny’s by Le Duc de Lévis in the \textit{Revue de Paris},\textsuperscript{23} in which his character and phenomenal memory are also discussed and in the same edition there is a biography of Scott by Amédée Pichot entitled ‘Souvenirs d’Enfance de Walter Scott’.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} Loc. cit. \textit{Stendhal}. Scott’s book on Napoleon was also reviewed in the \textit{Journal des Débats}, July 26, August 9, 18, 26, 31 and September 19, 1827.
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Revue de Paris}, 1st series, 1-2, April-May 1829, pp. 49-50.
\textsuperscript{24} Loc. cit. pp. 185-197. It is interesting to see how present day appreciation of Scott varies: Eric Anderson, who edited Scott’s journal, published to celebrate the bicentenary of his birth, writes about his ‘sheer, old-fashioned niceness’ in ‘Enthusiasms’, \textit{The Times Saturday Review} (July 11, 1992), while in contrast John Sutherland, in his critical biography \textit{The Life of Sir Walter Scott} (Oxford 1995), is less impressed, as is indicated in the review by John Carey, \textit{The Sunday Times}, Books section (February 26, 1995).
By the 1830s his influence had extended significantly into the world of the painter, as can be noted in the 1833 Salon, where over thirty canvases were inspired directly by Scott's writings. Examples from other salons are ‘L'Enlèvement de Rebecca’, a late working of an earlier work by Eugène Delacroix (1798-1863), Rebecca being the heroine in *Ivanhoe* and 'La Bataille de Nancy', inspired by *Quentin Durward*, also by Delacroix.\(^{25}\) He admired Scott for his powers of description and wrote as much in an article, ‘L'enseignement du dessin’.\(^{26}\) Alongside the history paintings in the grand style, there were also smaller-scale works designed to evoke a sense of history using gentler themes and a sense of nostalgia, complementing the novels of Scott and his followers. (Ex. 2)\(^ {27}\)

Scott, ‘like Chateaubriand, awakened an interest in periods which had been condemned as backward and in cultures and civilisations which had been written off because they had been suppressed’.\(^ {28}\) It is clear that Scott would have been a regular figure in Berlioz’s cultural framework, and it is not surprising that such qualities found favour with him. He had a life-long interest in travel and the exotic, in which category belonged anything removed from the reality of daily life, experienced only through the imagination and experience of another. Scott was a master at setting his scene, be it in craggy landscapes, imposing castle halls or mysterious ruins; these he would use as a backdrop for episodes requiring a cast of thousands, often involving dramatic spectacle - bloodthirsty battles, the burning of castles - all such lending themselves to vivid re-creation in the imagination. At the core of this was some form of conflict incapable of resolution, with the hero caught in the middle, torn between opposing loyalties. The hero of *Waverley*, Edward, shows here an unmistakeable parallel with Berlioz: both

\(^{25}\) Louis Hautecœur, *Littérature et peinture en France*, Paris, 1942, pp. 317-8 and 325. Friedlaender does not make this connection but admits that Delacroix was susceptible to the 'historicizing taste of his period'. *David to Delacroix*, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1952, p. 124.

\(^{26}\) Revue des Deux Mondes, September 15, 1850.


BARROT, 41, r. Neuve-St.-Augustin.
39 — "Fordi de Woodstock.
Charles II, venu à Warwick, est recueilli, sous un
nom supposé, à la luge de Woodstock, par un cavalier
bâton dont la fille Alice est seule dans le secret du
fugitif. Markham Everard, colonel attaché à Cromwell,
prend d'Alice, jaloux de ses attentions pour
Everard, lui envoie un cartel par son ami Wildlake,
qui lui sera de second. Alice, d'accord avec le docteur
Bouchot, veut empêcher le combat entre son amant
certes celle qu'arpentait en ce moment : leurs
découvertes inquiétantes sont vaines... Alice s'exclame...
"Non, non, dit le roi, cela ne peut plus à présable,
colonel Everard, je suis Charles Stuart."
(WALTER-SCOTT. 15 ordre.)

CABON (Mlle ROSALIE), 3, r. de Vendôme.
343 — Une sainte-famille.
344 — Miss Alice Lee et Charles II.
Charles, désigné sans les vêtements d'une femme de
poupre, venait les pourfendeurs de Cromwell. Il rencontre
à la fin, près le château de Woodstock, la fille
de son Henri Lee, qui reçoit poings de l'eau. Si vous
voulez accepter mon aide, votre bague serait plus
"Mais, dit Charles, en jetant un œil
aussi large que dur sur le tête de jen fille, croyant
de cette rencontre inusitée.
(François et la Chevalière, WALTER-SCOTT.)

CHAPONNIÈRE, 11, r. de l'Abbaye.
200 — Magnus et ses filles.
(Charpentier (X.), 4, r. Saint-Antoine, à
Versailles.
501 — "La reine Bérengère vient, accompagnée
de ses dames, demander à Richard la grâce du
chevalier sir Kenneth d'Ecosse.
(François de Lombron et la Chevalière, WALTER-SCOTT.)

COLIN (A.), 33, r. d'Enfer.
443 — Sujet tiré de Woodstock.
Non, non, dit le roi, cela ne se peut plus à présent,
colonel Everard : je suis Charles Stuart!
Everard recula de surprise : impossible, s'écria-t-il!
(WALTER-SCOTT.)
444 — Cromwell retournant le portrait de Char­
es II.
(WALTER-SCOTT. 17 ordre.)

DUBOULX, 19, r. de la Croix.
793 — "Louis XI à la chasse.
Le roi de Louis était dans un péril imminent, lors­
que Quentin Durward, qui était resté en arrière de
la chasse, arriva et perça l'animal.
(WALTER-SCOTT.)
724 — "Quentin Durward et maître Pierre.
Quentin répond au roi qu'il jeterait le gage du com­
batt à tout antagoniste, du même rang et de même
âge, qui osait dire qu'une figure telle que celle qu'il
avait maintain sous les yeux pouvait être suivie de
nourir un que par l'eau la plus pure et la plus sincère.
(WALTER-SCOTT.)
725 — "Le défie-jeur de Louis XI avec le cardinal
La Balue et le comte de Crève-Cœur.
"Allons, dit le roi, Olivier, remplacez cette coupe
et offre-la au comte, un genou en terre..., il
représente notre amie frère... ____
(WALTER-SCOTT.)

HAUTIER, 6, r. de Seine.
4217 — Marie au château de Loch-Leven.
Signe, lui dit Lindsay en saisissant le bras de Marie-
Stuart de sa main courante d'un geste... 
(Cadet, WALTER-SCOTT.)
4218 — Le cavalier.
4219 — Walter étend son manteau dans un endroit
fangeux où Elisabeth hésita à passer; squarrelle.
4220 — Elisabeth, scène du kiosque; id.
(Ces deux scènes sont dans le Château de Kincorth, WALTER-SCOTT.)
4221 — Portraits destinés, même numéro.

LAVAUDEN, 46, r. de l'Aubre-Sec.
4600 — Abidication de Marie-Stuart.
Envoys par le régent d'Ecosse (le comte Murray),
bord Lindsay, lord Batwen et sir Robert Nuthville, font
signer à Marie-Stuart, retenue au château de Lochi-
Leven, les deux actes de son abidication.
La reine révant alors, avec une expression de dou­
leur, la manche de sa robe, son voir les marques violentes
que les doigts de Lindsay avaient imprimées sur son
bras, et dit: "Je prends à temoign tous ceux qui se
« trouvent dans cette chambre, qui apposent ici ma
signature, je ne fait que ceder à la violence."
(L'Abid. de Walter-SCOTT.)

LESAINT, 17, r. des Finaigriers.
4893 — "Scène tirée de l'Aquitaine de Walter-
Scott.
Je la connais, dit le mendiant, je l'ai entendu ciler
bien des fois quand je n'était encore qu'un enfant; la
voici.
(Ollibuck, les luettes sur le nez, était déjà ag­
pouillé sur la pierre, et suivait de l'œil et du doigt les
traces, à demi-effacées par le temps, des armes
graves sur la tombe de Malcolm-Ballard.

MARCHANT (X.), 26, r. Grange-aux-Belles.
1064 — Annette Lyle, au château Dalitswarach.
Elle chante la ballade de l'orpheline devant sir
Duncan, lord Moutheil et Allan-MacAulay, en s'ac­
compagnant de la clariné.
(WALTER-SCOTT. L'Officier de Fortune, 3.)

Ex. 2 Some of the paintings inspired by Sir Walter Scott as listed in the Paris salon catalogue of 1833
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suffered from *mal d'isolement* and both were highly susceptible to stimuli which triggered their fertile and passionate imaginations. In addition both were trying to resolve conflict, Berlioz battling with that between his loyalty to his family's wishes and his passionate belief in his career as a composer, while Edward knew his duty was to the memory of his father, although the idea of a military career did not appeal to him. At the other end of the emotional spectrum it is certain that Berlioz enjoyed Scott's humour: there is a distinct similarity between his account of the Institute prize-giving scene and Scott's description of the brawl at the end of an evening of heavy drinking in chapter 11 of *Waverley*. Sainte-Beuve wrote in Scott's obituary in *Le Globe*: 'Posterity will doubtless admire his works less than we do, but he will always remain a grand man, an immortal painter of humanity.' All in all, it would have been difficult to live in Paris and avoid being aware of Scott during this period.

It was inevitable that, a generation later, James Fenimore Cooper (1789-1851) (Ex. 3), became dubbed 'the American Scott' by many, including Berlioz, and Cooper, like Scott, found his works being adapted for stage, such as in *L'Espion*. His books were translated into German, Italian, Polish, Russian, Spanish and even Persian, as well as French. In Germany one hundred and five translations and five separate collections were published between 1820 and 1853. The trilogy of *The Pioneers, The Last of the Mohicans, and The Prairie* was published in translation by Defauconpret in 1823, 1826 and 1827 respectively. Apart from the Russians, the French were the only people to produce any perceptive criticism of him. His republicanism was a source of admiration in France, as can be imagined.
JAMES FENIMORE COOPER
PORTRAIT BY JOHN WESLEY JARVIS ABOUT 1822

Ex. 3
Cooper writes as citizen and a philosophical man at the same time. In him one finds human reason that is remarkably free of prejudice, has enlightened moral feeling, profound faith in liberty, in equality, in religion, in his country, in the dignity of human nature ... Above all, one recognises in Fenimore Cooper the noble type of an American republican. 34

*Le Globe* also criticises Cooper because, '...in the last pages [of *Lionel Lincoln*] the moral idealism which we have attributed to the works of the American author seems to flag badly...' But in general his works '...possess enough superlative beauties to atone for a few obscurities and improbabilities'.35 Nevertheless he seems to have kindled passionate feelings, causing his hero Leather-Stocking, from the trilogy *The Pioneers, The Last of the Mohicans* and *The Prairie*, to be described as 'the embodiment of the first dream of Jean Jacques Rousseau'. The quotation is cited here at length because it also embodies much of the spirit of the age of which Berlioz was a part and from which he drew his inspiration:

The law is his enemy, for he sees in law a human invention foreign to the natural order. His spirit, accustomed to the vast reaches of the wilderness, simply cannot perceive that the civil law derives from a necessity of natural order.... We continue to sympathise with him when, fleeing before a civilization which repels yet pursues him, fleeing before a social contract to which he has not consented, and which weighs heavily upon him, he abandons the soil of which he, like the Indians, had been the first occupant, and disappears towards the distant plains, in search of that sanctuary which the desert, for a few years at least, still offers to the individual hemmed in by society. Thus, in this profound work are embodied, under circumstances favourable to both, yet working one against the other to their mutual detriment, the two dreams of Rousseau: the man of nature, and a social contract *unanimously agreed upon*.36

*The Red Rover*, acknowledged to be the initial inspiration for Berlioz's overture *Le Corsaire*, was written when Cooper was living in Paris, where it was first published in English in October 1827 by Hector Bossage. It

---


36 Ibid., p. 134.
then appeared in 1828, translated into French with the title *Le Corsaire rouge* by Gosselin. The fact that the entire book is set at sea held a particular appeal for Berlioz, reflected in his love of travel tales and the exotic, which was ultimately satisfied by his son, Louis, who chose a sea-faring career. Gosselin later brought out *The Works of Fenimore Cooper*, also in French, between 1836 and 1852, in 30 volumes. Sainte-Beuve, whose appreciation of Scott has already been discussed, wrote a fair review of *The Red Rover* for *Le Globe* because his romantic nature responded to Cooper's descriptive powers. It is interesting to note how directly he addresses his readers: it is as though literary criticism were a legitimate outlet for expressing passion for freedom, for identifying with the ideals yet to be fully realised by the French people. After praising Cooper for the way he has improved, and pursued a path independent of Scott, Sainte-Beuve continues:

To begin with his failings, they are undoubtedly serious enough. For the most part, it is because of the *plot* that his novels fall short. So feeble and badly constructed, ... almost always so improbable, ... that it had been conceived as an afterthought, and that the incidents in its development had been thought out and arranged for a quite different purpose. ... Cooper, in fact, tells less as a storyteller than as a descriptive artist: that rather obvious remark gives us the key to his talent. Gifted with a sober and profound sensibility, ... he saw ... the most magnificent natural spectacles; he saw ... in the heart of these sublime scenes, human beings in harmony with virgin forests, the wide-open prairies, where the sky seemed higher and more immense than elsewhere. The struggles of civilization against nature, especially those of justice and liberty against oppression and force, came to endow these youthful tableaux with colours and shades no less varied than alive. A descriptive and imaginative poet, a sincere patriot, he sought above all, within the limits of the historical novel, an opportunity to pour out his soul, to throw open the gates of his imagination, and to celebrate a country and a cause which was close to his heart. ... In spite of their faults, the American author's works excite the greatest pleasure and emotion; they possess enough superlative beauties to atone for all obscurities and improbabilities.37


It is known that Cooper's writing moved Berlioz deeply, as he described in a letter to his sister Nanci:
Even though there is no firm evidence to connect Berlioz’s overture directly to Cooper’s novel, there is enough to show that Berlioz not only read *Le Corsaire rouge* but also kept in touch with the criticism of the day. He would have appreciated the idealism embodied in Cooper’s writing which epitomized the French ideal of liberty, denied the people by the Bourbon régime. The sense of betrayal felt by so many in France at the failure of the Revolution - as it must surely have appeared to them - found an outlet of expression in the accolades bestowed upon Cooper. From a position of hindsight this is all the more striking because the French public took him to their hearts in spite of literary shortcomings that would have been at least partly obscured in translation. Although they might be accused of lack of discrimination, it seems that the principles he represented to them ultimately were paramount at that time. Perhaps that is why they, more than any other nation, left such a clear record of their appreciation. It makes an interesting contrast to read what Scott wrote about *The Red Rover* in his journal:

I have read Cowper’s [sic] new work, the *Red Rover*, the current of it rolls entirely upon the ocean. Something there is too much of is nautical language; in fact it overpowers everything else. But, so people once take an interest in a description, they will swallow a great deal which they do not understand... He has much genius, a powerful conception of character and force of execution. The same ideas, I see, recur upon him that haunt other folks. The graceful form of the spars and the tracery of the ropes and cordage against the sky is too often dwelt upon... I have read Cooper’s *Prairie* - better I think than the *Red Rover*, in which you never get a foot on shore, and to understand entirely the incidents of the story it requires too much [knowledge of] nautical language. It is very clever, though.

---

38 CG I, no. 75, p. 156.
While it is inappropriate to place too much significance upon an isolated extract, this is, nevertheless, indicative of Scott's comparatively bland approach both to Cooper as a writer and to the principles in which he and his followers fervently believed. Scott emerges as a powerful, but apolitical, leader in the field of the historical novel, while Cooper seems to have created a certain reputation for himself as a republican champion for good, honest human values.40

The works of George Gordon, Lord Byron (1788-1824) were first published in French by Galignani in 1818 and by the 1820s there were 33 translations of separate works and a number of so-called complete editions. They were all very successful, if not wholly because of the quality of his writing, in which occasional slackness - like that of Cooper - was hidden in translation. He was greatly admired, and probably not a little envied by some, for his life of dissolute glamour. His irresistible power as a seducer of many women, including in all probability his half-sister; his escapades while travelling; his flouting of all convention whenever it suited him - these were the qualities of the idealised Romantic, of which many dreamed but few dared to emulate. It is easy to understand the appeal of Byron, adoration of whom became like a new religion, and for which his death at Missolonghi was in part responsible. Robert Escarpit wrote:

I began my doctoral thesis in these words: 'Byron has been talked about much more than he has been read.' That sentence could be understood in many ways, but it mainly referred to the irruption of Byron into the ideological environment of young Europe between 1825 and 1848. That irruption can hardly have been due to the bland, insipid, untruthful and misleading translation of Amédée Pichot, which more or less consciously blotted out Byron's revolutionary message... 41

40 Further extracts of critical commentary are to be found in the appendix to this chapter (item 2). They are among the many which Berlioz is likely to have read and they serve to emphasise the degree to which these writers provoked discussion and comment.
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This difference between Byron on the one hand and Scott and Cooper on the other, with whom he shared the critical limelight in Paris, is encapsulated in a quotation by Matthew Arnold (1822-88):

When Byron's eyes were shut in death,
   We bow'd our heads and held our breath.
   He taught us little: but our soul
   Had felt him like a thunder's roll.42

It was the charismatic figure of Byron himself who roused feelings, both during and after his life, while Cooper and Scott were admired for what they wrote, rather than who they were (in spite of Cooper's republican tendencies). This is one of the reasons why Byron is so strongly associated with the concept of Romanticism and explains his cultural influence among French contemporaries. Above all, during his life he was a rôle model for freedom and fighting for beliefs, even when death was the outcome.

That Byron had made an impact upon Berlioz - as an icon who was prepared to die for freedom - can be seen in the early cantata known as the Scène héroïque, which he wrote in the winter of 1825-6, in collaboration with his friend Ferrand, who wrote the poem. He had hoped that it would be performed at the benefit concert given for the Greeks (April 28, 1826) but the cantata Chant Grec by Chelard, a violinist in the orchestra at the Opéra, and composer of the opera Macbeth (June 1827), was chosen.43 Nevertheless, Byron was more than a passing whim of fashionable interest for Berlioz. There are many references in his letters44 and the long-standing presence of Byron in his life is reflected in Harold in Italie (1834). It is also a part of the background to the overture Le Corsaire, Byron having written his poem by the same name over a period of ten days in 1813. Berlioz enjoyed losing himself in the escapist adventures of Byron's The Corsair:

---

42 Quoted from Matthew Arnold by A. S. B. Glover in his introduction to Byron, London 1954.
43 For more on Chelard see Chapter 2: A Case study: the trompette à pistons.
44 e.g. CG I, nos 94, 148 and 238, pp. 199, 293, and 479 respectively.
I became absorbed in that burning verse. I followed the Corsair across the sea in his audacious journeys. I adored the extraordinary nature of the man, at once ruthless and of extreme tenderness, generous hearted and without pity, a strange amalgam of feelings seemingly opposed: love of a woman, hatred of his kind."45

Elsewhere he recalls his journey to Italy in the company of Italians, full of good stories, including one by a Venetian who claimed to have been the skipper of Byron's corvette when he sailed down the Adriatic into the Greek archipelago. The story, based around Byron playing cards during a violent storm, Berlioz concedes is questionable:

It is quite possible that there was not a word of truth in it; but one must admit that the gold-lace uniform and the game of écarté are very much in character with the author of *Lara*. Besides, the narrator did not have enough wit to invent such convincing local colour; and I was much too pleased at meeting someone who had been with Childe Harold on his pilgrimage not to believe it implicitly.46

Byron provoked many differences of opinion, and although he was frequently criticised in his own country on moral grounds, his poetry was very popular: his reputation in Europe, being judged as second only to Shakespeare, was beyond dispute. As the archetypal Romantic figure he stood for the aspirations of the emerging generation, not through his poetry alone, but because of the ironic detachment with which he viewed the social scene. The extent of his influence on Berlioz has been discussed in a variety of articles and, as is often the case, the truth lies somewhere between the extremes,47 which Glyn Court suggests: 'Berlioz was stirred by the legend but, contrary to popular belief, this emotion [i.e. the strong feelings brought up by the legend] was not fully reflected in his life and work'.48

These three writers, Scott, Cooper and Byron, were the subjects of much discussion in the press and literary circles during the first part of the

---

45 Mem ch. 36, p. 166.
46 Mem ch. 32, p. 144.
19th century. Indeed, Scott himself is shown to be an interesting critic if his comments on Byron are representative. There were inevitable comparisons between Scott and Cooper, although Scott's background is also compared to Byron's, in for example the biography presented in the *Revue de Paris* (1829) and in Washington Irving's book *Walter Scott et Lord Byron*.

The other major literary influence relevant to this study, who has so far received only a passing mention, is Shakespeare. More has been written about his influence on Berlioz than about the three discussed so far put together. For this reason a lengthy discourse will be set aside in favour of a few pertinent details. When *Othello* was first performed in Paris in English on July 31, 1822 (or rather, when the company tried to perform it), it was hissed off the stage. He was regarded as wild and untutored, above all for his disregard of the unities of French classical drama: indeed, the English company, a group managed by a mediocre actor-manager, named Penley, had provoked questions of artistic liberty which were debated vigorously until their next visit. 'Z' (Hoffmann) wrote in the *Journal des Débats*:

Let us admire then the genius of Shakespeare, let us do full justice to the beauties with which his tragedies teem, but at the same time let us beware of proposing as models and artistic canons the works of a man running without a guide, or art, or law. [sic]

---

49 Glyn Court, 'Berlioz and Byron and *Harold in Italy*', *Music Review*, xvii, 1956, p. 229.
49 Even horses were named after novels (Ivanhoe, Rob Roy) and writers (Scott, Hugo) so people could say 'I saw Scott today' etc., referring, of course, to the horse.
50 See, for example, his comments on *Childe Harold* in *The Quarterly Review*, February 1817.
52 Langford, entries 239, 297, 372, 387, 494, 499, 500, 502-4, 507-8, 609, 612, 628, 629, 654, 860, 861, 893, 895, 921 and 977 for a few examples of writings on this subject.
53 J. Barzun, *Berlioz and the Romantic Century* (hereafter Bar Rom), Vol. I, p. 49, 3rd ed. NY 1969, and Draper, p. 86ff. Both suggest that the adverse reception was connected, at least in part, with the fact that it was too soon after Waterloo (Scott was described as 'un aide de camp de Wellington'), and French audiences were still smarting from their wounded pride. More recent commentary is in *Fair Ophelia*, Peter Raby (hereafter Raby), Cambridge and New York 1982. The chapter entitled *Shakespeare In France* enlarges on the significance of these performances in the history of French drama and theatre.
54 *Journal des Débats*, August 10, 1822, trans. in Draper, p. 89.
In spite of this, over the next two months, the company performed *Othello, Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet* and *Richard III* to a small, subscribing audience with sufficient success, despite the inadequate surroundings, for it to be remembered and repeated five years later.\(^{55}\)

When Berlioz came to Paris, therefore, Shakespeare had yet to be established as an important literary figure and there is no evidence that he went to any of these performances. Nevertheless, Berlioz's development as a composer was inextricably entwined with Shakespeare's impact in France. When the English touring company - a group drawn mainly from Covent Garden, Drury Lane and the Haymarket theatres and managed by William Abbott - tried again to bring Shakespeare to the Parisian stage in September 1827, this time he was accepted and recognized for his true worth, in so far as it was possible in the rewritten versions which were staged at the Odéon during that highly successful season.\(^{56}\) The advent of Shakespeare in Berlioz's life affected him with an intensity which is impossible to recreate today: 'Shakespeare, coming upon me unawares, struck me like a thunderbolt.'\(^{57}\) The truth of Berlioz's reaction - that it was not exaggerated - can be measured by understanding critics' reaction. Charles Magnin, critic of *Le Globe* noted that on this occasion:

... there were no signs of derision in the audience. A murmur of astonishment was heard indeed when Hamlet sat on the ground to listen to the comedy. For the posture seemed unsuitable - or at least unusual - in a tragedy. But the murmur was almost immediately suppressed and had become, by the end, a cry of admiration. ... the entrance of Miss Smithson as the mad Ophelia produced something like a shudder of surprise. But the whole scene was so poetic and yet so real, it contained such a mixture of the naive and the sublime, of

\(^{55}\) Raby, pp. 46-7.
\(^{56}\) 1) For details of the version of Hamlet staged at the Odéon see Raby, pp. 59ff.
2) The translating of Shakespeare is still a challenge and many performances in France today have a new translation with each new production. Shakespeare was not as well-known as Scott or Cooper, for example, although many of his plots were familiar because they came from Italian sources known to the French via other dramatists. It is quite possible that the basic stories of Shakespeare’s plays were known to some of the audience, since the sources were used by other writers as well. *Narrative and dramatic sources of Shakespeare*, ed. Geoffrey Bullough, 8 vols, London and New York, 1957; e.g. vol 1, pp 269-283 re. *Romeo and Juliet*.
\(^{57}\) *Mem* ch. 18, p. 95.
the picturesque and the natural - a novelty in France - that even those were deeply moved who did not understand the words perfectly.\textsuperscript{58}

The performances at the Odéon had a profound influence upon the whole course of Berlioz's life, not least because of the connection with Harriet Smithson, later to become his wife. The truth of this is reflected in the following extract from a letter written by Berlioz to his uncle, Félix Marmion, shortly after Harriet's death. It shows how deeply he felt about Shakespeare and Harriet's part in engendering that feeling:

\begin{quote}
Elle était si grandement intelligente des choses du monde poétique, cette pauvre Henriette! Elle devinait ce qu'elle n'avait jamais. Elle m'avait d'ailleurs révélé Shakspeare et Dieu sait l'influence que cette révélation a exercée encore sur ma carrière. C'est incalculable...c'est infini.\textsuperscript{59}
\end{quote}

Indeed, the letters and the Memoirs are rich sources of evidence of Berlioz's familiarity with Shakespeare's plays, quoting as he does some 150 passages from twenty-two of the thirty-four plays. He knew Hamlet by heart in French and most of it in English, too.\textsuperscript{60} Even though Berlioz was also familiar with the other authors discussed in this chapter, it is clear that Shakespeare offered him something more profound than he had found hitherto.\textsuperscript{61} Glyn Court wrote that Berlioz and a whole generation 'né avec le siècle' was 'afflicted with a superabundance of sensitivity and a strong desire for the unnamed and the unattainable', which for Berlioz was filled in part by Shakespeare '...whose knowledge of human sorrow was boundless' and in whom 'he found a sane and comforting intelligence in a distracted world'.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{58} Le Globe, September 18, 1827: 'Car le génie de Shakespeare est tellement pittoresque, cet homme dispose si naturellement la scène, dessine si exactement, si largement chaque situation, que les yeux peuvent suivre et comprendre ses drames presque sans le secours des mots.' The paraphrase is taken from Draper, pp. 96-7.

\textsuperscript{59} CG V, no. 1726, p. 500.

\textsuperscript{60} BarRom, vol. II, p. 220, n. 15.

\textsuperscript{61} Virgil lies outside the scope of this study, his influence not extending directly to the overtures.

In addition to authors mentioned so far, Berlioz's literary taste would have included reading the works of other writers, comments about whom are outside the scope of this study since they have no connection to Berlioz's concert overtures. Paris was full of talented writers, such as those to be found frequenting Victor Hugo's salons, and Berlioz would want to be able to discuss whatever was the current literary fashion. So although his sources of inspiration may seem to be an odd assortment, Byron and Shakespeare having retained their reputations, while Cooper and Scott are out of favour today, all are of significance because of the influence they had on the culture of Paris at that time and thus, in varying degrees, on Berlioz's choice of subject and genre for his compositions in general and concert overtures in particular.

***

Turning from matters literary to matters musical, this section will look briefly at the musical background around and up to the first quarter of 1827, by which time Berlioz had probably written Waverley. The object is to assess such factors as may have given him the impetus to take this particular compositional path - that of the concert overture - at this point in his life. Therefore, the composition of Waverley is the key point of reference at this stage in terms of background and influences, rather than the composition of other overtures, which receive little, if any, mention here. The section will include comments about the dissemination of music; the purpose and standing of the overture; the state of concert-giving up to c.1827, and the extent to which overtures were a part of concert programmes. The position of Beethoven in relation both to his reception in Paris and his importance to Berlioz at this time is assessed and mention is made of the influence of Cherubini, Spontini and Weber, although the scope of this chapter is such that none of these can be examined in depth. Finally, there is discussion about Berlioz's two teachers at the Conservatoire, Antoine Reicha (1770-

---

63 This will not, therefore, include any part played by the Société des concerts, since their history does not begin until 1828.
1836, originally Antonín Rejcha), teacher of fugue and counterpoint, and Jean-François Le Sueur (1760-1837), teacher of composition.

It is interesting that, though the French were insular about their drama for the first twenty-five years or so of the 19th century, in some respects they showed a greater of acceptance of music from other countries. At the turn of the century full scores were being published in Paris, 'already the most active European centre of music publication', and symphonies by Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven had appeared by 1809. In addition, the Conservatoire publishing house, Magasin de musique du Conservatoire, was the first to publish the full scores of overtures separately from the operas to which they were attached - like, for example, La Chasse du jeune Henri (1797) by Méhul, from the opera Le jeune Henri and Les Confidences (1803) by Isouard (sometimes called Nicoló) - and with increasing accuracy during the first decade or so of the 19th century.

It seems that in the early 19th century, despite the lack of a serious tradition of orchestral music, there is evidence that its status was improving, if only gradually, in relation to its more powerful sister, opera. There were anomalies, however, since for all their willingness to take music from other countries under their publishing wing, foreigners were not welcome in other areas: for instance, they were not allowed into the Conservatoire, and the Société des Concerts, founded in 1828, did not allow foreign performers. This might seem to be a good thing for aspiring French musicians: they had access to a wide range of

---

65 For a full account see Constant Pierre, Le Magasin de musique à l'usage des fêtes nationales et du Conservatoire, Paris 1895.
66 CharltonDiss, pp. 3-4. Other historical factors are discussed on pp. 9-10. Further to this see Constant Pierre, Bernard Sarrette et les origines du Conservatoire national de musique et de déclamation (hereafter PierreSarrette), Paris 1895.
67 Jean Mongrédié, French Music from the Enlightenment to Romanticism (hereafter Mongrédié), trans. Sylvain Frémaux, Portland 1996. Mongrédié points out that Cherubini's Symphonie (1815) and Overture (1815) (commissioned by the newly formed Royal Philharmonic Society of London and not very successful) and Hérold's early symphonies (1813 and 1815) constitute the total orchestral corpus since 1789.
music, including that from other countries and they were, it seemed, ‘protected’ from the unwelcome competition of foreign musicians. In practice, however, as Berlioz found out, it was only helpful if one were willing to sacrifice musical integrity in return for acceptance by the influential.

The origins of the concert overture in France are difficult to define. Rousseau indicates in his *Dictionnaire de musique*\(^6\) that an overture should have some thematic connection with its opera, ideally preparing the audience for the mood of the work to follow and in particular the opening scene.\(^6\) This thinking continued when the formal structure varied from the fast-slow-fast - at its most popular in the 18th century - to the single movement structure, often with a slow introduction, that became the norm from the early part of the 19th century onwards. The use of the term ‘concert overture’ has been found in a review dating from 1811, although judging from the content, it could have already been in use before this date:

The overture *Leila, ou Le Voyage aux glaciers du* Mont St Bernard by Mr Cherubini could only lose much being separated from the opera which it precedes. It is not at all a Concert overture; it only creates much noise, and certain passages will be judged cold and insignificant when detached from the bizarre scenes following them [and] of which they form the development.\(^7\)

It is tantalising to know that there was such a concept, without knowing what was expected of a ‘Concert overture’; whether it referred simply to an overture being performed in a concert as opposed to in the theatre before its opera, or whether there was emerging as early as this an idea of it having an extra-musical connection cannot be ascertained. Two overtures, in particular, suggest the presence of an embryonic programmatic connection

---


\(^{7}\) This is supported elsewhere. See Johann Joachim Quantz, *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen* (1752) and Francesco Algarotti, *Saggio sopra l'opera in musica* (1755), to name but two examples. Both are translated in Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History* (New York 1950), pp. 588, item 43 and 665 respectively.
by this time; Monsigny's *Le Déserteur* overture (1769) is seen as the precursor of the symphonic tone poem and programme overture and Méhul's *La Chasse du jeune Henri* as an example of programme music suggested by a series of events.⁷¹

Here the discussion will summarise information about two sources which contributed to the establishing of the concert overture as a genre in its own right. First, a general influence, which was the music which was a part of the post-Revolutionary *al fresco* tradition, along with other large-scale performances of the Republic. (There was similar activity in the Consulate and Empire, although the latter saw only very functional music performed by the military; but it was important as 'a rôle of popular communication'.)⁷² Charlton mentions that a 'Revolutionary genre was heard in the form of one-movement overtures or symphonies for wind instruments, chiefly written in 1793-5'.⁷³ Study of these is beyond the scope of this chapter, but as works of originality and invention both in terms of structure and use of instruments, they were part of the early bridge-building between the operatic and concert overtures.⁷⁴ One important result of the *al fresco* tradition, in particular, was the effect this had on increasing the size and scope of the orchestra, which also brought with it an interest in improving instruments.⁷⁵ For example, Reicha, along with other composers, wrote large scale works for outdoor performance like *Musique pour célébrer des grands hommes qui se sont illustres au service de la Nation française* (1809?). This was accompanied by detailed instructions and hints for conductor, performers and organizers, which included information on the spacing of the instruments from each other and from the audience.⁷⁶ Thus, for

---

⁷⁰ Les Tablettes de polynnie II (20 May, 1811), p. 376, reviewing *Exercice* of May 12 and quoted from note 8 in CharltonOverture, p. xv.
⁷¹ CharltonOverture, p. xvi and Boris Schwarz, *French instrumental music between the Revolutions, 1789-1830* (hereafter Schwarz), New York 1987, p. 79.
⁷³ CharltonOverture, pp. xiii-xiv.
⁷⁴ CharltonOverture, pp. xvii-xviii.
example, the inclusion of two piccolos, two flutes and four clarinets in the original instrumentation of *Waverley* was not as unusual then as it may seem to be now. Such music did not directly influence Berlioz's choice of the concert overture as a genre, being too far removed from him in time, but contributed to his knowledge and understanding of the orchestra.

The predominant field of influence of the concert overture evolved via the continuing importance of the theatre, which attracted the best composers who wrote operas together, of course, with their overtures, some of which became highly thought of as concert pieces. In addition, from operas which had failed there were good overtures which were performed separately - for example *La Chasse du jeune Henri* (1797) by Méhul - so it was not unusual to see them as items in a concert programme. Castil-Blaze writes about them as follows:

> Certaines ouvertures dénuées de toute expression dramatique, telles que celles de *Didon*, des *Horaces* de Cimarosa, et même d’*Œdipe à Colone*, gagnent beaucoup à être enterfhs au concert. Une fois éloignée de la scène, on les considère comme musique instrumentale, et les effets éclatants et mélodieux qui s’y rencontrent font pardonner le défaut d’images et de passion.

Clearly, at this time an overture as music divested of any specific dramatic associations was acceptable; but, as suggested above, there does not seem to be any indication that such pieces with specific, but non-operatic associations had been thought of. At the end of his chapter on the overture Castil-Blaze cites the operatic overtures he regards as the best, Gluck’s *Iphigénie en Aulide* (1774), taking pride of place, followed by (among others) *Démophon*.

---

77 Nicholas Temperley calls these ‘dramatic overtures’ to distinguish them from the concert overture. *NG*, vol. 14, p. 33ff. See also Schwarz, pp. 66-8, for more on the importance of the overture in France.

78 H. Castil-Blaze, *De l’Opéra en France*, 2 vols, Paris 1820, vol. 1, p. 10. Of incidental interest is Castil-Blaze’s thorough knowledge of the scores to which he refers in his writings, here and elsewhere, notably his feuilletons for the *Journal des Débats*. For all Berlioz’s antagonism towards him, it is possible that his style of criticism was influenced by Castil-Blaze. See ‘Castil-Blaze: *De l’Opéra en France* and the feuilletons of the *Journal des Débats*, 1820-1832’, thesis submitted in partial fulfillment for Ph. D in 1992, by Donald Garth, University of Columbia. For a different perspective see Kerry Murphy, *Hector Berlioz and the development of French Music Criticism*, Ann Arbor, 1988.
(Vogel, 1789), Lodoiska (Cherubini, 1791), La Caverne (one by Mélhul, 1795, and one by Le Sueur, 1793), Armide (1777) and Alceste (1776), both by Gluck. Taïeb cites twenty-four concerts between April 1790 and May 1800 which included a performance of Démophon and thirteen between August 1797 and September 1800 which included performances of La Chasse du jeune Henri. In addition to these, the overtures by Cherubini for Démophon (1788), Catel for Sémiramis (1802) and Mélhul for Uthal (1806) are also highly original works and deserve to be more familiar today, since they demonstrate the wide range of orchestral colour and expression heard in the early nineteenth century. The overture became such a popular item that concert programmes were rarely without one, and it is not difficult to see why. The operatic orchestra expanded after the Revolution to accommodate the increasing range of colour and expression required to accompany dramatic music. In contrast, the symphony orchestra was more restrained. In addition, overtures were written with no fixed formal structure, allowing a freedom of expression which matched that of post-Revolution concert-goers.

It will already be apparent that there must have been concert life to support the performance of overtures separately from their operas. In the first years of the 19th century, concert-giving in Paris was popular both in private and public, although in many instances it was used as a social event rather than as an opportunity to listen to well-played, good quality music. The Restoration of 1814 caused the concert-giving organisations in Paris to

---

79 Fétis also speaks highly of this overture. F.-J. Fétis, Biographie universelle des musiciens (hereafter FétisBiog), Paris 1877, 2nd edition, vol. 8, p. 373, column 1.
81 Patrick Taïeb, L'Ouverture d'Opéra-Comique de 1781 à 1801 (hereafter Taïeb), Université François Rabelais de Tours, 1994. The appendix headed 'Programmes de concerts contenant une ouverture' indicates that there existed a regular habit of concert-giving up till 1801. Charlton Diss refers to concert-giving in Appendix 4, p. 514ff, overlapping in part with Taïeb's Annex.
82 Schwarz, pp. 68-71.
83 The large amount of chamber music performed in private concerts, including some of Beethoven's quartets, is not considered here, but note will be made of public performance of Beethoven's music. For more on this see, for example, Charlton Diss, p. 512 and Mongrédiéen, p. 320.
84 Mongrédiéen, pp. 206-8.
be thrown into a state of disarray. The government closed down the Conservatoire, which ended the series of student concerts (called *Exercices*) organised by Habeneck, although not before Beethoven's *Die Geschöpfen des Prometheus* was performed in August 1814.\(^{85}\) Although the Conservatoire had reopened in 1817 as the Académie Royale de Musique, by 1818 there was still no permanent musical society in Paris.\(^{86}\) In addition such concerts as did take place at the Conservatoire alternated tragedies and classical comedies with music, rather than giving concerts. Between 1818 and 1825, however, some twenty of these ‘concerts’ took place and included some Mozart symphonies (most notably No. 40), as well as Beethoven’s First Symphony and his overture to *Fidelio*. From 1821 onwards it was permitted to organize some four concerts every Easter, known as the *Concerts spirituels*. In those of 1822 there were performances of a Beethoven overture and the Benedictus from his Mass in C; in 1824 his First Symphony was given and in 1826 there was another performance of the overture to *Fidelio*.\(^{87}\) In the same year that the Conservatoire re-opened (1817), Rossini’s *L’Italiana in Algeri* was performed in Paris for the first time. Enthusiasm for his music grew steadily over the next ten years, at which point he was appointed director at the Théâtre Italien, which caused his popularity to soar.\(^{88}\) From 1825 onwards there was an effort to increase the number of concerts, to which end several music societies were formed.\(^{89}\) Although these were, by and large, short-lived during the period under consideration here (i.e. up to early 1827), they are indicative of the trend of which Berlioz was a part in his desire to have his music heard and in which he was to choose to perform his concert overture *Waverley*.

\(^{85}\) The information in this section is taken from Mongrédien, chapters 5 and 7. Also op. cit. CharltonDiss and Taleb. Beethoven’s 1st symphony was performed in Paris February, 1807, the 5th in April, 1808, the 3rd in May, 1811 and again in 1813 and 1814.
\(^{86}\) Mongrédien, p. 243.
\(^{87}\) Full details of these programmes are to be found in the Archives Nationales in Paris (hereafter AN), AJ13/118.
\(^{88}\) There does not seem to be any specific reference to particular Rossini overtures being performed as separate concert items. The author acknowledges Professor E. Bartlet for her advice on this topic. It was not possible to examine Parisian papers and journals for evidence which might be found in concert programmes of the period.
\(^{89}\) For background to this period see Schwarz, pp. 54 and 66.
Notwithstanding the impact and life-long influence of his music on Berlioz, the history of the introduction of Beethoven to Paris in relation to Berlioz's contribution to the genre of the concert overture, is - as far as current evidence shows - something of a non-event. There is a parallel between the reception of Beethoven's music and Shakespeare's plays, both being met with some critical hostility before being accepted. In this way, Beethoven and Shakespeare were a revelation to many - not just Berlioz - in the mid-1820's, even though Beethoven's music had been heard in public and private since the start of the century (see above). When reading some of the critical responses to the first performances of Beethoven's music, it is also hard to ignore the strong parallels with the way in which some of Berlioz's music was received. It certainly seems that there ought to be a link between Beethoven and Berlioz's choosing to compose a concert overture with a strong literary connection. Three factors conspire to make this unlikely to be the case. First, a brief look at Beethoven's contribution to the genre will show that all his overtures were functional in the sense that they were 'for' something and secondly that the appearance of the scores in published format makes their dissemination in France by the period up to early 1827 more unlikely than likely: the list below gives the title, reasons for having been written and the dates the scores were published:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reasons/comments</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overture to Collin's Coriolan</td>
<td>For the play; no other music</td>
<td>Vienna 1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelio</td>
<td>Opera: private edition</td>
<td>Leipzig 1810 / Paris 1826 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Ruinen von Athen</td>
<td>For the play: 7 other pieces</td>
<td>Vienna 1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overture Namensfeier</td>
<td>Occasion piece</td>
<td>Vienna 1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overture to Die Weihe des Hauses</td>
<td>Occasion piece</td>
<td>Mainz 1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>König Stephan</td>
<td>For the play: 9 other pieces</td>
<td>Vienna 1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermont (Goethe)</td>
<td>For the play: 9 other pieces</td>
<td>Leipzig 1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonore no. 1</td>
<td>For Fidelio</td>
<td>Vienna 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Geschopfe des Prometheus</td>
<td>For the ballet: 16 items</td>
<td>Leipzig 1862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90a. For example A. Dumar, V. Hugo, A. Descamps and A. de Mongredien, pp. 320-23
91 1) The author has been unable to find out specific information about the publication of Beethoven's music in France. His name appears in the catalogues of publishers like Schlesinger from 1830 onwards, but without reference to specific works. See Dictionnaire.
2) The titles and information are as taken from NG, vol. 2, pp. 394 and 402. For a brief résumé of these works see Basil Deane, 'The Symphonies and Overtures' in The Beethoven Companion, eds Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune, London 1971.
Third, even if Berlioz had not been aware of the performances of Beethoven in the *Concert spirituels* of 1822 and 1824, he was aware of the one in 1826 in which *Fidelio* was performed\(^92\) - he was hoping to have his *Scène héroïque* performed at one of them\(^93\) - but there is nothing extant which records either that Berlioz heard the performance or that he had any reaction to Beethoven in 1826. In fact Berlioz’s first experience of hearing Beethoven’s orchestral music was on November 30, 1827, in a concert at the Conservatoire.\(^94\) In the first letter extant thereafter, dating from January 10, 1828, Berlioz’s reaction to Beethoven is recorded in no uncertain terms:

> ...c’est quand on a entendu les sublimes compositions instrumentales de l’aigle Beethoven qu’on voit la justesse de l’exclamation du poète: ‘O divine musique, le langage impuissant et faible se retire devant ta magie. Ah, pourquoi le sentiment parlerait-il jamais, quand tu peux seule exhaler toute ton âme?’ ... Dernièrement après le concert dont j’avais parlé à mon père, à peine fus-je dans le cou du Conservatoire, tremblant de la tête aux pieds, il était quatre heures; ...

And thus it continued to be, after the first concert of the Société des Concerts\(^96\) and many times and at great length thereafter. Given the degree to which the depth of Berlioz’s admiration and love of Beethoven and his music is reflected in his writings and letters, it is likely that - had Berlioz heard Beethoven’s music in 1826 - he would have written about it at the time.

Although there is little direct evidence to connect Berlioz to Beethoven through the concept of writing a concert overture, there are four important figures whose presence serves to show the diversity and interweaving of influences, their own and that of Beethoven, upon Berlioz in the early 1820’s. They are Cherubini, head of the Conservatoire during Berlioz’s term as a student, Weber and Spontini, whose music Berlioz

---

92 The full score of the final version was published in Paris in 1826. All the other overtures by Beethoven had been published in Germany between 1804 (*Prometheus*) and 1838 (*Leonora*, op. 138), but it is not known whether they were exported to Paris.

93 *CG I*, no. 53, p. 110.

94 *CG I*, foot note to no. 78D, p. 162. Citron notes that it was an overture but there is no record of which one.

96 *CG I*, no. 79, p. 168.
esteemed most highly, and Reicha, his teacher of counterpoint. Cherubini (1760-1842), was viewed by Beethoven as his greatest contemporary and his legacy in this context, as has already been suggested in the preceding paragraphs, is most powerfully manifest in the overtures to his operas, most of which are able to stand independently. His handling of the orchestra, especially of the brass, which was often heavy for the period, is very impressive and assured and all the more remarkable since the important overtures were written by 1803. He favoured using a freely adapted sonata form, with a fairly long introduction (except Médée) and a coda of some significance. This was the structure adopted by Berlioz in his first two concert overtures, Waverley and Le Roi Lear. In addition, in the overtures to Démophon and Emma ou la prisonnière the theme from the slow introduction returns just before the recapitulation, in a manner enlarged upon by Berlioz in Le Roi Lear, who must have become acquainted with Cherubini’s music, while a student. Despite the personal antagonism that prevailed between the two, Berlioz spoke highly of him, even when he was still at the Conservatoire:

Cependant quoiqu’il soit évidemment le plus grand compositeur existant en France dans ce moment.99

He also acknowledged Cherubini’s support of him during the Prix de Rome competition of 1829.100

Weber adds another link in this chain of influence: he, like Beethoven, had a high opinion of Cherubini, traces of whose music can be heard in both Der Freischütz and Euryanthe. His essays on Les Deux journées and Lodoiska endorse this view, Weber having conducted both of these works in Dresden.101 Another connection is provided by Spontini,

96 E.g. Mem, ch. 20, p. 104ff.
98 Schwarz, p. 113ff.
99 CG I, no. 125, p. 252.
100 CG I, no. 132, p. 265.
much admired by Berlioz, who was writing operas with highly effective overtures long after Cherubini had stopped (except for Ali baba, (1833)), all of which were well-known to Berlioz. Weber also wrote about and conducted Spontini’s La Vestale and praised Spontini for his ‘great genius in making each work absolutely individual, a real achievement wholly his own and wholly real’ while not always seeing eye to eye with him. Weber was also influenced by Beethoven, and had a wide knowledge of his music which is reflected in the many references to him in his writings. In addition, Reicha knew Beethoven - in Bonn, c. 1785 and in Vienna c. 1801-8 - and it is hard to imagine that the subject of Beethoven did not come up for discussion in his lessons with Berlioz. Berlioz was equally passionate about the music of Weber and Spontini, reflected in his outrage at the production of Robin des bois, later essays on his operas and highly effective and sympathetic arrangements of some of his music and, for example, his writings on Spontini in Evenings with the Orchestra. Although many of Berlioz’s writings on these composers are retrospective to the period in question, they serve to demonstrate the depth and breadth of Berlioz’s knowledge, which only came through long-term study of their music. In this way it is reasonable to suggest that there were aspects of Beethoven which were permeating Berlioz’s consciousness in a variety of ways, even before he himself was aware of them - for example, the way in which the overture to Fidelio begins with a short allegro followed by a slow section before resuming the fast tempo, a format adopted by Berlioz in later overtures - but it is not possible to draw any specific conclusions concerning the influence

102 Berlioz mentions Spontini on numerous occasions. In CG I the number equals that accorded to Harriet Smithson and Shakespeare, in CG II a little less than Shakespeare and in CG III Spontini is back in the ratings with the Bard. They also corresponded on a regular, if not very frequent basis: CG I nos 178, 191 (in which Berlioz sends Spontini scores of the Symphonie fantastique and an overture - presumably Les Francs-juges - both of which Spontini had heard at a concert on December 5, 1830), 268; CG II nos 364, 752, 768; CG III nos 870 and 1052. There is evidence that Spontini replied to Berlioz, as in CG III nos 862, 866, 1051.

103 Ibid., p. 247 and 336, from Dresden Abend-Zeitung, no. 22, January 27, 1818 and ch. 5 of Tonkünstler’s Leben, written in Berlin January 7, 1817.

104 Hector Berlioz, Evenings with the Orchestra, trans. and ed. by Jacques Barzun, Chicago and London 1956, Evenings 12 and 13, for example.
of Beethoven on Berlioz at this early stage which may have contributed him writing *Waverley*.\(^{105}\)

Berlioz had two teachers of special significance during his time as a student at the Conservatoire: Antoine Reicha (1770-1836), teacher of fugue and counterpoint, and Jean-François Le Sueur (1760-1837), teacher of composition, with whom he had been studying privately since 1823. The effect of their presence in Berlioz's life is of great significance, irrespective of the extent of their influence. Since Berlioz was a student at the Conservatoire while writing *Waverley*, and since he wrote *Le Roi Lear* and *Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor* while in Italy, having won the coveted *Prix de Rome*, something must be said about the place these teachers hold in relation to Berlioz's career. The observations which follow are selective and the balance of comment emerges unevenly weighted in favour of Reicha. This is partly because Le Sueur's influence on Berlioz has been assessed by Jean Mongréden in *NG*\(^{106}\) and partly because there are aspects of Reicha which do not seem to have received the attention they merit in relation to Berlioz.

The importance of Reicha in his life has, by and large, been underestimated, some say as much by Berlioz himself as by other commentators. There are aspects of Reicha's attitude to music which undoubtedly permeated his whole approach to teaching and which, therefore, would have been a part of the relationship between teacher and pupil. There is, for example, his approach to large-scale works mentioned earlier and the *Te Deum* of 1825, regarded as one of his best works.\(^ {107}\) Much of this information Reicha recorded in his *Cours de composition* which was one of several

---

\(^{105}\) Mendelssohn's contribution and influence to this genre are not considered here because his first overture, to Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* although written in 1826, was not published until 1830 and his more famously independent programmatic concert overtures, the *Hebrides* and *A Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage*, appeared in Germany in 1832 and 1833 respectively.

\(^{106}\) *NG*, vol. 10, p. 696.

\(^{107}\) Reicha, pp. 34-5.
* The first two do not mention the subjects' instruments or instrumentation and although the fourth one does, it is only in brief (vol II, pp. 330-1, sections 7 and 8).
treatises, of which at least four would have been known to Berlioz while he was at the Conservatoire:

*Traité de mélodie, Paris, 1814*

*Petit traité d’harmonie pratique à deux parties, op. 84, Paris 1814*

*Cours de composition musicale, où Traité complet et raisonné d’harmonie pratique Paris, ?1816-18*

*Traité de haute composition musicale, Paris, 1824-26*

The *Cours*, on the other hand, seems a likely source from which Berlioz could have taken information on instruments, their ranges and capabilities. The orchestration section is divided into two, dealing with strings and wind. Reicha writes:

Nous avons dit plus haut quels étoient les instrumens usités dans l’orchestre, la petite flûte, les trompettes, les trombones et les timballes ne s’emploient que pour augmenter l’effet dans le forte. Ces instrumens n’étant pas de la première nécessité parce qu’ils n’entrent presque pour rien dans les combinaisons harmoniques ...

It is possible that it is to this and other comments by Reicha that Berlioz is referring when he says:

Reicha connaissait bien les ressources particulières de la plupart des instruments à vent, mais je doute qu’il ait eu des idées très-avancées au sujet de leur groupement par grandes et petites masses...

This is probably one of the comments he made which has led people to say that he did not acknowledge Reicha’s contribution to his musical education. Such comments are open to misinterpretation or even several different interpretations, and in this case it must be pointed out that by the time he wrote his *Memoirs*, Berlioz had published his own treatise and done much to advance awareness of orchestral colour. In more recent times Maurice

---


Emmanuel agreed with Berlioz in principle, but seems to suggest that Berlioz owes Reicha more than he (Emmanuel) feels he has shown:

Il est vrai qu’ici Reicha n’a que des idées assez rudimentaires; mais il faut encore, sur ce terrain, lui rendre hommage, car il pressent l’emploi d’exécutants assez nombreux pour que chaque groupe puisse suffire en fournissant une harmonie complète; ou, au contraire, se diviser et subdiviser, en vue d’effets nouveaux de plénitude et de douceur...

Reicha, sans être un réalisateur de subtils mélanges de timbres, préconise le développement de l’orchestre.\textsuperscript{110}

Reicha was, however, aware of how one instrument can be heard above many ‘Telle est la magie de cette difference du timbre’\textsuperscript{111} and advised against excessive use of noisy instruments, ‘il faut se servir le moins souvent que possible’.\textsuperscript{112}

Reicha is perhaps best remembered today for his wind quintets, some of which display great sensitivity and understanding of the instruments.\textsuperscript{113} Even though Berlioz did not particularly like these works, that does not prevent them from having contributed to his knowledge and handling of wind instruments, which extends to the overtures and beyond. Of equal importance are Reicha’s overtures: he had written one called En l’honneur de l’Impératrice Marie-Thérèse in Vienna around 1805, as well as about nine others called simply ‘overture’, which could have been known or even heard by Berlioz. Two operatic overtures were published by 1824, Natalie, for piano duet and Sapho for piano and violin. With the bias to the piano in these arrangements it is unlikely that Berlioz got to know them via this means, although it is sure that he saw Sapho (see below). Of the others only one appears to have been published; an Overture in C, called opus 24, but with no publication date in either of the sources available (NG and Reicha): there are extant ms parts and full scores for two others, the presence of parts...
suggesting that they were performed, and ms full scores for a further six, the absence of parts probably suggesting they are lost rather than that they never existed; plus additional fragments identified with an F-Pn call number. It is possible that Berlioz saw some or all of these, including the overture with the innovative 3/8:2/8 Allegro, which could have contributed to his decision to write an overture as a separate concert item.114

Reicha regarded music which received critical acclaim in Paris as being distinct from first class music. He was very aware of the shallowness of musical culture in Paris at this time, especially in relation to opera and his unswerving integrity in wishing to write only music of quality, often experimenting with time signatures, keys and rhythms, assured him of Berlioz’s total respect:115

D’un tempérament naturellement froid et porté à l’observation, plutôt qu’à l’action, Reicha avait bien vite reconnu que les difficultés, les chagrins, les déboires de toute espèce que le compositeur doit nécessairement rencontrer à chaque pas, en France surtout, avant d’arriver à l’exhibition de ses œuvres, étaient en trop grand nombre pour le persévérance dont il se sentait doué.116

The important point is that Berlioz acknowledged Reicha’s singlemindedness in daring to be innovative and in believing that to be a more desirable way forward than composing in the more fashionable styles of the day. It could be said that Berlioz appreciated Reicha’s more philosophical approach to his art. Berlioz did not often refer to Reicha in his letters117 nor did he write to him (as far as is currently known), but he wrote at length about him in the obituary from which the above quotation is taken, and in a biographical portrait published exactly two years after

114 More will be said about possible connections between Reicha’s overtures and Waverley in Chapter 3. In this section reference has been made to Reicha pp. 158-162 and NG vol. 15, p. 700.

115 Reicha’s compositions are not consistently of the sort of quality which withstand the test of time, but that in no way conflicts with his integrity and motivation for writing as he did.

116 Journal des Débats, July 3, 1836.

117 CG I no. 91, p. 192, 29 May 1828. After the concert Berlioz gave of his own works, to which this letter refers, he tells his father that he was pleased to see various important people applauding, including Reicha.
Reicha’s death. In his Memoirs he has nothing but praise for him as a teacher of fugue and counterpoint, and even though he was sceptical about Reicha’s theories on mathematics and music, because he did not see them as particularly conducive to high quality composition, he affirms his admiration of him as a teacher, particularly his willingness to explain rules and not condemn something simply because it lay outside the accepted canon, an attitude which Berlioz must have found particularly refreshing. He found Reicha’s wind quintets cold, but he admired a duet from the opera Sapho, which he describes as being full of fire and passion. In addition, there is no doubt that Berlioz found Reicha’s information about instruments and their arrangement helpful when he put on large-scale performances, even though he was not in favour of open-air concerts. Given Berlioz’s acknowledged respect for Reicha, it has to be concluded that he took note of his teacher’s comments. That there was discussion of Beethoven, large-scale performances and overtures cannot be dismissed. Even though there does not appear to be any direct link to Berlioz writing Waverley, it has to be that Reicha’s importance in Berlioz’s musical development has greater depth than may at first be concluded. And in addition, what can be said is that through his connection to Reicha, Berlioz is shown as being a part of his period, not a composer who was for so long seen as one without a tradition or context.

The temptation is to compare disadvantageously the relationship between Berlioz and Reicha with that which he enjoyed with M. et Mme Le Sueur and to conclude that he regarded the latter more highly because it continued after Berlioz’s time at the Conservatoire. On present evidence this seems a misguided conclusion and it could, of course, be denied or confirmed by the discovery of new information from the period, but as it stands, seems based on assumptions which need qualifying, rather than on undisputed fact. For example, from the information currently available

119 Mem, ch. 13, p. 75. Sapho was first performed on December 16, 1822.
120 CG II, no. 341, p. 111.
about Reicha's personality, it seems that he provoked respect but rarely any kind of intimacy in the sense of pupils becoming friends by being invited into his home,\(^1\) as happened with Le Sueur, who seems to have taken on the role of mentor to Berlioz as much as teacher. This does not mean that Reicha was not respected and thought of highly: many musicians who were already professors at the Conservatoire in their own right, such as Baillot and Rode (violinists), Habeneck (later conductor at the Opéra), Dauprat (horn player), Vogt (oboist) and others, chose to have counterpoint lessons with him, which he corrected with conscientious exactitude.

It is apparent that the two masters were very different in their personalities, rendering comparison inappropriate. Le Sueur was from an earlier generation (ten years older than Reicha), having experienced his greatest successes during the first decade or so of the century and he confessed freely his view that music like Beethoven's 5th symphony 'ought not to be written', which made it difficult for Berlioz to sympathize with him, given his admiration of Beethoven. It is not realistic, however, to discount Le Sueur from the broader sphere of influence. It is interesting to note that Le Sueur wrote no purely instrumental music (which perhaps contributed to his attitude towards Beethoven), but he had been a daring innovator, having been obliged to leave his post at Notre Dame (he was there from 1786-1787) because his dramatic, large-scale performances were judged unsuitable by the establishment. His attitude towards Berlioz reflected sympathy, tinged with nostalgia, towards this outspoken and intense young man and which, therefore, offered a certain freedom of communication between them, not to be found between Berlioz and Reicha. Despite Berlioz's lasting affection for Le Sueur, which extended to his widow in later years, he says - not with complete conviction - that Le Sueur's music did not influence him. Each of these men was important to Berlioz, however, but with very different spheres of influence. Irrespective of the degree to which Berlioz himself is thought to have been dismissive of them, that they made their mark is certain. There is a case for arguing that Le

\(^1\) He did, however, have an active social life with colleagues. *Reicha*, p. 78.
Sueur's influence permeated Berlioz's compositions, to emerge from time to time, for example in passages from *L'Enfance du Christ*, and it is easy to hear similarities in timbre and harmonic language to parts of Le Sueur's opera *Ossian*. In the case of the overtures, it is likely that Reicha's influence on Berlioz is significant, and the study of formal structures used by both Reicha and Berlioz could be of interest, particularly in those works by Reicha titled overture.

**Conclusion**

In examining some of the influences surrounding Berlioz up to the time he composed *Waverley*, it is clear that there were many different factors which contributed its background and genesis. To summarise: literature was making an important cultural and intellectual contribution to the salons in Paris; the orchestra was being used as a means of dramatic expression and instruments were being developed to increase the power of that expression; composers like Cherubini, Spontini, Weber and Beethoven were setting their own stamp on this improved vehicle of expression; Le Sueur and Reicha were giving Berlioz solid grounding in compositional technique. The freedom of musical expression that developed during the first twenty to twenty-five years of the nineteenth century was not matched by an equivalent dramatic freedom on stage until the advent of Shakespeare in Paris in 1827, and, therefore, the time to combine the two was not yet ripe. Knowingly or not, Berlioz brought drama and music together in ways which avoided the necessity of running the political gauntlet of Parisian music bureaucracy. Later works, such as *Roméo et Juliette* and *La Damnation de Faust*, are evidence of this, but in the mid-1820's simpler plans were taking shape. The paucity of references from the period pre-1826, connecting overtures with extra-musical literary connotations, suggests that this idea as seen in four of Berlioz's five ouvertures de concert, had not evolved sufficiently to be the norm when Berlioz wrote *Waverley*, and such associations were not established in concert programmes in Paris by the mid 1820's. It would seem, therefore, that, in choosing this form for his earliest
essay in purely orchestral writing and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, Berlioz was the first composer to write a concert overture in France.
APPENDIX TO CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND INFLUENCES

1a) Berlioz’s account of the Institute prize-giving

The laureate rises. ... He embraces the Permanent Secretary (polite applause). The laureate’s distinguished master is sitting a few feet from the Permanent Secretary’s rostrum. The pupil embraces his distinguished master (more polite applause). On the bench at the back, behind the academicians, the laureate’s parents sit weeping tears of silent joy. The laureate vaults over the intervening benches, treading on someone's toe, trampling another's coat and, reaching the top, flings himself into the arms of his father and mother, who are by now sobbing unashamedly (no applause, but people are beginning to laugh). To the right of this touching group a young person is signalling to the hero of the hour. He responds by leaping in her direction and, after tearing a woman's dress and crushing a dandy's hat, contrives to reach his cousin. He embraces his cousin. Sometimes he embraces his cousin's neighbour (loud laughter). Another lady, sitting by herself in a distant corner of the hall, makes discreet signs of affection which our hero affects not to notice. Then he turns and flies to embrace his mistress - his betrothed, the woman who is to share his life and fame. This time, in his haste and confusion and blindness to all other women, he kicks one of them over, trips over a bench, falls with a crash, abandons all hope of greeting the hapless girl, and regains his seat, bathed in perspiration (loud and prolonged laughter and applause).

1b) Waverley, end of chapter 11

In an instant both rapiers were brandished, and some desperate passes exchanged. Balmawhapple was young, stout, and active; but the Baron, infinitely more master of his weapon, would, like Sir Toby Belch, have tickled his opponent other gates than he did, had he not been under the influence of Ursa Major.

Edward rushed forward to interfere between the combatants, but the prostrate bulk of the Laird of Killancureit, over which he stumbled, intercepted his passage. How Killancureit happened to be in this recumbent position at so interesting a moment, was never accurately known. Some thought he was about

---

1 Memoir ch. 30, pp. 136-7.
to ensconce himself under the table; he himself alleged that he stumbled in the act of lifting a joint-stool, to prevent mischief, by knocking down Balmawhapple.

2) Further extracts of critical commentary on Scott and Cooper

The Courrier des Théâtres published an article over two issues in June 1827 under the column Littérature, headed simply Walter Scott - Cooper. In the first the writer (the articles are unsigned) writes about Cooper's background in the United States:

Son émancipation politique fut son premier ouvrage parce qu'elle fut son premier besoin, maintenant vient le tour de l'émancipation littéraire. La littéraire ne joue que le second rôle dans le dénouement du grand drame de la révolution américaine.

Although somewhat patronising in tone and lacking any significant comment about Cooper, the second part is more specific. Scott is criticised, 'c'est qu'il n'a réussi dans aucun caractère de femme; ... une chose suprenant aussi, c'est que la peinture vraie d'amour est chose fort rare...'. The literary styles of both are compared and he concludes that, 'Walter Scott et Cooper ne se ressemblent pas plus que les personnages qu'ils mettent en scène.' The political opinions of Scott and Cooper were a popular topic and this provided a platform from which sympathy for Cooper - because that is with whom it lay - could be expressed without fear of unfortunate repercussions:

We do not see much resemblance between the entirely new culture portrayed by the republican author and the feudal customs which the Scotch Baronet has exhumed from old chronicles...The reader demands that some moral idea dominate an author's pages, that an ideological conviction lend dignity to an author's work. Well, we ask, what moral idea can we observe in the writings of the Scotch novelist, unless it be the Voltaireian idea of tolerance - a tolerance founded on indifference...4

Stendhal, writing in 1830, also prefers Cooper, but chooses literary, not political grounds:

My reflections will not be welcome. An immense body of men of letters finds it in its own interest to praise Sir Walter Scott to the skies, together with his method of composition. The doublet and leather collar of a medieval serf are easier to describe than the movements of the human

---

3 Courrier des Théâtres, June 23 and 25, 1827.
4 Le Globe, June 19, 1827.
heart ... (and)... the mannered approximations of Sir Walter Scott will one
day seem as distasteful as they at first seemed charming.\textsuperscript{5}

Balzac thought differently. In 1838 he wrote:-

It is twelve years since I have been saying of Sir Walter Scott what you
have now written to me. Beside him, Lord Byron is nothing, or almost
nothing ... Scott will still be growing greater when Byron is forgotten ...  
Byron’s brains had never any other imprint than that of his own
personality; whereas the whole world has posed before the creative
genius of Scott and has there, so to speak, beheld itself.\textsuperscript{6}

And in 1840:

That which renders Cooper inferior to Scott is his profound and radical
impotence for the comic ... (but) ... The difference that exists between
Walter Scott and Cooper is derived essentially from the nature of the
subjects towards which their genius led them. From Cooper’s scenes
nothing philosophical or impressive to the intellect issues when, the work
once read, the soul looks back to take in a sense of the whole. Yet both are
great historians ... the one initiates you into great human evolutions, the
other into the mighty heart of nature herself. One has brought literature
to grasp the earth and ocean, the other makes it grapple body to body
with humanity. Read Cooper and this will strike you, especially in The
Pathfinder. Whereas Scott gives you wherever you are, a brilliant
company of human beings. Cooper’s work isolates; Scott weds you to his
drama... The grandeur of Cooper is a reflection of the nature he depicts;
that of Walter Scott more peculiarly his own. The Scotchman procreates
his work; the American is the son of his.\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{5} Stendhal, p. 322: from Walter Scott et La Princesse de Clèves in Le National, February 19, 1830.
\textsuperscript{6} Part of letter to Mme. Hanska, January 20-22, 1838, trans. in Scott: the critical heritage, ed. J.
\textsuperscript{7} Scott: the Critical Heritage, op. cit.: from the preface to the first edition of La Femme Superieure, 1838.
CHAPTER 2: A CASE STUDY:
THE TROMPETTE A PISTONS
IN THE OVERTURE Waverley

The purpose of this chapter is to offer a new perspective as to why Berlioz made revisions to the part for the trompette à pistons in his overture Waverley and in so doing, extend the breadth of historical background, as referred to in the title of this thesis. There are many strands of information which contribute to the answer to this question, the communicating of which to the reader has presented a number of organisational problems. There is inevitable overlapping of information, especially when the chronology of one section covers a similar time span to another section and also to sections of another chapter. But since one of the most important reasons for this chapter lies in showing how the various strands of information weave together, it has proved best to place this chapter before that on Waverley, since it is against this backdrop that the overture was conceived, revised and published. In this way Part I offers some insights into the political machinations which prevailed at the Opéra during this period via the unfolding of the development of the trompette à pistons during its formative years. In view of the comments made in Chapter 1 about Berlioz's wish to receive public recognition as a dramatic composer, these political aspects confirm the difficulties and frustrations Berlioz faced and which contributed to him seeking to compose non-operatic genre, such as the concert overtures, at this stage in his life. Part II contains material pertaining to the more specific aim, which is to relate the

1 Special acknowledgements are due to: Jeremy Montagu, Curator of the Bate Collection of Musical Instruments, Oxford for his help and expertise, especially during the early stages of research in this area and without whose patience progress would not have been possible; Professor Tarr for the time and trouble he took in an extended correspondence during research for this chapter; John Wallace, for his time and advice (indicated in subsequent footnotes by 'JW'); and finally to Professor Hugh Macdonald for raising this whole question in the first place.

2 Only the basic information on Waverley is given in this chapter. For all further details the reader is referred to Chapter 3. This applies to all references to Waverley, and will not be noted again.
When the author began preliminary research on the editing of Waverley, she found that Baines & Tarr stated that Spontini (1774-1851) had sent valued instruments to Paris in October 1826. This information probably came from Rastner's account (Manuel, p.192n and p.68 of this thesis) and/or Dauverne's Notice to his sixth and last Méthode (1856), the only one commonly known at that time (see p.122 of this thesis). Professor Hugh Macdonald suggested the possible hypothesis that Berlioz first heard the instrument in Macbeth by Chelard (1789-1861) in June 1827 and decided to include the instrument in Waverley.

organological developments directly to the revisions made by Berlioz to the part for trompette à pistons in Waverley, which in turn will be shown to have some bearing on the possible timing of revisions he made to the score.

PART I

Introduction

The autograph of Waverley\(^3\) shows that the part for the trompette à pistons has been rewritten (Ex. 1), the explanation on first sight having been that Berlioz had included it in Waverley but without realising that he had misunderstood this new instrument's capabilities. After hearing that the part would not work - presumably, it was thought, at the rehearsals for the first performance - it was then suggested that Berlioz revised the part in accordance with what was playable. A more detailed examination of this issue, however, provides different answers.

Early valved brass instruments: early solutions: Stölzel, Blühmel and Wieprecht

The natural trumpet has inherent tuning problems, in particular unreliability around the seventh and eleventh partials, b\(^e\) and f\(^e\), respectively. Although these notes are used regularly in the natural trumpet repertoire, they always require careful intonation. Given that the distance of a semitone is measured as 100 cents, the b\(^e\) partial is 267 cents above the g\(^e\), when it should be 300 cents above to be in tune. Similarly, the f\(^e\) is 165 cents

\(^3\) F-Pn ms 1507.
above e", making it closer to f\#" than f". While the theory of adding pistons suggested the amelioration of tuning problems - notes could obtained using pistons rather than relying on the embouchure for tuning - and although valves widened the range of notes available in theory, in practice the usage of pistons to lower the note tended to compound the tuning problem.4

From this information, albeit brief, it is easy to see whence came the impetus to improve the instrument, which focussed on two areas: the need to increase the range and the need to improve the reliability of intonation. Four (main) devices were tried: the stopped trumpet,5 keys, slides and valves,6 this last proving to be the one that endured. The history of the valve begins earlier than one might imagine: in 1788, for example, Charles Clagget (1740--c.1795, Irish violinist and inventor) patented a 'Cromatic Trumpet and French Horn'.7 This and other more or less isolated examples can be found leading up to about 1815, by which time Cherubini is recorded as having written pieces requiring valved brass instruments: March (1814) and Pas redouble (1814), both for the National Guard and Six pas redoubles and Deux Marches for trumpet, three horns and trombone, for the Prussian regiment.8 Thereafter, the development of the valve becomes a subject of considerable complexity, particularly for those having no specialist knowledge of brass instruments. Reading about the researches by Herbert Heyde in, for example, the writings of Edward Tarr, shows it to be a minefield of technical jargon about different kinds of valves, pistons and

---

4 Certain experiments used devices which raised the notes, but these were less successful than those which lowered the note and were therefore rejected. Further details lie outside the scope of this study. See Baines for full details.

5 Tius was a trumpet made in such a way that the player could put his hand in the bell to adjust intonation, in the manner of horn players. Berlioz wrote: 'Some players can produce passable stopped notes on the trumpet by placing the hand in the bell, as on the horn, but the effect of these notes is poor and their intonation so uncertain that almost all composers have rightly refrained from using them, and still do.' Grande Traité d'instrumentation et d'orchestration modernes, (hereafter Treatise), Paris 1843, p. 186.

6 There were several different types of valves, discussion of which is not relevant here. See Baines for further information.

7 NG, volume 4, p. 423 and JW. Dr. Frances Palmer, Curator of Instruments at the Horniman Museum questions whether or not this instrument was ever made, but that the idea of valves to increase the range was around is without question.

8 NG, volume 4, p. 213 and JW.
cylinders, made the more confusing because it was not until some time after the period under discussion that terms became standardized. In addition there is further confusion concerning the granting of patents and privileges (the latter being less important than the former) and the collaboration between Stölzel (1777-1844) and Blühmel (d.o.b. not known - died after 1845), the two main valve-building protagonists at this time. Wieprecht (1802-1872), Director of Music of the Royal Guard to the King of Prussia, was interested in the improvement of brass instruments to the degree that he had valve trumpets in his band as early as 1824. Working in Berlin at the same time as Spontini and acquainted with Stölzel and Blühmel, his account is found in Baines:

On dit même (remarquons bien que c'est toujours Wieprecht qui parle) que les autres facteurs, par jalousie de métier, engagèrent les hautboîtes à déclarer ces instruments complètement incapable de rendre le moindre service. ... les musiciens de Berlin ne lui tinrent nullement compte de ses efforts ... bien qu'il eût mieux réussi cette fois ... toute-fois celle-ci fut plus heureuse à l'étranger, notamment en France et en Russie, et dans ces pays fut même accueillie assez favorablement.

---


10 Baines, p. 207ff and J-G. Kastner, Manuel Générale de Musique Militaire (hereafter Manuel), Paris 1848, rep. Geneva 1973. Kastner, a well-respected theorist who had limited success with his compositions, moved to Paris in 1835. He had published a Cours d'instrumentation in 1839 which concentrates on historical aspects of instruments and orchestral plans. He was well acquainted with Berlioz who wrote reviews of his (Kastner's) work, as letters show. CG II, no. 615, p. 304; no. 629, p. 332; no. 662, p. 576. Wieprecht became a controversial participant in brass matters a little later in the century as seen in FétisBiog, vol. 1, pp. 465-6.

11 a) Baines, p. 209; Manuel, p. 130, n. 1; and TarrRom, p. 234. In correspondence with the author Prof. Tarr suggests that Spontini's motivation was not because of a negative response in Berlin, but simply because he wanted the French to know about this new instrument. He notes that in general, however, valve instruments were more readily accepted in military than in art music circles.

b) This is also borne out by Karl Bagans, first trumpeter to the King of Prussia, in an article in The Harmonicon, VIII, January 1830, p. 23-25. He discounts keyed and valved instruments, conceding by the end of the article, however, that they may have their place regarding higher tones. He notes, one suspects with some bias, that the Royal Prussian Corps of Guard Artillery has neither keyed nor valved instruments in its 'excellent' band.
The main point that emerges is that players of art music in Berlin - as opposed to military musicians - were against the invention but it was received abroad, especially in Russia and France.

A promoter of the new brass: Spontini

Spontini, the naturalised French Italian-born composer whom Berlioz idolised in his youth, was, as already mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, responsible for the arrival in Paris of the first valved brass instruments, while working in Berlin (1820-1842) as General-musikdirektor to the King of Prussia, Friedrich Wilhelm III. Perhaps Spontini felt, like Wieprecht, that the instrument was not receiving the attention it deserved in Berlin and he knew from his sojourn in Paris (1803-1820) that it was an open and innovative city in many respects, despite the strict rules which governed the performance of opera. This could have convinced him of its readiness to receive more valve instruments. For instance Castil-Blaze and Constant Pierre both comment on the fact that Rudolphe Kreutzer (1766-1831, conductor at the Opéra until 1824) used a trompette à clés in his opera *Ipsiboë*, as played by Bauman on March 31, 1824. Spontini was probably aware of this and his commitment to the 'new brass' is reflected in a letter dated April 6, 1840, which he wrote to the Académie des Beaux Arts:

J'envoyai de Berlin à Paris, de 1823 à 1831, nombre de cors à pistons, de trompettes ou cornets à deux ou trois pistons ou ventiles (les premiers connus à Paris), notamment à M. Barrillon, au professor de cor, M. Dauprat, et au chef de musique des gardes, M. David Buhl ....

Louis-François Dauprat (1781-1868) was horn professor at the Conservatoire from 1816 to 1842 and Buhl (1781-1860) - a celebrated performer on the stop

---

12 See Ch.1 for evidence.
13 Some of the pros and cons of the acceptance of innovation in Paris are discussed in chapter 1.
14 H. Castil-Blaze, *Théâtres Lyriques de Paris, L'Academie Royale de Musique de 1645 à 1855* (hereafter C-BThéâtres), Tome II, Paris 1855, p. 350; Constant Pierre, *Histoire de l'orchestre de l'Opéra*, unpublished ms. held in F-Pn. This can no longer be found in the BN catalogue which accounts for the absence of a shelf mark. *Ipsiboë's* call numbers are F-Po A 475 (score) and 19[160 (1-134)] (parts).
trumpet - was the uncle of the celebrated trumpet virtuoso, François-Georges-Auguste Dauverné (1800-1874).  

Spontini’s opera *Alcidor* had received its first performance in Berlin on May 23, 1825 and is noteworthy here because the rubric ‘Kromatische Trompete’ has been added by Spontini to the manuscript of *Alcidor* held at the Bibliothèque de l’Opéra in Paris (the score is part copyist, part by Spontini), but there is no specific evidence as to what sort of chromatic trumpet that might have been. The orchestra list says ‘trombe in es’ and then ‘tromba 1ª Kromatiche’ has been added. Although the part does not make extensive use of the full chromatic range - a good player could lip the notes up or down as required - a valved instrument would be preferable (Ex. 2). The style of writing in the example is typical of the post-revolutionary style, moving away from the ‘horn call’ figuration and employing more sixths and thirds between two instruments, with some complex rhythms and tonguing, which would be particularly effective if played fast. Sometime after *Alcidor*’s première, Spontini travelled to Paris, where he had arrived by July 10, 1825, with the score, presumably hoping it would be accepted by the Opéra, in which suit he was unsuccessful. There is no mention of *Alcidor* in the Inventaire des Archives, so it seems that this plan never got to the point of formal application. The assumption that Spontini had considered a Paris performance has been made because: a) the manuscript score is now in the Bibliothèque de l’Opéra in Paris, and b) in a letter to Neukom dated 8 October 1824 he writes about *Alcidor*, ‘c’est la plus grande machine qui ait jamais paru sur un théâtre! Je ne voudrois au monde rien autre pour la satisfaction que les Parisiens assistent aux

---

16 It has not, as yet, been possible to find any information on M. Barrillon.
17 F-Po, MS 21 063.
18 Acknowledgements to Anno Mungen in Berlin for pointing this out; see fol. 90v, in Act II, the ‘Marche et danses des Princesses’. There is also a non-autograph copy in Vienna at the Bibliothek der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, but it is not known whether or not this has a similar rubric.
19 JW.
20 There are letters written by him from Paris, dated July 10 and 25, 1825.
Second act

Ex. 2 Aladov by Spontini
It was, however, a revised version of his opera *Olimpie* which was accepted and successfully performed at the Opéra in Paris on February 28, 1826, although it was unsuccessful in the long term. This was partly because La Rochefoucauld (1785-1864), director of the Académie des Beaux-Arts, had refused to renew Mme Branchu’s contract, despite deputations from the Institute and Spontini himself: she had a key role in *Olimpie* in which she was very successful. After La Rochefoucauld’s refusal to allow her even a few more performances, Spontini returned to Berlin, leaving his wife and the score of *Olimpie* in Paris. Whether or not he took any trumpets he may have had back to Berlin with him is not known.

The key point of this section as far as Berlioz and his revisions to the piston trumpet part in *Waverley* are concerned, is to be reminded that although he (Berlioz) could only admire Spontini from afar - he did not approach him for a personal meeting until 1830 - there is no doubting his

---


22 The orchestra with which Spontini worked in Berlin between 1823 and 1825 was about the same size as that at the Opéra. D. Koury, *Orchestral Performance Practice in the 19th century* (hereafter Koury), Studies in Musicology, no. 85, Michigan 1986.

23 *Olimpie* was first performed at the Paris Opéra on Dec. 22, 1819. See also Archives Nationales de Paris (hereafter AN), AJ13/117, 1826, no. 210, March 2, congratulating the performers and no. 256, March 14, concerning the cuts to be made ‘dans l’intérêt de l’ouvrage’. Acknowledgements are due Dr Jean-Louis Tamvaco for the time he has taken in sharing his incomparable personal archives of this period with me, for familiarizing me with the AN and for drawing my attention to various details concerning matters operatic and theatrical during the early 19th century.

24 Of the La Rochefoucauld, Castil-Blaze wrote, ‘Toujours prêt à contrarier les projets d’une réforme, d’une régénération que l’état de misère et de complet délabrement de l’Académie rendait indispensables, ce moralist plein de zèle ne songeait qu’à préserver doublement les ballerinas du péril de la tentation.’ C-BThéâtres, p. 200.

25 Spontini tore up his contract in front of the immovable minister, leaving the room and slamming the door in such fury that it split from top to bottom. He was still in Paris on March 16, 1826, but in Berlin by May 5, 1826, as letters show. For Berlioz’s account of this episode, see CG 1, no. 61, p. 129.
profound knowledge of the master's music. He was becoming familiar with *La Vestale* and *Fernand Cortez* as early as 1822: in August 1823 he wrote an article in *Le Corsair* defending *La Vestale* and by November 1826, when he auditioned for the Nouveautés, he knew *La Vestale* and *Fernand Cortez* by heart.\(^{26}\) It would indeed be strange if Berlioz had not been aware of Spontini's part in bringing the piston trumpet to Paris.

**Practical developments: Dauverné**

Dauverné wrote six methods, variously for natural trumpet, trumpet à pistons and cornet à pistons spanning the period from 1827/8 to 1856.\(^{27}\) In order to avoid jumping ahead in the chronology, at this point it is necessary to look only at the first one (hereafter Method 1), written for a three-valve instrument, details of which follow (Exx. 3a and b):\(^{28}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Main title:</th>
<th>Théorie ou Tablature de la Trompette à Pistons donnant la connaissance de ce nouvel Instrument et du doigté des Gammes Majeurs et Mineurs dans tous les tons.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>A° Dauverné, Premier Trompette de l’Académie Royale de Musique et de la Musique des Gardes du Corps du Roi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price:</td>
<td>9 francs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication:</td>
<td>à son Oncle, David Buhl, chef de la Musique des Gardes-du-Corps, Artiste de la Musique du Roi etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher:</td>
<td>À Paris, Chez Janet et Cotelle, éditeurs, M° de Musique du ROI, rue S' Honoré, N° 123, et Rue de Richelieu, N° 92 et chez L'AUTEUR, Rue d'Anjou, N° 2, Faubourg St Germain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clues to dating:</td>
<td>Before the 1830 July Revolution, after which there was no Gardes du Corps du Roi. Other evidence explained below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other information:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music cited:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelf mark at F-Pn:</td>
<td>Vm°. L. 92 (stacked bi-folios)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{26}\) *Mem* ch. 12 and CG I, no. 61, p. 126.

\(^{27}\) The last one from 1856 includes a complete history of the instrument and has been translated into English in the *HBSJ*, Vol. 3, 1991, pp. 179-261. This is the only method mentioned in *FétisBiog*. See Appendix to this chapter for brief details of Dauverné's life.

\(^{28}\) The following format is used for all the methods discussed in this chapter and its appendix, for ease of comparison. Extracts from all Dauverné's 'Notices' - interesting exercises in omission as much as in inclusion - are in the appendix to this chapter.
Best Copy Available
Théorie
ou
Tablature de la Trompette à Pistons:
Donnant la connaissance de ce nouvel Instrument et du Doigté des Géommes.

Dédicée
à son Oncle David Busle,
Chef de la Musique des gardes du Corps,
Acteur de la Musique du Roi.

par
A. Dauvers.

Premier Trompette de l'Académie Royale de Musique
de la Musique des gardes du Corps.

Prix : 9.

A PARIS.

Ches. JANET et COTTET, tabiencn, No. de Musique du 10, Rue St. Honoré, No. 25.
et Rue de Richelieu, No. 52.
et Chrs. l'AUTGUIL, Rue d'Argue, No. 2, Issouzly, 5e terrain.

Ex. 3a. Method 1, title page.
Method 1, engraving of a three valve trumpet.
In the opening *Notice sur la trompette à pistons* Dauverné writes:

La trompette à pistons n’a été connue en France que vers la fin de l’année 1826. C’est à Monsieur Spontini, l’un de nos plus célèbres compositeurs dramatiques, maintenant Directeur Général de la musique de S. M. le Roi de Prusse, à qui nous devons l’avantage de connaître la trompette à pistons. Monsieur Spontini, jaloux de faire connaître en France une invention aussi heureuse, qu’utile à l’art musical, envoya un de ces nouveaux instrumens [sic] à la musique de l’état-major des Gardes-du-corps du Roi, ainsi qu’un Trombone ou Trompette-Basse de même mécanisme.* Ayant l’honneur de faire partie de la musique de l’état-major des Gardes-du-corps du Roi, en qualité de trompette d’harmonie, j’ai possédé, (sic) le premier, cette nouvelle trompette et j’ai pu en apprécier le mérite. Comme je n’avais aucune instruction positive sur la manière de jouer cet instrument, j’ai été obligé d’étudier son mécanisme avec beaucoup de soin afin d’en connaître le plus parfaitement possible le véritable doigté, et j’ai cru utile d’offrir provisoirement ce petit travail qui suffira, je crois, pour avoir une idée du mécanisme de ce nouvel instrument. ... Il y a environ trois ans que la Trompette à pistons est en usage dans toute Allemagne... Depuis ce temps on s’est occupé dans différentes villes d’Allemagne, à fabriquer et à perfectionner ces Instrumens, ce qui nous permet d’espérer qu’en France, on parviendra à leur donner un point de perfection très satisfaisant. (*

* Le Trombone à Pistons ou plutôt la Trompette-Basse est semblable à la Trompette à Pistons sous le rapport de la forme, également munie de trois Pistons qui font à peu-près les mêmes fonctions. L’Instrument avec sa plus petite coulisse est en Mi♭, et peut également jouer dans tous les tons, mais il s’y adapte une seconde coulisse qui met l’Instrument en Ut, pour faciliter le doigté de certains tons.

Le son de la Trompette-Basse est très agréable, se rapprochant des sons graves du Cor plus que de celui du trombone; il est par conséquent moins âpre et moins bruyant. Son embouchure est de la même dimension que celle du Trombone-Basse ou du Tenor. Son étendue est de trois octaves par demi-tons. (Ab♭ - a♭)

(*) Mr Labbaye, facteur d’Instrumens à vent en cuivre, rue de Chartres à Paris, vient d’entreprendre la fabrication de ces nouveaux Instrumens, pour les quels il a obtenu un Brevet d’Importation et de perfectionnement.

The *brevet d’importation* granted to M. Labbaye, dated December 26, 1826, is the *terminus ante quem* for the Méthode, although Dauverné fails
Absence of plate numbers has reduced the amount of help in precise
dating of this Méthode which standard reference books on Parisian
music publishers can give. Janet et Lobelle inherited the fonds of
Charles Michel Qi et Cie in 1826, the latter themselves having
taken deposits from the Magasin du Conservatoire (Constant Pierre,
Le magasin de musique à l’usage des Fêtes Nationales et du
Conservatoire, Paris 1835, p. 102). According to Berries and Lousme
Janet et Lobelle were at 125 rue St-Honoré from March 1826 to
1826 (month not stated), moving to number 123 in 1826 and
staying there until January 1837 (Anik Berries and François
Lousme, Dictionnaire des éditeurs de musique français (here
ments are due to Dr David Charlton for confirming the absence
of plate numbers and verifying the address on both the copies held
in BN as being 123 rue St-Honoré.
N.B. Care Johansson’s Parisian Music Publishers does not cover the
period in question.
to put the date into his preface. The *terminus ad quem* in 1830, at which time the Gardes-du-corp du Roi mentioned in the Foreword was disbanded, at the time of the July revolution. Setting the estimated date of c. 1827-8 for the publication of this Method has been arrived at by piecing together other information, like the fact that the preface includes the comment that the trompette à pistons had been in use in Germany for about three years and it is recorded that Stölzel had introduced a new piston c. 1825. It is reasonable to suppose that the publisher would have liked the publication of a new *Méthode* to coincide with the use of the instrument in public. This places publication in 1827, when the new valved trumpet was used in Chelard's *Macbeth* (June 29, 1827, see below). A more convincing reason for a date contemporary with - or even just prior to - the production of *Macbeth*, but with less actual evidence to support it, is the notion that it would seem likely that Dauverné would mention when the instrument had been used in performance had it been possible to do so: it was his practice in his last three *Méthodes*. Thus, circumstantially, it looks as though Dauverné wrote the preface to the first Method before he played the instrument in Chelard's *Macbeth*.

There is no evidence from any contemporary primary sources to connect Berlioz to Dauverné at this period, which is not altogether surprising. Berlioz had spent much time at the Opéra (although less time while he was singing at the Nouveautés, November 1826 to September

---


30 In 1829 Dauverné was promoted to first trumpet of the Gardes. Should one subscribe to the plausible notion that he would have been sure to mention this, had he been so at the time of writing the *Notice*, then the *terminus ad quem* could be moved back a year.


32 The author has recently tried to make contact with Professor Tarr, who suggested 1827-8 as the publication date for this *Méthode* during earlier correspondence, to discuss this further, but has so far been unsuccessful.
1827), and would have been well-acquainted with members of the pit, rendering the exchange of letters - the most obvious primary source to prove acquaintanceship - both unlikely and unnecessary. But one can be sure that Dauverné was one of the virtuoso musicians to whom Berlioz refers in his *Memoirs*\(^{33}\) and that he was very likely to have been involved in the first performances of *Waverley*. While it would be good to know the precise date of Dauverné's first *Méthode*, it does not affect the fact that around this time (i.e. between 1826, the arrival of the valved trumpet in Paris, and 1830, the *terminus ad quem* for Dauverné's book), a three-valved piston trumpet was being developed and promoted in Paris. Further evidence of this is contained in the two sections which follow.

**The office of the Académie des Beaux Arts: Chelard and his opera *Macbeth*.**

The first person commonly thought to have composed for valve instruments after Spontini had started to send instruments to Paris was Chelard, who - as mentioned briefly in the introduction - used three in his opera *Macbeth*. The logistics of presenting an opera in Paris were long and complex, especially at the Opéra and the letters from this period are a rich source of information on the course of events.\(^{34}\) Although *Macbeth* did not appear until June 1827, it was composed by October 1825, since there is a letter from La Rochefoucauld to Duplantys,\(^ {35}\) dated January 12, 1826 indicating that the score might be accepted, subject to certain changes:

J'ai l'honneur de vous informer, Monsieur, que dans le séance de 24 octobre dernier, le Jury musical a reçu à correction la partition de M. Chéard (sic) sur la poème de *Macbeth*. Les membres de ce jury s'occupent à examiner cette partition, afin d'indiquer à l'auteur les

\(^{33}\) *Mem*, ch. 13, p. 74.

\(^{34}\) AN holds many letters from this period. There is a summary booklet - *sommaire* - for each year, giving each letter written or received a number, with brief details about when and on what subject. The process was even more difficult for people who worked at the Opéra: Halévy, because he was Chef de Chant, had to seek special permission from the Commission spéciale for each opera performed: acknowledgements to Professor Peter Bloom for pointing this out.

\(^{35}\) Sosthène, Vicomte de la Rochefoucauld (1785-1864) was the Director of Fine Arts during the time of Louis XVIII and Charles X. Duplantys was Director of the Opéra 1824-7.
changements dont elle leur parait susceptible, et doivent m’adresser leurs observations à cet égard... etc.36

Eventually, ten months later, on November 20, 1826, the jury representative writes:

Je m’imprime de vous informer, Monsieur, de la réception définitive faite par le jury musical de la partition de *Macbeth* dont M. Chelard (sic) est l’auteur. Cet ouvrage pourra donc entrer en concurrence avec ceux reçut déjà et jugés susceptibles d’être mis en scène ... 37

Everything seemed set to move forward; even the possibility that preparations for Rossini’s *Moïse* might interfere was denied in a letter dated February 13, 1827, from La Rochefoucauld’s office:

En ordonnant, Monsieur, de monter l’Opéra de *Moïse* pour être représenté pendant le carême, je n’ai point eu l’intention d’ajourner ou de ralentir le représentation des ouvrages reçus par le jury, et dont la mise en scène est déjà prescrite... Je vous invite donc à faire distribuer, sans nul délai, les rôles de l’Opéra de *Macbeth*.38

The sommaire lists two items on April 22, 1827 for which the letters are lost. In the first the chef de danse, M. Lefevbre, ‘dit que *Macbeth* sera prêt - demande un compte sur ce qui lui est dû’.39 The other lost letter from this day is, unfortunately, the one most relevant to the trompettes à pistons. The sommaire states, ‘M. Chelard - observations sur l’orchestre’, suggesting the possibility of his orchestration requiring some discussion and decisions from his superiors. The autograph of *Macbeth* shows that the trio for valved trumpets was an addition to the original layer; maybe these were the subject of the missing letter. All was not set to run without incident, however: with just over a month to go to the opening night the matter of the budget was raised in the sommaire of May 22, when La Rochefoucauld wrote to Duplantys in no uncertain terms about the economies he expected:

J’ai reçu, Monsieur, le devis estimatif que vous m’avez transmis pour la mise en scène de l’Opéra de *Macbeth* et je vois qu’il s’élève

36 AN, AJ13/117, 1826, no. 32.
37 AN, AJ13/117, 1826, no. 1090.
38 AN, AJ13/119, 1827, no. 39.
39 AN/AJ13/119, 1827, no. 289.
beaucoup au delà des provisions primitives: je désire donc qu’il soit fait à ce devis toutes les réductions possibles avant de lui donner mon approbation, et je vous invite, en conséquence à procéder avec la plus sérieuse attention à la révision de toutes les dépenses proposées, en principalement de celles qui concernent les costumes...

Not surprisingly, Duplantys replied promptly (May 30, 1827) and his revisions were approved, complete with a further warning not to exceed the agreed figure.

D’après les observations contenues dans votre lettre du 30 mai, Monsieur, et l’assurance que vous m’y donnes de pouvoir réduire de 5,000fr environ, les frais des costumes de l’opéra de Macbeth, je ne trouve plus aucune objection à faire contre la mise en scène de cet ouvrage, mais je vous recommande toujours fortement de veiller à ce quel la somme portée au devis estimatif ne s’élève pas au delà des 16,000 fr qui vous paraissent maintenant suffisants pour solder toutes les dépenses ...

The drama seems to have been as intense off stage as Chelard probably hoped it would be on stage and neither was all running smoothly in the pit. Having offered an economy to the administration regarding payment to the Gambati brothers late in May (see next section on the purchase of trumpets), on June 19th Habeneck followed it up by asking for horns in Ab, needed for Macbeth -:

Les cors de l’opéra n’ont pas le ton de la bémol et comme il sont indispensable dans l’opéra de Macbeth je vous prie de vouloir bien autoriser de suite cette dépense afin que nous puissions les avoir pour l’exécution de cet ouvrage.

A note at the bottom of the letter confirms that this was agreed. For June 25, the sommaire lists a letter saying all is ready, but the relief is short-lived: there is a listing dated June 29 in the sommaire (but probably having been written the day before) from one of the librettists, Rouget de Lisle, requesting - to no avail - a postponement of the first night. The final letter in this thumbnail sketch of everyday life at the Opéra, dated July 17, 1827, is a stab in the back for Chelard:

40 AN, AJ13/119, 1827, no. 384.
41 AN, AJ13/119, 1827, no. 391
Lorsque j'ai donné Monsieur l'autorisation de monter Macbeth, j'étais mu par le désir d'offrir à M. Chelard une preuve de l'intérêt que je prends aux compositeurs de l'École française, et de celui que m'inspirait plus particulièrement un ouvrage dans lequel on s'était plu à reconnaître des indices d'un véritable talent, mais je vois avec regret qu'en refusant de retoucher les parties de sa composition qui avaient paru susceptibles d'être modifiés, l'auteur s'est enlevé des moyens d'acquérir la faveur du public, l'épreuve que son opéra vient de subir ne laisse plus malheureusement aucun doute sur son peu de succès puisque les recettes ont toujours été en diminuant et comme il resulterait un préjudice notable pour l'administration de la laisser au répertoire, je vous invite, Monsieur, à vouloir bien la retirer immédiatement et à faire rentrer en magasin les décorations et les costumes, pour être employés en tous et lieu de la manière la plus favorable.

Cet exemple ne doit pas être perdu pour l'avenir en dorénavant il ne devra plus être monté aucun ouvrage dont les auteurs se refuseraient à faire les changements indiqués par le jury d'examen, je vous charge particulièrement, Monsieur, de veiller à l'exécution de cette déposition. J'ai l'honneur etc.

P.S. Je serais bien fâché que M. Chelard put croire que cette mesure lui fut personnelle. Je me plais à compter au contraire qu'elle ne servir qu'à stimuler son zèle et à redoubler son courage.

It is hard to imagine a situation whereby the circle of people who made up the pit and habitués at the Opéra would not, at least, have been aware of these events. As for Berlioz's part here, apart from knowing Chelard because he was in the orchestra at the Opéra, he had, in all probability, made his acquaintance on a more personal level in 1826 when he (Berlioz) was trying to get his Scène héroïque performed at a concert to benefit the Greeks. In the event, it was Chelard's cantata which was performed. The earliest definitive source indicating that Berlioz and Chelard knew each other is a letter dating from 1829 where Berlioz notes that Chelard was one of the people wanting a copy of his recently published Huit scènes de Faust, for which Chelard had, perhaps, advised him on some detail of the orchestration, such as the harmonics. So, even though in 1827 he was attending perhaps fewer

42 AN, AJ13/119, 1827, no. 435.
43 AN, AJ13/119, 1827, no. 491.
44 CG I, no. 126, p. 254.
45 a) In the last 12 bars of the 'Concert des Sylphes', 'cellos are divided into 4 parts and play harmonics: NBE, vol. 5, pp. 66-67.
b) Further correspondence between them can be found in connection with Berlioz's travels in Germany: CG III, nos. 796, 810, 826 and 831, pp. 51, 65, 86 and 91.
performances at the Opéra than his preferred habit because of his enforced commitment to the Nouveautés, he was pragmatic enough to make an effort to keep himself informed.*

The office of the Académie des Beaux Arts and the purchase of trumpets

Meanwhile at about the same time that Dauverné says Spontini sent trumpets and other brass instruments to Paris, i.e. October 1826, and when the process for presenting Macbeth was grinding along, the Académie des Beaux Arts was also negotiating the engagement of the Gambati brothers and discussing the purchase of new trumpets. On October 13, 1826 the sommaire lists the following letter from Habeneck:

J’avais dit à M. Duplantys que je préférais donner 2,400 fr sur trompettes pour les avoir entièrement à leurs disposition pour les deux théâtres que 2,000 pour un seul ... L’engagement aurait dû déjà été signé je m’en rapporte à M. Duplantys pour ne jamais rien recette.*

Two letters date from ten days later, October 23, 1826, the first probably being a continuation of the correspondence of which the letter quoted above is a part. In it permission is given to purchase four new trumpets. La Rochefoucauld writes to Duplantys:

J’ai reçu, Monsieur, la lettre que vous m’avez adressée le 20 de ce mois, pour m’exposer las nécessité où vous êtes de vous procurer des trompettes que demandent les frères Gambati, pour le service de l’Académie Royale de musique. Des deux moyens que vous me proposez, le premier consiste à faire l’acquisition de ces instruments me paraît, sans contredit, préférable au second, puisqu’au moyen d’une somme de 1,200 fr, les quatres trompettes dont on a besoin,

* This was a network in which Chelard and Spontini also kept in touch. For example there is a letter from Spontini to Vogt, principal oboist in the Opéra orchestra, dated February 10, 1829, in which Spontini writes: ‘Si vous avez l’occasion de voir M. Chelard et M. Soumet, veuillez dire au dernier que le premier m’a promis une réponse du second, et je voudrais savoir du premier s’il a reçu une lettre que ma femme lui a écrite il y a quelques mois déjà’. Lettre de musiciens écrites en français du XVie au XVe siècle (hereafter TiersotLettres), ed J. Tiersot, Milan 1924, I, p. 373. Chelard had written to Mme Spontini on October 28, 1828. The autograph letter is in US-NYpm.

* In the history of the trumpet which Dauverné includes in his last méthode of 1856, he writes that the Gambati brothers were famous as players of the keyed trumpet. HBSJ, vol. 3, 1991, p. 208.

* AN, AJ13/117, 1826, no. 914.
appartiendront, en propre, à l’administration de l’Opéra. J’autorise, en conséquence, la dépense nécessaire à l’acquisition de deux trompettes ordinaires pour quatre cents francs et de deux trompettes à clés pour huit cents francs...49

The second letter from October 23 shows that the engagement of the Gambati brothers is not quite completed, requesting that Duplantys prepares the contract, one for each of the two theatres with which they were engaged, the Théâtre Italien and the Opéra, and one for his office, ‘en cas de besoin’.50

Attached to this letter in the dossier is one dated January 7, 1827 (out of chronology, for some unknown reason), from the Raoux brothers (famous instrument makers in Paris), but without an addressee:

Lorsque vous me fites l’honneur de me consulter sur l’indemnité que vous pourriez accorder à MM. Gambati pour que les Messieurs fissent le service du Théâtre avec les instruments à eux appartenant, j’ai l’honneur de vous répondre que vous feriez les choses grandement en accordant cent francs par an à chacun mais comme les instruments sont en assez mauvais état je penses que s’ils avaient besoin de réparation il serait juste qu’elles fussent à leurs compte. Vous voyez que je parle contre mes intérêts je crains de vous dire ce que je crois plus convenable. Veuillez, M. garder entre nous ces observations et recevrez la nouvelle assurance de mon parfait respect.51

Some months later, probably late May/early June 1827,52 when preparations for Macbeth were approaching fruition Habeneck wrote to M. Lubbert, ‘administration du personnel de l’Académie Royale de Musique’, with a scheme of payment to the Gambati brothers: perhaps he had been the recipient of the letter quoted above:53

il n’y a point de trompettes au theatre Italien, il est donc constant que Messieurs Gambatti font le service des deux théâtres avec leurs instrumens. Je pense que si l’administration veut leur accorder une indemnité il y aura plus d’avantage à la fixer par representation (sic) à raison de 4 francs pour les deux trompettes.

49 AN, AJ13/117, 1826, no. 960.
50 AN, AJ13/117, 1826, no. 961.
51 AN, AJ13/117, 1826, no. 961 bis.
52 The letter is not dated, but the number 389 in the summary book places it between May 30 (no. 394) and June 4 (no. 391).
53 This extract and the next by him are transcribed as written, demonstrating that Habeneck’s spelling and presentation were not good.
Having offered this economy to the administration, on June 19th Habeneck followed it up by asking for horns in Ab, needed for *Macbeth* (see previous section, *Chelard and Macbeth*).

A month or so later (July 23) there is a letter signed jointly by Dauverné and his colleague Legros which seems to be part of an on-going dialogue:

Monsieur, Nous avons l'honneur de vous renouvelés que vous nous avez manifesté votre satisfaction, de l'impression que nous avons mis à nous servir de trompettes droites, que nous avons fait établir à nos frais pour le service de l'Opéra. Comme il est en usage de fournir les instruments à vent aux artistes de l'Académie Royale de Musique, nous vous prions, Monsieur, d'ordonner, s'il vous plaît, la fourniture de ces dits instruments.

Nous vous avons fait une réclamation à laquelle vous nous aviez promis de faire droit; à seul fin de faire alléger notre service (qui est extrêmement pénible), par les deux trompettes qui sous porter sur les États de l'Opéra, à des appointements presqu'aussi fort que ceux que nous touchons, pour n'être employés que très rarement. Notre instrument est sans contredit le plus fatiguant des instruments à vent, et surtout par l'usage qu'on fait maintenant et le seul de l'Orchestre qui n'a point l'avantage d'être doublé. L'intérêt et l'estime que vous portez aux artistes nous donne lieu d'espérer, Monsieur, notre juste demande sur ce dernier point sera prise en considération...

The summary book states that in a letter written on July 28, 1827, Henri Valentino (1787-1865) - the conductor at the Opéra alongside Habeneck - supports the above request:

*Je ne puis qu'approver le réclamation des trompettistes Dauverné et Legros ... que les trompettes longeuses produisissent plus d'effet que les trompettes rondeaux, ces messieurs ne consultent que leur zèle, d'après leur consulter que je leur ai donner, ont ... adopté ... l'instrument. Ils ont oublié compter sur votre justice pour leur (les)*

---

54 AN, AJ13/119, 1827, no. 389.
55 AN, AJ13/119, no. 526 bis.
56 The writing makes transcription very difficult, hence only extracts.
indemnite(s) du leur dépense. Quant à leur seconde réclamation, il me paraît également juste; car la partie de trompette est tellement compliqué maintenant que la fatigue que les Messieurs éprouvent doit nécessairement ... ... qui est indispensable pour bien donner de cet instrument. 57

Je vous informe, Monsieur, que sur l'exposé que vous m'avez fait des avantages qui résultent d'emploi des trompettes droites à l'orchestre de l'Académie Royale de musique, et d'après l'avis de MM les chefs de ce service, j'ai consenti à l'achat des instruments dont MM Dauverné et Legros ont fait choix. Je vous autorise en conséquence à rembourser ces artistes des avances qu'ils ont faites pour l'acquisition dont il s'agit...

It seems likely that this refers to the fact that Dauverné and his colleagues had purchased the valved instruments for Macbeth and, remarkably perhaps, were being re-imbursted for them a few months later, having persuaded their superiors of the effectiveness of the new instrument (not wholly truthfully). 58 It is as likely as not that Berlioz was aware of these events, despite the restrictions imposed by working at the Nouveautés. At this time he was also en loge for the Prix de Rome competition, so he could well have kept in touch with events by taking in the gossip while he was confined to the Institute. As he wrote to his sister, Nanci, on July 28, 1827:

P.S. Nous aurons tous les soirs salon de réception dans la grande cour de l'Institute, les amis et connaissances peuvent venir nous voir de six à neuf heures. Il y a un surveillant qui prend soin qu'on ne nous transmette rien du dehors qui puisse avoir rapport au sujet de concours. 59

57 AN, AJI3, 119, no. 526. Pierre Facteurs, notes that Dauverné played a circular trumpet made by the Raoux brothers until 1826 (p. 107), when it was replaced by another made by Courtois, which housed until 1832 (p. 330).
58 Although on the periphery of events here, it is interesting to speculate as to the logistics and practicality of the trumpet arriving in Paris in October 1826, Dauverné and two colleagues learning to play it and three being made in time for use in Chelard's Macbeth.
59 CG I, no. 76, p. 158.
The trio in Macbeth

Ex. 4 is a facsimile of the trio from Macbeth, as taken from the parts and Ex. 5 shows the context as it is seen in the vocal score. Only the top two parts, each played by a three-valve piston trumpet, are notated in E flat, the lowest part using a type of transposition seen in horn writing whereby a double system is in operation. It can be read ‘as is’ in the bass clef applying an imaginary three flats so that it reads in concert pitch, or the player reads it in the treble clef, playing on an E flat instrument, which seems to have been the case here. Had the player been reading in the bass clef, the sharp in the second bar of the third system is more likely to have been a natural. The striking thing is that the E-flat instrument must have been a valved bass trumpet, to which Dauverne refers in the footnote of his first Méthode, for it to be able to reach the lower notes. These low notes are particularly intriguing, particularly if they had been used in connection with the ghosts or witches; as it is Lady Macbeth had been appealing to the mother of shadows and the spirits of murder in the aria previous to this one, which could be a programmatic or expressive reason for choosing the orchestral colour provided by the three trumpets, making full use of the chromatic range newly available to them.  

Berlioz and brass: early indications

Until he came to Paris, Berlioz’s only knowledge of brass instruments would have been what he used to hear in the local National Guard band in La Côte St. André, who were ‘enthusiastic but inexpert’. Hearing a professional orchestra for the first time must have been an extraordinary

---

60 The call mark for trumpet parts is F-Po Mat. 19[287(85)] and Mat. 19[286(86)]. The vocal score was published in Munich, 1828. It is assumed that the trumpet trio is by a copyist; comparison with the autograph was not possible, since it was not in its place in F-Po.

61 Acknowledgements are due to JW and David Charlton for their comments and expertise on this topic. The question of orchestral colour in Macbeth requires further exploration which is beyond the scope of this study.

62 Covering the period up to the composition of Waverley by c. March 1827.

63 CairnsBiog, p. 77ff. The band is recorded as having a piccolo, clarinets, horns, a bassoon, a trumpet, a serpent, a trombone and percussion, but not necessarily with the full complement of personnel to play all of these. Although Lyons was a thriving centre for the manufacture of musical instruments, it seems unlikely that many of the better-made instruments made their way to La Côte.
Ex. 4  A facsimile of the trio for three trompettes à pistons. The system which has the text written in is found pinned over the original last line which, however, is that which is reflected in the published vocal score.
Ex. 4. Page showing last line, presumably as performed.
Ex. 4: cont. Page showing original last line, as was published.
The vocal score for example 10a. Note that the ending is equivalent to the original one for the trumpets.
experience for him and one that is impossible to recapture today. The letters and Memoirs, which give some insight as to the impact of this experience, also show that he always took the matters of instrumentation and orchestration very seriously. He made regular use of the expertise to be found in the orchestra pit of the Opéra. He recounts, for example, how he was unsure about the parts he had written for the trombones in the overture to Les Francs-juges, which was completed in October 1826. He showed the music to one of the trombone players at the Opéra, who set his mind completely at rest as to the suitability of the writing. The subjects of instrumentation and its close relation, orchestration, were not regarded as being of sufficient importance to merit a place in the curriculum at the Conservatoire. As Berlioz wrote, it was up to him to make a systematic study of the subject himself. He continues, 'this, and the company of virtuoso players of various instruments and the experiments I induced them to make, plus a dash of instinct, did the rest.'

Evidence of Berlioz's impressive breadth of knowledge in this area at this early stage in his career can be found in his use of brass in the Messe solennelle, which was written in 1824 and subject to various revisions and adaptations. It was rehearsed only in December 1824 but performed in July 1825 after revisions were made. Further revisions preceded a performance in November 1827 and there were two further performances of the Resurrexit in May 1828 and November 1829, when it was re-named Le Jugement dernier. It was sent in this form as a required envoi from Rome to the Institute, even though it had already been performed in Paris four times: the jury report was favourable! The piece, including the brass writing, must have worked well for Berlioz to have allowed the number of

---

64 CG I, no. 10, p. 36 and Mem ch. 5, for example.
65 Mem ch. 13.
66 Instrumentation is here defined as the study of instruments and their properties, and orchestration the choice and arrangement of instruments.
67 At least not until 1878, when it became part of the composition component. Pierre Sarrette, p. 261.
68 Mem ch. 13.
69 Cat, 20.
70 Cat, 20B.
performances he did and the fanfare in the Resurrexit was later developed into the 'Tuba Mirum' in the Requiem even though the mass itself was, in Berlioz's terminology, 'destroyed'.\textsuperscript{71} There are also some striking brass timbres to be heard in the cantata written for the \textit{Prix de Rome} competition in 1827, \textit{La Mort d'Orphée}.\textsuperscript{72} The approach of the Bacchantes is heralded by chords on the brass, which are repeated with mutes, and there is a stunning C pedal heard against a Db chord, not just in the bass, but piercing the middle of the texture on the (natural) cornets at bars 289-292 (Ex. 6).

\textbf{Waverley: composition and first performance: an interim summary}

It is now possible to set \textit{Waverley} - the earliest independent orchestral work Berlioz wrote - into the framework described in the preceding sections. It is estimated that Berlioz had written the overture during the early part of 1827. This is well after the time Spontini says he started to send valved brass instruments to Paris (1823) and some months after Dauverné says they arrived (October 1826). Chelard's \textit{Macbeth}, with its trio for three valved trumpets, was in preparation but not performed until June 1827. This being the case, he (Berlioz) was not dependent on the performances of \textit{Macbeth} for his introduction to the instrument.\textsuperscript{73} It could even be argued that, from a timing perspective, it was Berlioz's interest in the instrument which caused Chelard to use them, although the truth is more likely to revolve round a mutual interest in these matters. During the same period Dauverné, the person with the 'hands-on know-how', had written or was writing his first method. Thus, it is possible to see how these three people interacted. In addition, it is also likely that Berlioz had earned some respect from Dauverné by his imaginative use of brass in his Mass, particularly the

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Mem} ch. 8. The specification in the \textit{Messe} is as follows: 4 horns, 2 trumpets, 3 trombones and low brass, serpent, ophicleide and buccin, a kind of military trombone, in which the bell came over the shoulder, fashioned into a dragon's head, complete with a tongue which waggled when in use, which amused the children during military parades. Labbaye is known to have made one as late as 1829. \textit{PierreFacteurs}, p. 332ff. The complete score was re-discovered in 1992 and has since been published as \textit{NBE} vol. 23.

\textsuperscript{72} Although the Institute records the title of this cantata as being simply \textit{Orphée}, it will be referred to here by the title Berlioz uses in his writings and which is also on the title page of the extant scribal copy.

\textsuperscript{73} It is possible that Berlioz was unable to see \textit{Macbeth} since he was singing in the chorus of the \textit{Nouveautés} during its short life in Paris (only five performances).
Ex. 6. Extract from La Mort d'Orphée showing Berlioz's use of natural cornets.
Resurrexit. In the light of the foregoing information, it can be understood more readily how and why the inclusion of the new trumpet in Waverley came about.

Examination of an extract of the part Berlioz originally wrote for the trumpet in Waverley (Ex. 7), confirms that he had a three valve trumpet in mind. Had he needed to, he could have sought advice from Dauverné, who, one assumes, would have been pleased to help the first person (possibly or probably) to take an interest in and compose for his latest passion. If there had been need of changes at the time of the first performance of Waverley in May 1828, and in which it is more than likely that Dauverné and even Chelard played, such alterations would be visible on the autograph, but there are only changes which have been made at a later stage. It is clear that, contrary to what may have been surmised in the past, Berlioz had not miscalculated in terms of the piston trumpet’s theoretical capability.

Ex. 7

Excerpts from original part for piston trumpet in Waverley.

\[\text{Ex. 7}\]

\[\text{Ex. 7}\]

\[\text{Ex. 7}\]

\[\text{Ex. 7}\]
Practical developments - the next stage: Dauverné:

The next three methods by Dauverné - here called methods 2, 3 and 4 - are all for a two-valve instrument,\textsuperscript{74} the first of these for trumpet alone, those following both for trumpet and cornet (although number 4 has only 'cornet' on the title page, the trumpet is included inside). This apparent retrograde - one would expect the number of valves to progress from two to three, rather than the reverse - is explained by Dauverné, as will be shown later. There are some problems of dating within these three, but giving relevant information and details of them all consecutively will allow the reader to see the difficulties and understand the conclusions:

2) Main title: Méthode de Trompette à Pistons (Exx. 8a and b).
Secondary title: La théorie de ce nouvel instrument, suivie des Gammes, Études, Duos, Trios et d'un air varié avec accompagnement du Piano Forté
Author: A\textsuperscript{e} Dauverné, de l'Académie R\textsuperscript{e} de Musique, Membre de la Société des Concerts.
Price: 12 francs
Dedication: M\textsuperscript{e} Antoine-Halary
Publisher: Paris chez Antoine-Halary, rue Mazarine, N\textsuperscript{o} 37.
Clues to dating: Piece for five valved brass instruments by Strunz, performed April, 1833.
Three years since trumpets and horns with pistons were first in use in Germany.
The three-valve instrument abandoned three years after Spontini sent instruments to Paris.

Other information: This is engraved by hand, rather than being type-set like Method 1.

Works cited: Quintet for five valved brass instruments by Jacques Strunz, first performance April, 1833.

Shelf mark at F-Pn: \textit{Vm}\textsuperscript{5}, L. 91\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{74} Josef Cretufo (1771-1851) published a treatise entitled \textit{Des voix et des instruments à cordes} ... chez Roy, c. 1829-32, in which he identifies the piston trumpet as having two valves. It seems that Berlioz was not aware of this development until he returned from his sojourn in Italy.

\textsuperscript{75} Halary was at this address from 1825 onwards. Nothing more is known of him as a publisher. Cecil Hopkinson, \textit{A Dictionary of Parisian Music Publishers 1700-1830} (hereafter \textit{HopParis}), London 1954, p. 55.
Méthode de Trompette à Pistons.

Concours:


SUIVIE DES

Études, Duos, Trios.

UN AIR VARIE

Accompagnement de Piano Forti

DEVOTIÉ À M. Antoine-HALARY,

PAR

A. DEAUVERNE.

de l'Académie de Musique.
Membre de la Société de Concerts.

PRIX

11 FRANCS.

Paris.

ANTOINE-HALARY,

Rue Marsouine, N° 57.

Ex. 8a Method 2, title page.
La trompette à pistons se tient de la main gauche et la droite faire accroire les pistons, comme le démontre la figure au-dessus.

Dans les gammes suivantes le zéro (0) représente des notes naturelles de l'instrument, ou les chiffres déterminent les pistons et l'alignement de la main droite (voir le zéro sur le zéro), tournez vers le côté de l'embouchure une ou par l'index de la main droite et le pouce par le médian. Les doigts chiffre 1, 2 et 3 interminables des deux pistons à la fois.

Il est essentiel pour la pratique de tours de bien apprêter les pistons.

Comme je l'ai déjà dit, la trompette à pistons a l'avantage de pouvoir dans tous les tours de l'instrument se composer d'un corps de rechange qui sont Fa, Mi, Mi b, Ré et Mi. Chaque corps de rechange donne une gamme chromatique qui reproduit exactement par l'ensemble des pistons une étude diatonique servant à l'exécution des parties de trompette ordinaire sans rien changer à la notation, ce qui fait conserver toujours Mi, pour tonique de chaque tour.

Le tableau suivant mettra à même de voir la série des tours que donne chaque corps de rechange. Ce l'impossible qu'on doive faire des pistons pour les obtenir.

Ex. 86  Method 2, engraving with instruction.
3) Main title: Méthode complète de Trompette et Cornet à Pistons. (Exx. 9a and b)

Secondary title: None

Author: A"e Dauverné, Professeur au Conservatoire, 1re Trompette de l'Académie R"e de Musique, et Membre de la Société des Concerts.

Price: 20 francs

Dedication: M'r Antoine-Halary

Publisher: À Paris, chez l'auteur, Rue des Martyrs, No 34, Faub' Montmatre et chez tous les M'M de Musique.

Clues to dating: Four items point to a time after no. 2:
a)'Nouvelle edition' added below author; b) price higher than no. 2;
c) Cornet is an addition; d) Dauverné now a Professor at the Conservatoire; not mentioned in the 'credits' of Method 2.

Other information: None

Works cited: Strunz's quintet (see no. 2 above)

Shelf mark at F-Pn: L. 11.306

4) Main title: Nouvelle Méthode Complète de Cornet à Pistons (Exx. 10a and b)

Secondary title: None

Author: Aug"e Dauverné, De l'Académie Royale de Musique, Professeur au Conservatoire et Membre de la Société de Concerts.

Price: 25 francs

Dedication: None

Publisher: Paris, Chez Magasin de Musique de A. Petit, Rue Vivienne 6, au coin de la Galerie.76

Clues to dating: Preface dated Paris, 1837. Date of deposition, 1837, written by hand on the title page.

Other information: Designated opus 7 - no method so far has an opus number; also set with a type face.

Works cited: Guillaume Tell and Robert le Diable77

Shelf mark at F-Pn: L. 8612

It is not possible to date Methods 2 and 3 more precisely than to say they both belong after April 1833, the date of Strunz's piece and before 1835, when the Notice to Method 4 appeared in Ledhuy's Encyclopédie.78

---

76 A. Petit was at 6 rue Vivienne, au coin de la Galerie from 1825-1838. Dictionnaire, p. 342.

77 See, for example, Berlioz's article in the Gazette Musicale de Paris, no. 28, p. 129ff., July 12, 1833. He mentions the pistons trumpets several times.

78 Paris 1835, p. 186.
MÉTHODE COMPLÈTE

de Trompette et Cornet

à Pistons

Biotin à M° Antano – Hillary

Par

A. DAVUSNE

Professeur au Conservatoire

de Trompette de l’Académie Rég. de Musique,

et Membre de la Société des Concerts.

Nouvelle Édition.

Prix : 20 f.

A PARIS,

chez l’éditeur, Rue des Martyrs, 17, et chez Montautier,

et chez tous les libraires de Musique.

Ex. 3a Method 3, title page.
DE LA TENUE DE L'INSTRUMENT ET DU DOIGTÉ.

La Trompette à Pistons ainsi que le Cornet se tiennent de la main gauche et la droite fait agir les Pistons comme le démontre la figure ci-dessus.

Ex. 9b Method 3. engraving of two valve trumpet.
Ex. 10a  Method title page, with date of deposition (1837).
ARTICLE IV.
DE LA TENUE DE L'INSTRUMENT.

2. 1.

(A) Grande Coulisse des Pistons.
(B) Petite (same) id.
(C) Coulisse d'accord.

Le Cornet à pistons se tient de la main gauche dans une position presque horizontale comme le démontre la figure ci-dessus, et la droite sert à le supporter...

Ex. 10b  Method 4 engraving of two valve cornet. (Note the different mouthpiece from the trumpet in 3.)
Although of interest, the issue is not vital to the matter of Berlioz and his revisions to the piston trumpet part in Waverley. What is significant is that the two-valve piston trumpet was promoted by no less than three Methods by the same author over a maximum period of four years. Reasons for this are explained by Dauverné as part of the Notice in each of Methods 2, 3 and 4, quoted here from Method 2, after some opening preamble:79

Ayant possédé, le premier, cette nouvelle trompette, j'ai été à même d'en apprécier les avantages, bien cependant qu'il était indispensable d'apporter de grands changemens [sic] à sa conformation primitive pour lui rendre la justesse désirable dans tous les tons. Un habile facteur, M. Antoine Halary, a fait disparaître tous les vices existants dans l'instrument [sic] envoyé d'Allemagne, en trouvant le moyen d'adapter à la trompette deux petites coulisses (indépendamment de la coulisse d'accord) qui servent à modifier le tempérament de chaque corps de rechange. M. Antoine Halary, a donc surmonté toutes les difficultés puisqu'il est parvenu au point de rendre l'instrument parfaitement juste, de pouvoir le mettre dans tous les tons, ce qui n'existait pas, et de lui donner une forme plus commode et plus agréable que celle qu'il avait précédemment. ... On attribue l'invention de ces instruments [sic] à M. Stölzel, musicien de S. M. le Roi de Prusse, et il y a environ dix ans que les trompettes et cors à pistons, sont en usage en Allemagne; on a fabriqué de ces instruments à Berlin, Vienne, Carlsruhe etc.'

Dauverné continues to talk about the mechanics of the instrument and lists its advantages. But, in spite of the enthusiasm shown in the above extract, he concludes that the extra time needed to depress the valves and the extra pressure of breath required to sustain the valves makes the instrument less effective than those with keys or holes. After discussing the practical care and maintenance of the pistons, Dauverné continues with information about which pistons to use to achieve the wide range of notes now possible. No mention is made of the use of valve trumpets in Chelard's Macbeth or other pieces, notably Guillaume Tell (August, 1829) and Robert le diable (November 1831), perhaps because this method is for the two-valve trumpet and the operas mentioned above used the three-valve instrument (Guillaume Tell) and keyed trumpet (Robert le diable). Dauverné does, however, praise Strunz's piece, written for five valved instruments which

79 See appendix for the preamble of each Notice.
was performed in April 1833 and received considerable publicity. He lists the
performers, which included himself and comments that its performance
was attended by such eminent persons in the musical world as Cherubini,
Berton, Reicha, Habeneck, Nourrit and others. Fétis gives a lengthy
commentary about this in the Revue Musicale, May 4, 1833, beginning with
a brief history of the development of the valve up to that point. He says that
pistons applied to the trumpet were less satisfactory than those being applied
to the horn, but that some of the problems have been exaggerated. He, too
praises Strunz and the playing of Dauverné, among others. In the absence of
any score of this work (there is neither ms nor print at F-Pn), the
conclusions about this piece relevant to this study are to be drawn from
Fétis' account, which is interesting with respect to the number of valves. He
comments that the trumpet is similar to the horn, which has only two
valves, 'au lieu de trois'. Thus it seems that Strunz had written a piece
supporting Dauverné's promotion of the reduction from three valves to
two. In retrospect and of incidental interest, quite how sincere Fétis was
being about the trumpet is in question, since just over a year later he wrote
that trumpets are imperfect and crying out for the attention of makers to
improve their systems: perhaps he was encouraged, in the time honoured
manner of some form of gift, to be favourable to Strunz.

Despite the title, Method 3 is much on the same lines as Method 2,
neither mentioning any works which made use of the valved trumpet,
except Strunz's quintet, nor paying much attention to the cornet, until the
last two sentences:

Il a pu adapter aussi aux Cornets, le même principe de mécanisme, ce
qui donne de grandes ressources à cet Instrument si essentiel dans les
Musiques militaires et aujourd'hui si répandu même, dans les

---

80 Acknowledgements are due to Dr Elizabeth Bartlet, for pointing this out. Hereafter, other
items which have benefitted from her input are designated 'EB'.
81 Fétis' review was in Revue Musicale, June 1, 1834. Jeremy Montagu, Curator of the Bate
Collection, Oxford, suggests that perhaps Fétis was 'encouraged' to be favourable to Strunz.
Less than six months after the performance of this piece, Strunz, together with Liszt and
Robert Cooper, was a witness at Berlioz's marriage to Harriet Smithson.
Orchestres de Bals. Plusieurs facteurs ont entrepris avec succès, la fabrication de ces nouveaux Instrumens.

The preface to Method 4 is significantly headed, 'Notice sur l'origine de la trompette et du cornet à pistons'. It is similar in content to that heading Method 3, but with one or two interesting changes. Apart from minor adjustments to the wording such as can be found between the previous tutors, Dauverne now writes: 'M. Spontini m'adressa une trompette' (italics added), omitting any reference to his uncle M. Buhl. He does, however, enlarge on this first trumpet which was:

...d'après ce nouveau système, mais qui laissait encore à désirer plus de justesse dans les sons, et un piston meilleur que le troisième qui rendait le mécanisme embarrassant et compliqué, privait l'instrument d'une partie de sa sonorité. Cependant ce troisième piston donnait le moyen d'obtenir quelques notes dans les sons les plus graves du diapason de l'instrument; telles-que Ut # dièse, Ré * naturel, Re # dièse et Sol # dièse; mais je préférâi les perdre pour adopter les avantages du perfectionnement dont je parlerai plus loin.

For the first time, this introduction concludes with mention of the instrument being used in Guillaume Tell and Robert le diable, but there is no mention of its use in Macbeth or Waverley. The designation in the score of Robert le diable is for trompettes à clés but the part definitely requires a trumpet that can offer the full chromatic range, as does the part in Guillaume Tell. Curiously, however, these pieces, which are for three valve instruments, are mentioned here, in a Méthode for two-valve instruments, unlike in the previous method. Even though that was also for a two valve instrument, such works were not mentioned. Omitting reference to Macbeth and Waverley is strange and although suggesting it was nothing more than forgetfulness is not convincing, any other reason can only be conjectural. Other ideas are that since Macbeth was not a success and not in the repertoire, it was dismissed and that Waverley was not mentioned because it was an orchestral piece and the politically correct focus was on operatic works. Since Dauverné was a founder member of the Société des Concerts (1828), however, is it surprising that he felt unable to promote

---

82 Berlioz writes about Robert le diable in the Gazette Musicale, July 12, 1833.
instrumental music. This implies that there were other reasons for their omission, as yet unknown. Finally he talks about the cornet: Halary was also responsible for adding pistons to the cornet, which was very popular at balls, in the Champs-Elysées concerts, at the Contre-danse and with amateurs in general. 83

**Berlioz and the trumpet à pistons in the 1830's and as reflected in revisions to Waverley**

During the early 1830s, Berlioz shows no standard approach to his choice of instruments in this area, confirming the state of flux regarding the development and usage of valved brass instruments. For example he used only natural trumpets in the overture to *Roi Lear*, written while in Italy, but natural trumpets with one three-valve trumpet in the *Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor*, which was written only a matter of weeks after *Le Roi Lear*. Another work from the period when Berlioz was in Italy is the *Chant des brigands*, which was part of *Le Retour à la vie*, (1831) and also included a part for a three-valve trumpet. 84 At the same time that the piston trumpet was being developed, the cornet was also being given valves (see below). In spite of Dauverné’s efforts to improve the trompette à pistons and because of the inherent tuning difficulties, it seems that, if a valved instrument was required, players came to prefer the cornet à pistons once it came into more common usage, and often used it irrespective of what was specified. 85

---

83 The last two tutors by Dauverné date from 1846 and 1856 respectively and are for three valve instruments. They lie outside the scope of the discussion as it relates to Berlioz and the revisions to *Waverley*, but transcriptions of their *Notices* are to be found in the appendix to this chapter.

84 NBE, vol 7.

85 a) Discussed during conversation with Jeremy Montagu. He also suggested that sometimes players cut down F valve trumpets to Bb and these looked the same from the front and often fooled conductors who demanded the 6 foot F trumpet when players preferred to play the 4 1/2 foot Bb.

b) Until as recently as the 1920s, orchestras in Paris tended to have *cornets à pistons* as their treble brass, eschewing the valved trumpet. Baines, in *NG*, Vol. 4, p. 785, writes, ‘French orchestras still generally employ two trumpets and two cornets (and in works scored for three trumpets one of the cornet players changes to trumpet), but some use trumpets for all four parts making a very brilliant effect.’
unpopularity is confirmed by Berlioz, who did not approve of the instrument, when he wrote about *Robert le diable* (along with comments that players would adjust their parts if they were too difficult). Some confusion has been caused, however, by his account of the *Prix de Rome* ceremony in his *Memoirs*, as remembered from when he was awarded first prize in 1830. He writes in Chapter 30: 'a full orchestra is assembled, with nothing missing: strings, two flutes, two oboes, two clarinets, ... four horns, three trombones and even piston cornets - modern instruments!' In the feuilleton in which this episode was originally recounted, he wrote 'even piston trumpets'. A few years later, and the comment as it is in the *Memoirs* would undoubtedly have been true, but in 1830 the piston cornet had yet to be established. When Berlioz added the sections which constitute the changes to the structure of *Waverley* and which are easily recognisable because of the different paper type he used, it is clear that the part for piston trumpet continues to be for the three-valve instrument.

On a later occasion he reduced the instrumentation of *Waverley*, which exercise produced various changes visible on the autograph. Among a multitude of revisions and refinements, some concern the redisposition of harmony (mostly in woodwind) and some the addition of counter figures (also mostly in the woodwind). There are also changes to the part for the piston trumpet, but they do not appear to be directly connected with this, as a comparison of the original and revised parts shows (Ex.11). Several of the changes involve octave transpositions, such as bars 207, 209, 211, 364 and 374ff., and others the elimination of certain notes not available on the two-valve instrument (*d', eb', g#', and notes below c'*, such as bars 209-10, 384, 388 and 397, to name only some. But neither of these types of change is connected with redisposition of harmony which affected other instruments in the score. What emerges is, quite simply, that Berlioz adjusted the part so that it could be played on the two-valve trumpet which Dauverné was going

---

86 *Gazette musicale*, July 12, 1833.
87 *Memo* ch. 30.
Ex. 11 Transcription of original and revised parts for trompettes à pistons.
to such lengths to promote. In relation to Dauverné's methods, this would place the timing of the reduction in instrumentation between 1834 (possibly late 1833 - remembering that Methods 2 and 3 mention the piece by Strunz performed in April 1833) and 1837. There is firm evidence from around this time that Dauverné and Berlioz were in regular contact. Dauverné was playing for Berlioz, as seen in the latter's lists, recording players and expenses for some of his concerts. Dauverné is mentioned as having played on December 7, 1834, and in the concerts on November and December of 1835 - he was paid 15 francs on November 15. It is not surprising to learn that during the same period Berlioz was making changes to accommodate two-valve instruments elsewhere. For example, in the revisions he made to Harold en Italie, changes affect the first and last movements (the relevant brass being silent in the middle two movements). In the outer movements close examination of the layers shows that the part for piston trumpet was designed originally for a three-valve instrument and was altered so that the two-valve trumpet could be used. Harold en Italie was given its first performance in November 1834, when Waverley was also performed. They also appeared together in a programme given at the Gymnase Musicale in June 1835, which could have been the occasion for which Berlioz made these revisions.

This is a good place to make a further, brief comment about the piston cornet, without which this section would not be complete. By the time Berlioz was making the revisions to Harold and Waverley, the cornet was becoming widely used in Paris for social music. It quickly came to replace the valve trumpet in art music also, the result being that, even though Berlioz was often scornful of the sound of the piston cornet, he came to use it in combination with natural trumpets, because that is what was favoured by players. Thus it is that the revisions in Harold, mentioned above, show that the changes made to adapt from three-valve to two-valved trumpet (first

---

89 Also on December 5, 1837 he played first trumpet of eight in the first performance of the Requiem. F-Pn: Papiers Divers de Berlioz. Dauverné is also mentioned on some undated lists.
90 Acknowledgements are due to Dr Paul Banks for sharing this information. Full details of the revisions to Harold can be found in NBE vol. 17 (forthcoming), edited by Dr Paul Banks.
layer of revisions) were adjusted in favour of a two-valve cornet (second layer of changes), an accurate reflection of the transitional state of brass instruments during the 1830's. Neither Waverley nor Les Francs-juges were revised to accommodate the cornet and they remain the only two scores by Berlioz to have been published with parts for piston trumpets, Waverley in 1839 and Les Francs-juges in 1836. The fact that the part in Les Francs-juges is for a three-valve piston trumpet, even though published after the time when Berlioz revised other scores for the two-valve instrument can be explained by the fact that the parts had already been published in 1833 and and Berlioz either forgot or chose not to revise the piston trumpet part for publication of the full score in 1836. Also, the fact that the part was published for a three valve instrument in 1833 corroborates the suggestion made here and in more detail in Chapter 3, that the revisions to Waverley adjusting the trumpet part from a three-valve to a two-valve instrument were made no earlier than c.1834, coinciding with the publication of Dauverné's second method for two-valve trumpet.

Thus, the revisions to the part for trompette à pistons in Berlioz's first (extant) orchestral score show that his awareness of matters orchestral, which later found expression in his orchestration treatise, was as much a part of his musical persona from the beginning as composition itself. The research required for this chapter has looked at how the administrative processes of the period affected events and even suggested the results of what was then deemed to be 'politically correct'. Here is something that contributes equally to an important detail in Berlioz's compositional process, showing the way he included instrumental matters as a part of composition, and to the background against which this process developed.

---

91 JW. Also op. cit. Hugh Macdonald, Berlioz and the Cornet.
92 To complete the contribution made to this discussion by Les Francs-juges, the first edition part for trompette à pistons, belonging to the Société des Concerts, has various hand-written additions, presumably made by performers. One such appears to be the date '1836' and another has crossed out the word 'trompette' and replaced it with 'cornet', thus complying with the practice of replacing piston trumpets with cornets, outlined above.
93 For further information about the trumpet in nineteenth century music, the reader is referred to the writings of Edward Tarr.
APPENDIX TO CHAPTER 2: A CASE STUDY:
THE TROMPETTE A PISTONS IN THE OVERTURE WAVERLEY

Contents:
The Notices by Dauverné
Brief biographies of Dauverné and Chelard
Berlioz and the trompette à pistons: after Waverley

The Notices by Dauverné

Extracts from all Dauverné's Notices appear here consecutively. They quote the historical data, complete with capitals and other typographical indiosyncrasies.

Method 1; 1827-30

NOTICE SUR LA TROMPETTE A PISTONS
La trompette à pistons n'a été connue en France que vers la fin de l'année 1826. C'est à Monsieur SPONTINI, l'un de nos plus célèbres Compositeurs Dramatiques, maintenant directeur général de la musique de S. M. le Roi de Prusse, à qui nous devons l'avantage de connaître la Trompette à Pistons. Monsieur SPONTINI, jaloux de faire connaître en France une invention aussi heureuse, qu'utile à l'art musical, envoya un de ces nouveaux instrumens à la musique de l'état-major des Gardes-du-corps du Roi, ainsi qu'un Trombone ou Trompette-Basse de même mécanisme.

Ayant l'honneur de faire partie de la musique de l'état-major des Gardes-du-corps du Roi, en qualité de Trompette d'harmonie, j'ai possédé, le premier, cette nouvelle Trompette et j'ai pu en apprécier le mérite. Comme j'ai n'avais aucune instruction positive sur la manière de jouer cet instrument, j'ai été obligé d'étudier son mécanisme avec beaucoup de soin afin d'en connaître le plus parfaitement possible le véritable doigté, et j'ai cru utile d'offrir provisoirement ce petit travail qui suffira, je crois, pour avoir une idée du mécanisme de ce nouvel instrument.

... Il y a environ trois ans que la Trompette à pistons est en usage dans toute Allemagne...

Depuis ce temps on s'est occupé dans different villes d'Allemagne, à fabriquer et à perfectionner ces Instrumens, ce qui nous permet d'espérer qu'en France, on parviendra à leur donner un point de perfection très satisfaisant.*

*Mr Labbaye, facteur d'Instrumens à vent en cuivre, rue de Chartres à Paris, vient d'entreprendre la fabrication de ces nouveaux Instrumens, pour les quels il a obtenu un Brevet d'Importation et de perfectionnement.
Method 2: 1833/4

Notice sur la Trompette à pistons

La Trompette à Pistons n’a été connue en France que vers la fin de l’année 1826. C’est à Monsieur Spontini, l’un de nos plus Célèbres Compositeurs Dramatiques, d’Directeur Général de la musique de S. M. le Roi de Prusse, à qui nous devons l’avantage de connaître la Trompette à Pistons. Monsieur Spontini, jaloux de faire connaître en France une invention aussi heureuse, qu’utile à l’art Musical, adressa un de ces nouveaux instrumens à M. Buhl, chef de la musique des ex-Garde-du-corps du Roi, dont je faisais partie alors.

Ayant possédé, le premier, cette nouvelle Trompette, j’ai été à même d’en apprécier les avantages, bien cependant qu’il était indispensable d’apporter de grands changements à sa conformation primitive pour lui rendre la justesse désirables dans tous les tons. Un habile facteur, M. Antoine Halary, a fait disparaître tous les vices existants dans l’instrumens envoyé d’Allemagne, en trouvant le moyen d’adapter à la Trompette deux petites coulisses (indépendamment de la coulisse d’accord) qui servent à modifier le tempérament de chaque corps de rechange. M. Antoine Halary, a donc surmonté toutes les difficultés puisqu’il est parvenu au point de rendre l’instrumens parfaitement juste, de pouvoir le mettre dans tous les tons, ce qui n’existait pas, et de lui donner une forme plus commode et plus agréable que celle qu’il avait précédemment. ... On attribue l’invention de ces instrumens à M. Stölzel, musicien de S. M. le Roi de Prusse, et il y a environ dix ans que les trompettes et cors à pistons, sont en usage en Allemagne; on a fabriqué de ces instrumens à Berlin, Vienne, Carlsruhe etc.’

Avantages que présente la trompette à Pistons

... Par rapport à la fatigue qu’ éprouvent les lèvres, la Trompette à Pistons ne permettra pas de dire de longues phrases ni d’exécuter du difficultés aussi brillantes comme on pourrait l’obtenir sur les instrumens à clés ou à trous; car il est facile de concevoir qu’il faut beaucoup plus de temps pour pousser ou lever un des pistons qui doit produire le son, que de lever ou d’abaisser le doigt sur un trou ou une clé. Le peu de force qu’on est obligé de mettre dans les doigts pour contenir les Pistons, leur donne assez de roideur pour leur ôter de leur agilité. Cependant avec un travail assidu, la Trompette à Pistons peut devenir un instrument susceptible d’être d’une grande utilité aux compositeurs et de rendre des effets très agréables. On l’a déjà employé avec avantage dans les orchestres et les Musique Militaire. Je ne dois pas laisser échapper ici l’occasion de rendre hommage à un compositeur distingué, le premier qui ait écrit pour l’ensemble de ces Instruments. Monsieur Jacques Strunz, vient de composer un quintetto (sic.) etc.
Notice sur l'origine de la trompette à pistons

L'invention de la Trompette à Pistons est due à Jean, Henri STÖLZEL, né à Scheibenberg, en Saxe, le 17 Septembre, 1777, de parents musiciens. Dès son enfance il montra un penchant naturel pour le mécanique, quoique son éducation fût dirigée vers la Musique. Il parvint à jouer plusieurs Instruments avec perfection; la Harpe, le Violoncelle, le Cor et la Trompette lui furent familiers, il fût particulièrement considéré comme Virtuose sur ces deux derniers.

C'est fût en 1806, qu'il conçut pour la première fois, l'idée de perfectionner les Instruments de cuivre, en augmentant leur échelle en diatonique et en chromatique; mais la guerre, si funeste aux Arts, qui dévastait alors toute l'Allemagne, l'empêcha de poursuivre ses recherches et d'effectuer ses projets. Enfin sept années plus tard (en 1813) il parvint à obtenir un résultat heureux de son ingénieuse invention, et fit entendre à Breslaw en Silésie, ville qu'il habitait, un Cor, sur lequel il avait appliqué son système; mais ce fût en 1814, qu'il le fit entendre publiquement pour la première fois. S. M. le Roi Prusse, protecteur des Arts, instruit de la découverte et de l'avantage de ces Instruments, (le Cor, la Trompette et la Basse Trompette) fit accorder l'Inventeur, en 1817, en récompense de ses travaux, un Privilège de dix ans, pour la fabrication de ces Instruments, dans tous le Royaume, et il l'admit à son service, comme Musicien de la Chapelle.

La Trompette à Pistons n'a été connue en France, que vers la fin de l'Année 1826, et c'est au zèle de l'un de nos plus célèbres Compositeurs Dramatiques, Monsieur SPONTINI, Directeur Général de la Musique de S. M. le Roi de Prusse, que nous devons l'avantage de la connaître. Jaloux d'introduire en France une invention aussi heureuse qu'utile à l'art musical, Monsieur SPONTINI, adressa un de ces nouveaux Instruments ainsi que le Basse Trompette à Mr. Buhl, chef de la Musique des ex Gardes-du-Corps, dont je faisais partie alors. Ayant possédé, le premier, cette nouvelle Trompette, j'ai été à même d'en apprécier les avantages, quoi qu'il m'ait paru indispensable d'apporter de grands changemens à sa conformation primitive pour lui rendre la justesse désirée dans tous les tons. Un habile facteur, Mr. ANTOINE-HALARY, a fait disparaître tous les vices existants dans l'Instrument envoyé d'Allemagne, en trouvant le moyen d'adapter à la Trompette deux petites coulisses (indépendamment de la coulisse d'accord) qui servent à modifier le tempérament de chaque ton ou corps de rechange. Mr. ANTOINE-HALARY, a donc surmonté toutes les difficultés puisqu'il est parvenu au point de rendre l'Instrument parfaitement juste, de pouvoir le mettre dans tous les tons, ce qui n'existait pas, et de lui donner une forme plus commode et plus agréable que celle qu'il avait précédemment.

[There is a section following on 'avantages que présente' etc. which is almost identical to the one in Method 2.]
Method 4; 1837

Notice sur l'origine de la Trompette et du Cornet à pistons

L'Invention de la Trompette à pistons est due à Jean, Henri STÖLZEL, qui était originaire de Scheibenberg, en Saxe, où il naquit le 17 Septembre, 1777. Cet artiste jouait avec une égale perfection notamment la Harpe, du Violoncelle, le Cor et de la Trompette. Mais ce fut particulièrement à son talent sur ces deux derniers instrumens qu'il dut sa réputation.

En 1806, il conçut l'idée de perfectionner les Instrumens de cuivre, en augmentant leur échelle en diatonique et chromatique; mais la guerre, si funeste aux Arts, qui dévastait alors toute l'Allemagne, l'empêcha de poursuivre ses recherches et d'effectuer ses projets. Ce ne fut que sept ans plus tard qu'on put apprécier les heureux résultats de son invention; il fit entendre à Breslaw, en Silésie un Cor, sur le quel il avait appliqué son nouveau système. Sa découverte ayant été goutée, il la publia en 1814, et joua dans plusieurs Concerts. Le Roi de Prusse, protecteur des Arts, comprit l'importance des perfectionnemens que STÖLZEL, avait appliqué au Cor et la Trompette, et en 1817 il accorda à l'inventeur un privilège de dix ans, pour la fabrication de ces instrumens, dans tout le Royaume. Pour ajouter à ce brevet une marque plus positive, il admit STÖLZEL au nombre des musiciens de sa Chapelle.

La Trompette à Pistons n'a été connue en France, que dans le courant de l'année 1826, et c'est au zèle de l'un de nos plus célèbres compositeurs dramatiques, Mr SPONTINI, Directeur Général de la Musique du Roi de Prusse, que nous devons l'avantage de la connaître. Jaloux d'introduire en France une invention aussi heureuse qu'utile à l'art musical, Monsieur SPONTINI, m'adressa une Trompette d'après ce nouveau système, mais qui laissait encore à désirer plus de justesse dans les sons, et un piston meilleur que le troisième qui rendait le mécanisme embarrassant et compliqué, privait l'instrument d'une partie de sonorité. Cependant ce troisième piston donnait le moyen d'obtenir quelques notes dans les sons les plus graves du diapason de l'instrument; tells-que Ut # dièse, Re naturel, Re# dièse et Sol # dièse, mais je préférai les perdre pour adopter les avantages du perfectionnement dont je parlerai plus loin.

Ayant été le premier à faire usage de cette nouvelle Trompette, j'ai pu en apprécier les avantages, tout en reconnaissant la nécessité d'apporter des modifications à son conformation primitive. Trois ans s'étaient écoulés depuis la connaissance de ces instrumens et ils étaient presque abandonnés lorsqu'un habile facteur, Mr. Antoine-Halary trouva le moyen de perfectionner la Trompette en retirant ce troisième piston, et en adaptant sur l'instrument deux petites coulisses qui servent à modifier le tempérant de chaque ton où Corps de rechange, sans les quelles il est impossible de jouer juste. Dès lors, l'instrument changea de forme ainsi que le principe de son mécanisme, et je fus obligé de le travailler de nouveau en attendant l'occasion de le faire entendre.

En 1829, il fut introduit à l'orchestre de l'opéra, dans l'opéra de GUILLAUME TELL et ensuite dans plusieurs ouvrages et notamment dans ROBERT LE DIABLE. C'est de cette époque que date l'origine du Cornet à Pistons ...
Notice sur l'origine de la trompette et du Cornet à pistons

L'Invention de la Trompette à Pistons est due à Jean, Henri STÖLZEL, né à SCHEIBENBERG en Saxe, le 17 Septembre, 1777. Cet Artiste jouait avec une égale perfection notamment, de la Harpe, du Violoncelle, du Cor et de la Trompette; mais ce fût particulièrement à son talent sur ces deux derniers instruments, qu’il dut sa réputation.

En 1806, il conçut l'idée de perfectionner les instrumens de cuivre, en augmentant leur échelle en diatonique et chromatique. Mais la guerre si funeste aux Arts, qui désolait alors toute l'Allemagne, l'empêcha de poursuivre ses recherches et d'effectuer ses projets. Ce ne fut donc que sept ans plus tard qu'on put apprécier les heureux résultats de son invention, et il fit entendre à BRESLAW en Silésie un Cor, sur lequel il avait appliqué son nouveau système. Sa découverte ayant été goutée, il la publia en 1814, dans plusieurs concerts. Le Roi de Prusse,protecteur des Arts, comprit l'importance des avantages et des perfectionnemens que STÖLZEL, avait apporté au Cor et à la Trompette, et en 1817, il accorda à l'inventeur, un privilège pour la fabrication de ces instrumens, dans tout le Royaume. Pour ajouter à ce Brevet une marque plus positive, il admit STÖLZEL, au nombre des musiciens de sa Chapelle.

La Trompette à pistons n'a été connue en France, que dans le courant de l'année 1826, et c'est au zèle de l'un de nos plus célèbres compositeurs dramatiques, Mr SPONTINI, alors Directeur général de la musique du Roi de Prusse, que nous devons l'avantage de la connaître. Jaloux d'introduire en France une invention aussi heureuse qu'utile à l'art musical, Mr SPONTINI, m'adressa une Trompette d'après ce nouveau système, mais qui laissait encore à désirer sous le rapport de la justesse et de la sonorité.

1 Dictionnaire.
MÉTHODE

Théorique et Pratique

DE

GÖRNET

Pistons ou à Cylindres.

PAR

F.C.A. DAVOYERÈNÈ

Dédié à

Kastner.


Nouvelle Edition.

A PARIS, chez HEME LEMOYNE, imprimé par D. FAURON, libraire, 36, rue de Tournon, 1832.
ARTICLE 4.
DE LA TENUE DE L'INSTRUMENT.

Ex. 12b Method of engraving of three valve trumpet.
Ayant été le premier à faire usage de cette nouvelle Trompette, j'ai pu en apprécier les avantages, tout en reconnaissant la nécessité d'apporter des modifications et des perfectionnements à son conformation primitive.

Trois ans s'étaient écoulés depuis la connaissance de cet instrument et il était pour ainsi dire abandonné, lorsqu'un habile facteur, M. ANTOINE HALARY trouva le moyen de plus rendre la sonorité voulue en retranchant ce troisième Piston qui existait dès l'origine, et en adaptant sur l'Instrument deux petites coulisses qui servirent à modifier le tempérament de chaque Ton où Corps de rechange sans lesquelles il était impossible de jouer juste et de pouvoir accorder les pistons entr-eux. Dès lors, l'Instrument changea de forme ainsi que le principe de son mécanisme.

C'est en 1829, dans l'Opéra de GUILLAUME TELL qu'il fut employé pour la première fois à l'Orchestre de l'Académie Royale de musique, et ensuite dans plusieurs autres ouvrages et notamment dans ROBERT LE DIABLE, La Juive, Les Huguenots etc.

En 1831 Mr ANTOINE- HALARY eût heureuse idée d'appliquer le principe de mécanisme imaginé par STÖLZEL, ...

Plus tard on sentit l'importance et la nécessité de restituer à l'Instrument, son 3e Piston, afin de pouvoir combler les lacunes qui existaient dans sa gamme, causé par son absence.

Ce n'est donc qu'après de longues recherches et de nombreuses modifications que l'on est parvenu à perfectionner cet instrument, de manière à ce qu'il ne laisse plus rien à désirer maintenant, sous le rapport de la qualité du son et de la justesse.

Le Cornet à pistons est tellement répandu aujourd'hui, que non seulement, il est pour ainsi dire l'âme du Quadrille, mais encore, il tient une place importante dans les partitions dramatiques de nos plus célèbres compositeurs.
Method 6: \(1857\)

Main title: Methode pour la Trompette (Ex. 13)

Secondary title: Precédé d'un précis historique sur cet instrument en usage chez les différents peuples depuis l'antiquité jusqu'à nos jours

Author: F. G. A. Dauverné, Professor au Conservatoire de Musique et de déclamation etc. etc.

Price: 25 francs net

Dedication: Dédie à Monsieur Auber, Commandeur de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, Méembre de l'Institut de France, Directeur du Conservatoire Impérial de Musique et de Déclamation, et de la Musique de S. M. L'Empereur des Français Napoléon III.

Publisher: Paris, chez Brandus, Dufour et Cie, Editeurs, rue de Richelieu 103, et chez tous les marchands de musique. Saint-Petersbourg, maison Brandus. Belgique (déposé)

Clues to dating: Avant-propos dated 'Paris, 1856'.

Other information: Ouvrage apprové et adopté par la section de musique de L'Académie des Beaux-Arts (Institut de France), et par le Conservatoire impérial de musique.

Works cited: Macbeth, Guillaume Tell, Robert le Diable, La Juive, Les Huguenots

Shelf mark at F-Pn: Vm\(^8\) L. 93 and L. 10.182.

The last known and most extensive method by Dauverné, published in 1857, is specifically for trumpet.\(^2\) The format is different from the earlier Méthodes because it incorporates an extensive history of the instrument, so there is no Notice in the manner of the previous books. At the end of the history Dauverné reverts to the story in which Spontini sends instruments to his uncle, David Buhl, and himself, rather than simply to himself. He also acknowledges his uncle with appropriate respect in the Avant-propos:

... neveu et élève de David Buhl, qui, à juste titre, mérita d'être appelé le trompettiste par excellence de son époque, j'ai puisé à la source des meilleurs préceptes.

\(^2\) F.-G.-A. Dauverné, Methode pour la trompette, Paris 1857. There are two copies in F-Pn, and one in GB-Lbl (one of the listings is now lost). Friedrich Anzenberger lists others in his 'Method books for natural trumpet in the 19th century: an annotated bibliography' in HBSJ, vol. 5, 1993, p. 6.
MÉTHODE

POUR

LA TROMPETTE

PRÉCÉDÉE

D'UN PRÉCIS HISTORIQUE SUR CET INSTRUMENT

EN USAGE CHEZ LES DIFFÉRENTS PEUPLES

DEPUIS L'ANTIQUITÉ JUSQU'A NOS JOURS

DÉDICÉE À MONSIEUR AUBER,

COMMISSAIRE DE L'ORDRE IMPÉRIAL DE LA LÉGION D'HONNEUR,

Membre de l'Institut de France, Directeur du Conservatoire Impérial de Musique et de Déclamation,

et de la Musique du 1er Général des Français Napoléon III.

OUVRAGE APPROUVÉ ET ADOPTÉ

PAR LA SECTION DE MUSIQUE DE L'ACADÉMIE-DES BEAUX-ARTS (INSTITUT DE FRANCE),

ET PAR LE CONSERVATOIRE IMPÉRIAL DE MUSIQUE.

PAR

F. G. A. DAUVERNÉ,

PROFESSEUR AU CONSERVATOIRE IMPÉRIAL DE MUSIQUE ET DE DÉCLAMATION, ETC., ETC.

Prix : 25 francs net.

PARIS

CHEZ G. BRANDUS, DUFOR ET C°, ÉDITEURS

RUE DE RICHELIEU, 165,

ET CHEZ TOUS LES MARCHANDS DE MUSIQUE.

1836

Ex.13 Method 6 title page.
At the end of the history there is information about the various modifications, slides, keys, pistons, arriving finally at the invention of the cylinder which covers the information contained in the earlier Notices and is quoted here:

...c'était l'apparition du Piston au Cylindre qui faisait irruption et dont l'invention primitive est due au Silésian Blühmel et à Saxon Stölzel, qui par moyens différents arrivèrent au même but. En 1814 Stölzel fit connaître à Berlin un Cor chromatique à 3 pistons, dont il se dit l'inventeur, et obtint à ce sujet pour dix ans, et pour toute la Prusse, un brevet d'invention et en outre son admission comme premier Cor de la Chapelle du Roi. Cette ingénieuse invention fut également appliquée à la trompette ainsi qu'à toute la famille des instruments de cuivre, et qui plus tard donna naissance à tant instruments de formes et d'effets différents appelés depuis Sax-horns, à partir du Soprano aigu jusqu'à La Contre-Basse.

La Trompette à pistons qui servit de type et de point de départ à la fabrication de ces instruments ne fut connue en France que vers la fin d'année 1826, et c'est dans les premiers jours de mois d'octobre de cette même année, que le célèbre Spontini, alors Directeur général de la musique de S.M. Le Roi de Prusse, adressa à M. Buhl, Chef de musique des Gardes du corps du Roi, ainsi qu'à moi, qui faisaïs aussi partie de cette musique, une Trompette de ce nouveau système, mais qui laissait à désirer sous le rapport de la sonorité et de la justesse dans le jeu des pistons. C'est alors que toute la factorerie française se mit en émoi à l'apparition de cette nouvelle et ingénieuse invention, et qu'elle parvint à en faire disparaître les inconvénients originels.

Ayant été le premier, pour ainsi dire, à faire usage de cette nouvelle Trompette, j'ai été à même de pouvoir apprécier les avantages, tout en reconnaissant la nécessité impérieuse d'apporter des modifications à sa fabrication primitive. Arrivé au but désiré, j'eus l'occasion de faire entendre avec avantage ce nouvel instrument qui, en 1827, fut employé pour la première fois à l'orchestre de l'Académie Royale de Musique, dans l'opéra de Macbeth de la composition de M. Chelard, qui n'eut que peu de représentations à cause de l'apparition et de la splendeur du Moïse de Rossini, l'un des chefs-d'œuvre de ce grand maître. Ce n'est que deux années plus tard, en 1829, dans l'opéra de Guillaume Tell, que reparut de nouveau la trompette à pistons, pour y figurer ensuite dans plusieurs autres ouvrages, notamment Robert le Diable, La Juive, Les Huguenots, etc.

---

3 In fact, the archives in Paris show that Macbeth was withdrawn because Chelard refused to make the cuts demanded by the administration and that Rossini's Moïse was not receiving its premier, as Dauverné suggests, or rather, fails to clarify: that had taken place on March 5th, 1827, nearly four months before Macbeth was shown. Perhaps he was being generous to Chelard. He eventually revised Macbeth and had much success with it in Germany. Archives, AJ/119, no. 491.
As can be seen, the *Notices* raise many curiosities, some of which have been discussed briefly in the preceding pages and which are summarised here:

a) He changed ‘adressa à M’ Buhl’ to ‘m’adressa’.
b) He does not acknowledge that he played in *Macbeth*.
c) He does not even mention *Macbeth* in earlier *Notices*, even though it required three of the new instruments - quite an impressive début.
d) He does not mention *Waverley*, a non-operatic piece, even though he was a founder member of the Société des concerts, so it might be expected that he would promote instrumental music.
e) It is difficult to rationalise exactly what instruments were in Paris and by when. Dauverné chooses to pinpoint 1826 as their arrival date, omitting references to all all earlier dates.

Not the least of these is that in the last *Méthode* Dauverné pays a great deal of attention to the natural trumpet, particularly in the number of exercises for the ‘old’ instrument. Perhaps he was influenced by his colleague at the Conservatoire, Dauprat, the virtuoso horn player and long-established horn professor, who promoted the natural horn well into the second half of the nineteenth century. This could account, in part at least, for the large number of exercises and studies for the natural trumpet. Overall, the *Méthodes* cover a time span of some 28 years during which time Dauverné became a well-established figure in Parisian musical circles. Perhaps his increased respectability affected his attitude to what he did or did not include in his *Notices*. As Professor Tarr has pointed out, there has yet to be a biography written about Dauverné, research into which could help to explain some of these unanswered questions.
Brief biographies of Dauverné and Chelard

François-George-Auguste Dauverné (1800-1874)

Such was his ability on the trumpet that he was enrolled 'dans la musique des escadrons de service des gardes du corps du roi' in 1814, aged only fourteen years. As first trumpet at the Opéra, which post he obtained by competition in January 1820 and which he held for 31 years, he was accustomed to playing a circular trumpet, for hand-stopping, but he played a valved instrument in Chelard's Macbeth, with Legros and Bernard playing the other valved instruments in the trio. In 1829 he was promoted to first trumpet of the King's Music, which appointment was initially short-lived because of the July Revolution (1830), but he was re-instated thereafter and remained there until the 1848 Revolution. By the time his second method was published, he had been made the first professor of trumpet at the Conservatoire, the instrument having been recognized in its own right for the first time in 1833; and by the time he wrote his last method, he was a person of some standing in the musical world. Records show that soon after 1833 he was a part of several committees, becoming a prominent figure in the administration of the Conservatoire. He was a founder member of the Société des Concerts and he became the first professor of trumpet at the Conservatoire in 1833. His uncle was the M. Buhl mentioned above and the person to whom the first method is dedicated.

4 One en sol made by Raoux fils in 1820, which he used until 1826. Facteurs p. 107. (Legros, 2nd trumpet, played a similar instrument made by Courtois from 1826-32. Facteurs, p. 330) According to Constant Pierre thereafter Dauverné played a trompette droite (Histoire de l'Orchestre de l'Opéra, ms in F-Pn). The order for two trompettes ordinaires and two trompettes à clés was agreed in October 1826, (Archives, AJ13/117, 1826, no. 960) but the purchase of a trompette droite was not agreed until July 1827 (Archives, AJ13/119, 1827 no. 526bis). Maybe this was delayed until it was realized that the valve instrument would not be satisfactory in general use.

5 Pierre Sarrette, p. 261.
Hippolyte Chelard (1789-1861)

He had studied violin with Kreutzer and composition with Gossec, Méhul and Cherubini at the Conservatoire, won the Prix de Rome in 1811, and his opera La casa da vendre was performed first in Naples in 1815 and in Paris in 1820. He joined the orchestra at the Opéra in 1816, where he was when Macbeth was performed.⁶ It is probable that, if he had not already met Berlioz in the orchestra pit at the Opéra, he would have met him when his Chant Grec was performed at the benefit concert for the Greeks in April, 1826 in preference to Berlioz’s Scène héroïque. He was a diverse and energetic person, running a publishing business and inaugurating the Concerts Athéniens in 1829⁷ at which Berlioz had some songs performed with great success. He was also involved in a proposed new music journal, which he called Palladin des Artistes, and in an open letter dated October 1, 1829 he sets out his thoughts regarding its chances of success, content, layout etc. and encloses a list of regulations to govern the journal.⁸ After the July Revolution of 1830, however, his publishing business folded and he moved abroad. He was helpful to Berlioz when they met again in Weimar some years later and although there is little extant correspondence between them, it is apparent that they knew each other over a number of years.⁹

⁶ See Fétis’s critique in Revue Musicale, Première année, Tome 1, Paris 1827, p. 520-6. Although he praises the instrumentation in general, he makes no specific mention of the trio. The opera is also reviewed in Courrier des théâtres, June 30, 1827, p.2.
⁷ Some details of these can be found in the Harmonicon X, 1832, in an article entitled ‘Amateur Concerts in Paris’. There is more on Chelard’s music (not always complimentary) in the editions of April 1830 and March 1833.
⁸ Acknowledgements are due to Richard Macnutt for passing on a copy of his transcript of the letter.
⁹ For more details see Encyclopædia dello Spettacolo, III, p. 578-9; Fétis Biog vol. 1, 2nd edition, Paris 1877, and NG, vol. 4, p. 197, which entry sums him up as a first rate conductor and music director, but only a mediocre composer.
Berlioz and the trompette à pistons: after Waverley

Although the immediate concern of this chapter has been Berlioz’s use of the valve trumpet in Waverley, spanning 1827-1839, it is interesting to note Berlioz’s opinion of it as laid down in his Treatise (1843) which confirms him to be a great supporter of the trumpet:

Despite the real splendour and distinctiveness of its tone there are few instruments more abused than the trumpet. Before Beethoven and Weber every composer, including Mozart, persisted in confining it either to a wretched filling-in role or to sounding two or three rhythmic formulæ endlessly repeated, as boring and ridiculous as they are contradictory - as often as not - to the character of the pieces they are found in. This appalling commonplace has at last vanished nowadays; a composer of any worth gives his melodic shapes, accompaniment figures and the trumpet fanfares such flexibility, variety and independence as the nature of the instrument permits. It has taken almost a century to reach this point.¹⁰

He concludes the section on the trumpet by saying:

The piston trumpet and cylinder trumpet have the advantage of being able to give every note of the chromatic scale, like the piston horn. There is no loss of quality from these modifications compared with the ordinary trumpet, and intonation is satisfactory. Cylinder trumpets are the better of the two and will soon be in general use.

Like Dauverné, however, he did not practise what he preached. Suffice it to say that his scores show that he preferred to combine the cornet à pistons with the natural trumpet, which topic would benefit from further study.

¹⁰ Treatise. Acknowledgements are due to Professor Hugh Macdonald for giving permission to use extracts from his complete translation of the Treatise, Cambridge, forthcoming.
CHAPTER 3: GRANDE OUVERTURE WAVERLEY

The first of the five concert overtures is of particular significance in Berlioz's output for several reasons. First, the autograph is the earliest extant document of a work conceived by Berlioz from the start as an orchestral piece. Since he became famous in his own lifetime as an orchestrator, his first essay in purely instrumental writing must be of interest. Second, and perhaps more significantly, this is the earliest orchestral work Berlioz considered worth performing and publishing. Moreover, the autograph offers a unique opportunity to examine aspects of his compositional process at an early stage in his development. This chapter has four main sections covering the genesis and composition of the work, early performances, revisions and finally its publication. The second two topics have several subheadings.

1Cat, no. 26 and F-Pn ms 1507. The autograph has been incorrectly bound. Tiersot, assistant librarian at the Conservatoire from 1883, succeeding Weckerlin in 1909, notes on 27 recto that this page and the three following (i.e. 27v, 28r and 28v) belong sixteen pages further on, after 34 verso. The Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris has not been able to offer any date as to when the manuscript was bound or by whom. For the sake of clarity, specific places in the work will be referred to using bar numbers.

2Berlioz did not publish works from which he later borrowed and Waverley is, therefore, the earliest such work from which he did not borrow in later years. The Huit scènes de Faust, which Berlioz originally published as his opus 1, but withdrew after six months or so, and which was incorporated into La Damnation de Faust (Cat 33, p. 57 and 111, p. 277), is an exception because the pieces were subject to little or no alteration. Apart from this, self-borrowings were fragments of works which were otherwise discarded. For the publication history of Berlioz's works see Cecil Hopkinson, A bibliography of the literary and musical works of Hector Berlioz, (hereafter HopBib) 2nd edition, ed. Richard Macnutt, Tunbridge Wells, 1980.

3The overture to Les Francs-juges (1826), Cat. no. 23D, although one of his most popular works and frequently performed as a concert work, was conceived as the overture to the opera of the same name, so is not considered here except in passing. Neither is the Grande fantaisie dramatique sur La Tempête, drame de Shakespeare (1830), Cat. no. 52, since after two performances it became the concluding part of Le Retour à la vie, which highly appropriate inclusion has, however, somewhat eclipsed its promising beginning as an independent concert overture.
*Genesis and composition*

In examining the genesis and composition of *Waverley*, this section will assess the timing of composition, followed by literary connections and musical influences more immediate than those outlined as background in *Chapter 1*.

It is obvious from the title Berlioz chose for his first concert overture that he was one of the many in Paris who awaited eagerly the publications of Sir Walter Scott's novels in the translations by Defauconpret.⁴ Gosselin had already published a translation in 1822, which was the one Berlioz used to copy extracts from the novel onto the title page of the overture. This will be discussed in greater detail below. There is no specific evidence of this eagerness until c.1825, however, when he makes an allusion to Scott in an undated letter to his younger sister, Adèle (1814-1860).⁵ His interest spread to his elder sister, Nancy (1805-1850): she records in her journal that she read *Waverley* to keep awake at night while nursing her younger brother, Prosper, through illness early in 1825.⁶ Starting in May 1826, there is an extensive correspondence between Berlioz and Léon Compaignon about their collaboration on a project for an opera 'digne de Scott',⁷ to be called *Richard in Palestine*, based on one of Scott's *Tales of the Crusades, The Talisman*.⁸ There are no further references to it after the letter of February 3, 1827, when the project was, it seems, abandoned.⁹ Berlioz's enthusiasm for Scott's novels, however, is mirrored not only in this overture, but also in another, the *Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor*, written during the Italian sojourn in mid-1831.¹⁰

---

⁴ Gosselin, Paris 1826. Scott's name was on all the French editions although he did not admit authorship of his novels in Scotland until 1827, as indicated in the general preface of his *Collected Novels*, 48 vols, Edinburgh 1829-33.


⁶ CairnsBiog, p. 163.

⁷ CG I, no. 55, p. 116.


⁹ CG I, no. 72, pp. 150-1.

¹⁰ See Ch. 5.
Berlioz records in his Memoirs that he wrote Waverley after he had completed the overture to his opera Les Francs-juges in October 1826.\textsuperscript{11} Neither the Memoirs nor any other known source tell how soon after this he began work on Waverley, but it is a useful terminus ante quem if only because it coincides with his enrolment at the Conservatoire, also in October 1826. As mentioned in chapter 1, he had been a private pupil of Le Sueur since 1823 and apart from continuing lessons with him, now had counterpoint and fugue lessons with Reicha. The terminus ad quem is less well-defined, there being two sources which refer to the overtures in the plural, presumably referring to both Waverley and Les Francs-juges. One of these, suggesting that Waverley was written before Berlioz left the Nouveautés, is found in an article by John Ella in the Musical World of 1837 and taken from his Musical Travels.

The early history of Berlioz is romantic and may not be void of interest to the reader. He was first known to my informant [not named by Ella] as a chorister in a minor theatre; his reserved manners made him unsocial and unpopular with his comrades; by the musicians of the band he was remarked as eccentric in appearance, always proficient in his duties, and yet anxious to elude particular notice. My informant from motives of curiosity sought the acquaintance of this recluse and one day adjourned to a neighbouring estaminet to discuss divers matters on music and sip the beverage of a 'Demitasse'. The humble chorister produced from his pocket a bundle of mss, scores of descriptive overtures and dramatic scenes, and amidst the fumes of tobacco, the rattle of billiards and dominoes, endeavoured by singing the motivi of the various movements to interest his companion. When he arrived at a particular passage, the sedate and sullen chorister, having waxed warm and earnest in his gesticulation, 'Voilà! le climax!' and down went his fist smashing all the crockery upon the table.\textsuperscript{12}

The other terminus ad quem is in a letter dated February 11, 1828 from Le Sueur, Berlioz's teacher, to Alexandre Boucher. In it Le Sueur also talks about overtures in the plural when recommending those of his pupil, Hector Berlioz, for performance in one of Boucher's concerts. In the event, Boucher offered Berlioz such an opportunity, but for May 2, 1828, by which

\textsuperscript{11} Memo ch. 13, p. 73. Also see: CG I, nos 63 and 65, pp. 132-4, 135-6.
\textsuperscript{12} Musical World, December 15, 1837, pp. 210-11.
time he was too involved with plans for his concert on May 26 to accept. The gesture was not forgotten, however. Berlioz, it seems, had kept in touch over the years and sent him tickets for the concert of December 16, 1838.\textsuperscript{13}

Given this broad time-scale, it is worth noting matters occupying Berlioz during this period which suggest he was unlikely to be spending time on composition, thus pinpointing the composition of Waverley to a more narrowly defined period.\textsuperscript{14} His father had sent him one hundred and fifty francs in August 1826, telling him there was no more for the rest of the year.\textsuperscript{15} Berlioz had to get a job to supplement his teaching if he was to remain in Paris to pursue his career as a composer. He found one eventually, singing in the chorus at the Théâtre des Nouveautés, rehearsals taking up time from November 1826 to September 1827, with regular performances of works of little or no merit such as Jeu de cachecache and Couvée de veuves from March 1827 onwards.\textsuperscript{16} Meantime, he had applied for the licence to permit his opera, Les Francs-juges, to be performed at the Odéon, and, since this was not finally denied until September 1827, he was working in the anticipation of it being accepted, which entailed revising and copying parts during late 1826 and early 1827, having bought an alarm clock to ensure he got up early enough to do some copying before going to rehearse the depressingly poor music performed at the Nouveautés.\textsuperscript{17} In addition to this he was also attending classes at the Conservatoire, which required him to find time to do the necessary preparation and exercises. By July 1827 Berlioz had passed the preliminary examination of the Prix de Rome competition. He was therefore required to stay en loge, writing the stipulated cantata, and during August he had the task of preparing and

\textsuperscript{13} Tiersot\textit{Lettres}, pp. 535-36 and CG II, no. 598, p. 487.
\textsuperscript{14} For reasons as mentioned in the Preface.
\textsuperscript{15} Cairns\textit{Biog}, p. 189.
\textsuperscript{16} Although works being performed at larger theatres were listed with their composers, only titles were listed in Courrier des Théâtres for less important venues. See also Cairns\textit{Biog}, pp. 195-6. For details of his appointment see Mem ch. 11 and 12, p. 66ff.
\textsuperscript{17} CG I, no. 71, p. 149.
rehearsing a performance of his music for the adjudication. This brings the chronology to the first *terminus ad quem*. It has been suggested that the extract from Ella's *Musical Travels* is couched in fanciful terms and therefore not particularly reliable, for which reason a brief look at the period up to the second *terminus ad quem* follows.

Restoration of the interrupted allowance in September 1827 prompted Berlioz to give up his post in the chorus at the Nouveautés immediately. Notwithstanding his relief at this, however, September was to witness events of infinitely greater significance in his life: namely his introduction to Shakespeare and, thus, to Harriet Smithson. This was closely followed by his first hearing of an overture by Beethoven on November 30. These events threw him into a state of emotional turmoil, during which time he fluctuated between bouts of frantic activity, such as preparing for the St. Cecilia's Day (November 22) performance of his early mass, and periods of nervous exhaustion and intellectual incoherence. The *Memoirs* suggests that by early 1828 Berlioz had started to plan a concert of his own music to attract the attention of Miss Smithson which was to include the first performance of *Waverley* which thus brings events to the second *terminus ad quem*, February 11, 1828. It is unlikely that the period from September 1827 to February 1828 saw any creative activity from Berlioz, for which reason the most likely time that *Waverley* was composed was in the early part of 1827, probably before the opening of the Nouveautés in March 1827 and before Berlioz heard the Beethoven overture.

There are several factors which could have contributed to Berlioz choosing to write an overture called *Waverley*. None of these is of particular

---

19 The reviews of this concert do not identify which overture was performed. Symphonies 3 and 5 were performed in the following March and April of 1828 respectively.
20 *Mem*, ch. 18, p. 98.
21 Although Cairns' projected chronology in *Mem* pp. 580-1 suggests that *Waverley* was written in Autumn 1827, in Cairns*Biog* p. 199, he suggests the first half of 1827.
significance on its own, but when combined together offer a possible scenario from which *Waverley* emerged. One is the presence of Scott himself in Paris from October 30 until November 6, 1826. Although the correspondence with Compaignon about the projected opera continued until February 1827 (as mentioned above), it had all but petered out by October 1826, the time by which Berlioz tells us he had completed his overture to *Les Francs-juges* and after which he wrote his overture called *Waverley*. Perhaps news of Scott’s visit caused a fresh surge of enthusiasm in Berlioz to think of another means to write a work ‘digne de Scott’, particularly in view of his disappointment at the slow progress of the Scott-based opera project. Another factor could be that by this time his experience with musical bureaucracy in Paris - for example, while he was working to get his *Messe solennelle* and *Les Francs-juges* performed (or not, as the case may be) - was teaching him the virtues of pragmatism. Trying to get works performed which included a libretto proved to be a nightmare. Thus the strong literary connection (Scott’s visit) could have been the one part of the musical equation, his pragmatism (frustration with bureaucracy), the other, the result of which was *Waverley*.

Another factor is raised by Ballif in his book, suggesting that when Berlioz was writing *Waverley* he was strongly influenced by Reicha’s overture op. 24 in C major,\(^{22}\) which was performed at the *Société des enfants d’Apollon à Paris* on May 24, 1824.\(^ {23}\) This, he asserts, Berlioz must have heard, as he was in Paris during May 1824. The evidence, however, suggests that he did not - at least, not on that occasion. While Berlioz was undoubtedly willing to attend as many concerts containing his master’s works as possible once he had enrolled as his pupil in October 1826, it is unlikely that in 1824 he would choose Reicha in favour of a chance to hear his idol, Gluck. Berlioz was undoubtedly at all six of the performances\(^ {24}\) of

\(^{22}\) Cited in NG, vol. 15, p. 700, as ‘Brunswick, ?c. 1795’. Reicha *offers no publication date*, saying *it was composed before 1799 (p. 160).*


\(^{24}\) Cairns*Biog*, ch. 8, p. 149.
Fn 26 cont.

*Reicha* cites a total of four overtures in C, three written before 1799 and one before 1816. Note that the overture cited by Baliff could have been performed from ms parts, although there are none - ms or printed - in the BN. See also chapter 7 of this thesis, pp. 54-55. The incipits of all four of these overtures can be found in *Reicha*, pp. 158-160.
Gluck's *Orphée* given at the Opéra in May and May 24 was one of them.\(^\text{25}\) Given that Berlioz could have heard Reicha's overture at a different time, how much of the overture cited by Ballif is likely to have been in Berlioz's mind when he wrote *Waverley* is open to debate. The opening phrases of both works are quoted here to allow a comparison:\(^\text{26}\)

*Reicha: Overture in C, performed in 1824, composed before 1799 (incipit)*

*Berlioz: Waverley:*

---

Even though Ballif suggests that in *Waverley* Berlioz tried to impose upon himself a discipline demonstrating his ability as a good pupil of Le Sueur and did this by imitating the work by Reicha cited above, a specific connection cannot be confirmed.

Tantalisingly convincing as a musical antecedent to *Waverley*, the fourth factor concerns Carl Maria von Weber (1786-1826). The episode when Berlioz tried in vain to meet the man whose music he admired and on whose behalf he felt so outraged at the denigration of his music by Castil-Blaze is well known.\(^\text{27}\) That non-event had taken place in February 1826. *Oberon* received its premiere in London at Covent Garden in April and Weber had died in June the same year. Between five to nine months later Berlioz wrote the overture to *Waverley*. It is clear from the *Grande Traité d'instrumentation* (Paris 1843) and *Memoirs* (begun in 1848) that Berlioz was well-acquainted with Weber's music, in particular the operas *Der Freischütz*, *Euryanthe* and *Oberon*, all of which he held in the highest

\(^{25}\) *Journal de l'Opéra*, May 24, 1824. The other item was *Cendrillon, ballet féerie* in 3 acts, choreography Albert Decombe, music Ferdinand Sor (EB).

\(^{26}\) Reicha's overture is as quoted from *Reicha*, p. 159. See *

\(^{27}\) Mem., ch. 16, p. 87ff.
See also Carl Maria von Weber in seinen Werken, F.W. Jähns, Berlin 1871, which offers the following information:

The overture to \textit{Euryanthe} was published in Paris in April 1825 in a version for six players at three pianos (p. 277). It also mentions the publication of the overture to \textit{Euryanthe} in Paris (p. 291) and the score and parts of \textit{Oberon}, again in Paris (p. 306), but without dates in both cases.
esteem. What is not clear is how soon after the performance of Oberon in London, Berlioz may have become acquainted with the music. There are some clues in a feuilleton he wrote for the Journal des Débats.

A few months later [i.e. after Weber’s death, which was June, 1826] the overture to Oberon was published. The Odéon Theater [sic] in Paris, which made a fortune with its flayed and filleted version of Der Freischütz, was interested enough to hear at least one piece from Weber’s last work. The director ordered a rehearsal of this symphonic marvel. But the orchestra only heard in it only a harsh string of absurdities. I do not know whether the overture was given the privilege of being butchered in public.

The times are vague, but it seems that at the very least it would have been possible for Berlioz to know the score (in some form) before he wrote Waverley, and at best he could have been present at the ‘rehearsal’ of which he speaks, which could have happened before the end of 1826. The Weber connection becomes all the more forceful when the opening phrases to both overtures are compared, beginning as they do with a single note - an uncommon way to introduce a work whose purpose is to summon an audience’s attention; both are in D major and Berlioz’s phrase is an inversion of Weber’s.

---

Opening of Weber’s overture Oberon.

Opening of Berlioz’s overture Waverley.

---

28 There are numerous citations in Mem, beginning in chapter 13 (p. 73) and continuing until the Postscript (p. 515). Other instances are noted in Ch. 1.

29 March 7, 1857. This essay was later incorporated into The Art of Music, p. 156ff.


31 From this period Weber is included in catalogues from Dufaut (c. 1827) and Schlesinger (1828). Most other inclusions date from the 1840’s. See Dictionnaire II. See *
In contrast to the difficulty in trying to establish with any certainty musical antecedents to *Waverley*, the connection between it and the novel *Waverley*, however, is clear since Berlioz quotes at length from the latter (the 1822 edition), on the title page of the former (Ex. 1): 32

Waverley était dans sa seizième année, lorsque son goût pour la solitude et son caractère mélancolique et rêveur commencèrent à se manifester... Dans ces lieux solitaire et silencieux Edouard se plaisait à donner l’essor à son imagination... Il se représentait des scènes merveilleuses, plus brillantes que toutes celles dont il avait entendu parler... (ch. 4) Son secret et son isolement lui devinrent doublés amers, lorsqu’en avançant dans la vie, il sentit l’influence des passions naissantes... (ch. 5) Mon cher Edouard, la volonté du ciel et celle de votre père, volonté que vous devez respecter, font que vous entrez dans la carrière des armes, où plusieurs de vos ancêtres se sont couverts d’une gloire immortelle... (ch. 6) Edouard, agité de mille sentiments confus, sortit de la vaste cour du château de Waverley... et entrait dans un autre monde où tout lui parut d’abord charmant parce que tout était nouveau... (ch. 7) ‘Entendez-vous les cornemuses capitaine Waverley?’... Waverley prit la main de Flore et la soirée se termina par la danse et d’autres passe-temps agréables. Edouard se retira, le cœur agité; il chercha pendant longtemps mais en vain, à fixer ses idées, puis il s’abandonna tout entier à son imagination, et vogua sous sa conduite vers le pays des illusions. Il s’endormit enfin, et dans son sommeil il rêva constamment de Flora MacIvor... (ch. 23) Il y eut alors un silence important d’environ trois minutes pendant lesquelles, les montagnards, se découvrant la tête, levèrent les yeux aux ciel et prononcèrent une courte prière. Waverley sentit alors battre son cœur, comme s’il eut voulu s’échapper de son sein. Ce n’était ni la crainte ni l’ardeur du combat; c’était un mélange de ces deux sentiments qui l’étourdit d’abord et lui causa une espèce de délire. Le son des instrumens de guerre augmentait encore son enthousiasme. Les clans s’avancèrent en bon ordre, chaque colonne fondit sur l’ennemi. Le murmure de leurs voix réunies se changea bientôt en sauvage clameur... ‘En avant, enfants d’Ivor,’ s’écria Fergus, ‘laisserons-nous Caméron répandre le premier sang’. Ils se précipitèrent avec des cris déchirants... La bataille était finie, tous les bagages d’artillerie et munitions de guerre étaient restés au pouvoir des vainqueurs. (ch. 47)

From this it appears that in the early stages of development of the overture, Berlioz made some programmatic connections between the novel and his

---

32 Acknowledgements are due to Dr. Jean-Louis Tamvaco for transcribing this from the title page of the autograph. The 1822 version of the novel can be found under F-Pn Z 60079 and that of 1826 under F-Pn Z 60245. The numbers in brackets indicate the chapters from which the quotations are taken. Acknowledgements to Professor Hugh Macdonald for identifying these.
Ex. 1 The title page of the autograph of *Waverley*. 
music. There is some suggestion in the early reviews (see below) that this connection may have been made public in some way, although there is no mention in any source of a 'programme note': it could have been that the programmatic aspect was assumed by reviewers from the original complete title, *Ouverture caractéristique.*

**Performance**

The first performance of *Waverley* took place on May 26, 1828, in the Salle du Conservatoire, Paris, and, as planned, was part of a concert consisting entirely of Berlioz's music. He writes 'I would dare to attempt what no composer had attempted in France before,' and defended his action in a letter to the Press which was printed in the *Revue Musicale, Corsaire, Figaro* and *Pandore*, thus also publicising his concert. It must be noted that this refers to the giving of public concerts; Conservatoire students gave concerts of their own music regularly. The programme included excerpts from *Les Francs-juges*, the *Marche religieuse des mages* and the *Scène héroïque*. *La Mort d'Orphée* was well-received in rehearsal, but not performed because of the indisposition of the soloist, Alexis Dupont. It was replaced by the revised Credo and Resurrexit from the *Messe solennelle* (1824), which had already received its second performance on November 22, 1827. The orchestra was conducted by Nathan Bloc, who was the reliable but uninspired conductor at the Théâtre de l'Odeon. *Waverley* was received well, as Berlioz recounts in two letters. To his father on May 29, 1828 he

---

33 As stated in the Preface, the issue of programme music in connection with Berlioz's concert overtures is not considered here in any detail.
34 Mem, ch. 18, p. 98.
36 There is a substantial amount of primary source material on these concerts in the archives of the Music Department of the library of Boston University. They can be viewed on request, but had no specific call numbers when examined.
37 Cat 23A, 23D, 27, 21A and 25 respectively.
38 NBE vol. 23. Cat 20A.
39 Instrumentation as follows: 2 flutes, 2 piccolos (the first of which doubles the flute), 2 oboes, 4 clarinets, 4 bassoons, 4 horns, 2 natural trumpets, 1 piston trumpet, not the customary 2, 3 trombones, 1 ophicleide, timpani and strings (30, 20, 16, 15, 13). Although it is customary for trumpets to be used in pairs, Berlioz also used only one trompette à pistons in his overture *Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor.*
writes that his overture received several rounds of applause and to Humbert Ferrand on June 6 he declares that Waverley opened the concert as advantageously as possible, being given three rounds of applause.\(^{30}\)

There are, as far as can be ascertained, three extant reviews of the concert. Fétis, in the *Revue Musicale*,\(^{41}\) is not wholly complimentary; there are many good things here, but there are also some bad things: often his originality verges on the bizarre and his instrumentation is confused. But of Waverley he writes that it, along with the *Marche religieuse des mages* and some passages from the Credo, deserved applause. The *Journal des Artistes* comments that the concert given by M. Berlioz, pupil of Le Sueur:

...n’a pas été entièrement satisfaisant sous le rapport de l’exécution, et peut-être y a-t-il eu de la faute du compositeur. Cependant, M. Berlioz a donné de grandes espérances; on attend qu’il ait à traiter un bon poème, pour voir comment il sortira de cette épreuve.\(^{42}\)

*Le Voleur*\(^ {43}\) gives the most detailed review in the edition dated May 31. The writer was a contemporary of Berlioz’s, Guillaume Ross, who wrote under the name Despréaux, and who received the *Prix de Rome* a few months later for his setting of *Herminie*, for which Berlioz received second prize. He thinks that Berlioz, whom he sees as part of the Romantic School created by Beethoven, will one day be an important figure in the French School. He comments that errors resulting from Berlioz’s vibrant imagination were happily redressed by many good qualities, which are then discussed. He continues:

L’ouverture de Vaverley [sic] a particulièrement fixé l’attention de l’auditoire; elle est empreinte d’une couleur tout-à-fait locale; le début de l’allegro est franc, énergique et brillant; le motif qui suit est d’une naïveté toute montagnarde, et l’entrée des instruments de

---

\(^{30}\) CG I, nos 91 and 93, pp. 191, 194.
\(^{41}\) 1st Series, 2a, vol. 3, 1828, p. 422ff.
\(^{42}\) June 1, 1828.
\(^{43}\) This journal, which appeared every five days, according to the Revolutionary calendar, was, it seems, true to its name; it did indeed steal reviews, but the author has been unable to trace the source(s) of this one.
cuivre, qui a lieu immédiatement après a produit un contraste d'un grand effet; on croit entendre les rauques accens [sic] des cornemuses appeler au combat les guerriers de la vieille écosse; le crescendo et la coda sont heureusement imaginés et terminent chaudement ce morceau remarquable dont nous ne pouvons donner qu'une analyse succincte. Remarquons en passant que c'est le seul qui ait été bien exécuté. De nombreux bravos ont témoigné à l'auteur la satisfaction du public.

Despréaux concludes by saying that while it may seem somewhat bold for M. Berlioz to put on a concert consisting only of his music, the success has completely justified his temerity.

The second performance took place on February 25, 1829, at the Opéra-Comique, then housed in the Salle Feydeau. The occasion, at which Harriet Smithson had agreed to appear as Juliet in two acts of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet, was a benefit for the poor - 'une maison de refuge'. There was also a performance of La Fiancée by Auber and in order, perhaps, to attract the attention of Miss Smithson, Berlioz persuaded the manager of the theatre to include a performance of Waverley, although this item does not appear in any newspapers which announced the event.44 Berlioz’s recollection of the occasion in the Memoirs is more optimistic than the reality seen in contemporary letters, but it is not without a wry smile at his own naïvety in thinking it might have even the remotest effect upon Miss Smithson. He wrote:-

The orchestra assembled and my overture was rehearsed. I listened like one in a dream without making the least comment. But the players applauded the work and this revived my hopes that the public would like it, which would in turn have an effect upon Miss Smithson. Fool that I was!... My overture was played well enough and quite well received but not encored.45

All this took place at the beginning of the evening, before the theatre had begun to fill, which may account for the fact that it is not mentioned in any

---

44 E.g. La Semaine, Le Courrier Français, Courrier des Théâtres and Le Drapeau Blanc.
45 Mem, ch. 24, p. 120.
reviews of the occasion. Boschot argues vigorously that *Waverley* was not performed on this occasion, giving the lack of any mention of it in reviews as his reason. It is, however, mentioned in a letter from Berlioz to du Boys, dated March 2, 1829, which is probably a more accurate reflection of the performance than that given in the *Memoirs*. Berlioz says that he went to hear his overture, which, whilst being performed better than he had hoped, produced only a mediocre effect. He does not mention the name of the conductor or other details of the occasion, but, not surprisingly, concentrates on describing his emotions when he saw the remnants of a poster advertising his overture alongside Harriet's performance of *Romeo and Juliet* for the very day of the concert. It seems probable that the inclusion of *Waverley* was a last minute decision, hence its apparent absence in announcements except those put up on the day itself. It is unlikely that such a description as that to be found in this letter was a figment of Berlioz's imagination and, in this light, Boschot's doubts are unfounded.

The third performance, however, is more thoroughly documented. It took place at the Salle du Conservatoire on November 1, 1829. Apart from *Waverley*, Habeneck (1781-1849) conducted a performance of the Resurrexit from Berlioz's *Messe solennelle*, which was renamed *Le Jugement dernier*, his overture to *Les Francs-juges* and the 'Concert des Sylphes' from the *Huit scènes de Faust*, the air from *Les Francs-juges* having been cancelled. The rest of the concert consisted of Beethoven's fifth piano concerto, played by Hiller, and selections of Italian vocal music. This time, again in the *Revue Musicale*, Fétis was scathing about the concert in general, and about the 'Concert des Sylphes' in particular. The probable explanation for this, apart from the fact that Fétis was known to write with some capriciousness, is that he and Berlioz had had their first contretemps over the Troupenas edition.

---

*E.g. Courrier des Théâtres, February 26, 1829 and, more extensively, La Semaine on March 1, 1829.*


*48 CG 1, no. 117, pp. 236 and 238.*

*49 Cat 33.*

*50 Vol. 6, pp. 348-51.*
of the Beethoven symphonies during the first part of 1829. Fétis had little reason to feel kindly towards a composer he regarded as undisciplined and arrogant.\footnote{For details of this and other incidents involving Berlioz and Fétis see ‘Berlioz and the Critic: La Damnation de Fétis’, Peter Bloom, from Studies in Musicology in Honor of Otto E. Albrecht, London etc. 1980.} Le Figaro on November 3, 1829 was more generous: ‘L’ouverture de Waverley est originale et remplie d’effets adroitement combinés...’ On the following day the Gazette de France also spoke favourably, praising Berlioz’s knowledge of harmony and, in particular, his knowledge and use of instrumentation, even though, as the reviewer points out, this word has yet to find a place in the musical dictionaries.\footnote{CG I, p. 282n. for the review.} Other reviews appeared in Le Correspondant and the Journal des Débats, to which Berlioz contributed so successfully for so many years, but on this early occasion he was regarded as an upstart. The former, in contrast, was very enthusiastic, congratulating Berlioz for daring to take a new path and talking about Waverley in as much detail as the review in Le Voleur after the first performance, mentioned above.\footnote{The review in Le Correspondant is signed ‘J.O.’, probably Joseph d’Ortigue. He and Berlioz were to become great friends, but there is no evidence of any correspondence between them as early as this. The first extant letter Berlioz wrote to him is dated January 19, 1833, although d’Ortigue was present at the performance of the Symphonie fantastique on December 5, 1830. \footnote{Harmonicon no. 7, 1829, pp 177-8, under ‘Foreign Musical Report.’} The edition of May 6, 1833 has a review of the concert which concentrates on the performance of the}
Symphonie fantastique and programmatic aspects of Berlioz’s compositions. Another article, called ‘Une visite à Sir Walter Scott’, by Baron d’Haussée, is perhaps the reason for the inclusion of Waverley. Girard conducted a further performance on November 23, 1834, which was one in a series of concerts which Berlioz had arranged at the Salle du Conservatoire and it included the first performance of Harold en Italie. On November 27 Le Temps mentions that Waverley was performed, commenting on the broad, majestic melody, heard in the opening Adagio section. Three days later, the Revue Musicale, as part of general remarks about the ‘Romantic’ nature of Berlioz’s titles for his compositions, says that Waverley is a work in homage to Sir Walter Scott. The Gazette Musicale de Paris has reservations:

Quant à l’ouverture de Waverley, rendue avec beaucoup de feu par, nous avouons qu’elle ne nous jamais produit autant effet que dimanche dernier. Il y a loin de cette ouverture à celles des Francs-Juges et du Roi Lear; mais elle est digne de les précéder.

There was a performance on June 25 the next year, 1835, at one of two concerts given at the Théâtre Gymnase Musicale. Berlioz wanted his music performed in these because he was hoping to become the musical director there. The building was let:

to render great service to musical art: popularizing the masterpieces of the great composers, offering to talented instrumentalists the opportunity to be heard in concert, and lending to young composers the precious resources of an orchestra both accomplished and wisely conducted.

At some point during this year the Bertin family, long-standing friends and supporters of Berlioz, thought that they had secured the post for him, along with its promised salary of some 12,000 francs p.a, an ideal situation.

---

56 Cat 48.
57 Cat 68.
58 The overture Roi Lear had been performed at the previous concert on November 9. It seems that the writer of the review mistakenly thinks that Waverley was written before Les Francs-Juges.
Unfortunately the Minister of the Interior decided to ban singing in the hall, presumably to avoid added competition for the Opéra. Working under condition could not be contemplated by Berlioz and, thus, not for the first time, he was thwarted by politics. The potential of this situation, however, explains his willingness to promote such a late season affair. The conductor on this occasion was Tilmant l'aîné (Théophile Alexandre Tilmant 1799-1878). Le Ménestrel of June 28 mentions the concert with enthusiasm, but Waverley is not given a separate comment. Only one further performance is known to have been given in Paris before publication, this time at the Conservatoire on November 25, 1838. It was conducted by Habeneck because Berlioz was too ill to attend. This is corroborated in his correspondence, as is the success of the concert, although the account in the Memoirs is less positive: the concert at which Waverley was performed, 'barely covered expenses'.

Reviews appeared in the Revue et Gazette Musicale on December 2 and in La France Littéraire, both of which concentrate on the Symphonie fantastique: Waverley is not mentioned in either of them.

Waverley created considerable interest abroad very soon after publication and was also performed elsewhere in France. It received its first performance in London on March 23, 1839 under the auspices of the Royal Academy of Music, in the Hanover Square Rooms, at a concert for which 539 tickets were sold, as recorded in the minutes of the Academy. The Musical World of March 21, 1839 notes that, 'five compositions, new to London audiences, will be performed at the concert of the Academy of

---

61 Revue et Gazette Musicale, December 2, 1838; La France Littéraire, 2nd series, no. 7, September-December 1838, p. 467.
63 Minutes of Royal Academy of Music, April, 1839, held at the Royal Academy of Music, are available for inspection upon request to Academy office.
Music on Saturday morning; namely an overture by Berlioz... etc. Later in the same edition there is an announcement confirming that Waverley is indeed to be the first item in the concert. In June, 1839, after a performance in Leipzig, Schumann wrote about the work in the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik discussing in colourful style the programmatic aspects of the work, concluding that:

in spite of all its youthful shortcomings, it is, in grandeur and originality of invention, the most remarkable creation in the domain of instrumental music that France has recently produced.

The Allgemeine Musik Zeitschrift (hereafter AMZ), gave another favourable report after the performance (also in Leipzig) on November 11, 1839:

The music society Euterpe opened its first concert of the season under the direction of Herr Verhulst, with Berlioz's Waverley overture. It went well and is more effectively worked out than is the overture to Les Francs-Juges, and enjoyed the approbation of the audience.

Very soon after this, on November 24, 1839, Waverley was given its first performance in Douai, the small town (20,000 inhabitants at that time) in the north of France, which was famous for its orchestra, so ably directed

---

64 The Musical World, March 21, 1839, p. 183. The Musical Times, December 1, 1903, states that the first performance took place on June 1, 1840, given by the Società Armonica, conducted by Mr. Henry Forbes at the Opera Concert Rooms, Haymarket. By January 1840, however, there was speculation in The Musical Journal that Berlioz himself would soon conduct a performance of his symphony Roméo et Juliette, although this was denied in the edition of February 4, 1840. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the performance of Waverley contributed to this interest.

65 Ibid. p. 188. Note that the following issue (March 28) does not mention this concert, even though Berlioz's obituary for Nourrit from the Journal des Débats is printed in translation. Under the heading 'Concerts à la Valentino' it writes that 'the public can hardly do better during this week of privation than stop by the Crown and Anchor and regale themselves with the spirited musical performances going on there.' The 'privation' presumably referred to Lent (Easter was March 31 in 1839). A performance of Haydn's Creation in Exeter Hall is mentioned, but there is no mention of the Academy concert.


67 1839, no. 47, columns 936-7. Acknowledgements are due to Henry Pleasants for the translation.
Luce-Varlet. Another was given in Potsdam in May 1840 and another London performance took place at the Société Armonica's fifth concert on June 1, 1840. This is more fully reviewed, the overture to Waverley being billed as 'the great novelty of the evening.' As in previous reviews, the commentary deals at some length with the programmatic aspect of the work.

The autograph of Waverley: a general description

The Waverley autograph has 36 numbered folios in upright format divided between two types of twenty stave paper (hereafter Paper I and Paper II), 26 x 35.8 cm in size. As a basic principle, the pages which contain music will be described using bar numbers since, as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the autograph has been incorrectly bound, rendering use of folio numbers in conjunction with the music confusing. Where their use is essential - as for example during the discussion about the revisions on Paper II - two folio numbers will be given where necessary, the first being that on the autograph and the second being the folio number it should be, were the autograph correctly bound. Paper I, which has no watermark, is characterised by an unevenly-sized rastrum, either line number nine or number twelve, depending on which way up the paper was being used (Ex. 2). Paper II is easily distinguished from Paper I, being thicker and more pink in colour than Paper I and it has a watermark (Ex. 3). Paper II is also distinguishable from Paper I because of discernible differences in Berlioz's calligraphic style, notable in the style of C-clefs, Paper I showing a straight-
Ex. 2 The first page of music in the autograph, numbered to show the uneven rastra and also the straight-lined style of C-clef.
Ex. 3  
A copy of the watermark found on Paper II.
lined version (Ex. 2) and Paper II a curved version (Ex. 4). The two types of paper are distributed in the autograph as follows:

Paper I: 1 recto is the much-revised title page (Ex. 1) described in detail below. 1 verso is blank. Bars 1-332 and the original bars 333-338.

Paper II: Bars 333 - 338bis (the recto is blank); bars 339-364.

Paper I: Bars 365 - 416.

Paper II: Bars 417 - 441.

Any further descriptive information about the autograph is inextricably connected to revisions Berlioz made between its initial composition and publication and will be discussed under appropriate headings below.

The autograph of Waverley: the title page and revisions to it

First layer: Originally Berlioz called this composition Waverley, Grande Ouverture Caractéristique. After his name he wrote an œuvre number which looks as if it was ‘2mo’. There follows a lengthy extract from Waverley (in French), already quoted in this chapter under the section Genesis and composition (Ex. 1).

Second layer: At a later date Berlioz renamed the work Grande Ouverture du Waverley, following it with a dedication to his uncle, Colonel Marmion. The œuvre number is crossed out and '1' (sic) put beside it. The lengthy quotation is replaced by a couplet from the English version of Waverley:

...dreams of love and lady's charms
Give way to honour and to arms.

Other layers: Between writing the original title page and publication, but probably after the revisions outlined in 'second layer', Berlioz added three other items to the title page:

a) his address, rue de Londres, 31;

b) some scribbles - mostly addition sums - in the margins, about which nothing more can be said here, beyond


73 In this context 'first layer' is taken to refer to what constitutes the first fair copy, there being no separate sketches of Waverley. The second layer refers to the result of changes to the first layer, making, as it were, a revised fair copy. There are also references to 'layers' added at different times, used in the same sense and meaning a further set of changes to the document.

74 Berlioz's decision to delete the word 'Caractéristique' suggests that he wanted to divest the overture of any programmatic connotations which may have became associated with it during the twelve years between composition and publication.

75 Hugh Macdonald suggests that maybe it says '10', but the last stroke is at the bottom of the letter which makes 'o' unlikely.
Ex. 4    Page of revised section showing curved type of C-clef.
pointing out their presence; and
c) a dedication for the autograph itself: 'A Monsieur Brown,
Témoignage d'une vive et inaltérable amitié. Hector
Berlioz ce 16 avril 1839' (Ex. 5)

The changes to the œuvre number are less clear than the change of
title. The Huit scènes de Faust, which had been published at Berlioz’s own
expense in the spring of 1829 as opus 1, was withdrawn immediately after
the November 1839 performance of the ‘Concert des Sylphes’. That he
wanted another work to take the opus 1 position is confirmed by the title
page to the printed edition of Waverley, which states: 'N.B. La Partition des
huit Scènes de Faust, intitulée Œuvre 1re ayant été détruite par l’Auteur il l’a
remplacée par celle-ci.' In all probability Waverley was not assigned that
number for some while, since close examination of the autograph title page
(Ex. 1) shows that it was originally given the number ‘œuvre 2me', a possible
reason being that in 1827 one out of Les Francs-juges, the Messe solennelle
and the Scène héroïque was to have held the position of ‘œuvre 1re'. At some
undetermined point (perhaps as a layer on its own), the ‘œuvre 2me' was then
changed to ‘œuvre 4me', the 4 being written over the 2. Perhaps Berlioz had
thought about publishing all the works listed above, in which case ‘œuvre
4me' for Waverley would have fitted into the list of works mentioned above,
chronologically speaking. There is a final layer, however, when the words
‘œuvre 2me/4me' were crossed out and ‘œuvre 1re'(sic) written beside them,
which took place along with the other major changes to the title page
mentioned above. Waverley was always referred to as œuvre 1re in the
catalogues, printed and hand-written, that appeared in Berlioz’s life-time.

The dedication of the work itself to his uncle, Félix-Joseph Marmion
(1787-1872), could have been part of the process of reconciliation between
them, after the rift caused by Berlioz’s marriage to Harriet Smithson.76
Berlioz had always been fond of his uncle, whose presence added a dash of

76 The following list gives references to letters relevant to this rift, chronologically: CG I, p.
493, p. 342.
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Ex. 5 Enlargement of part of title page to show dedication to M. Brown.
* Acknowledgements are due to David Charlton for pointing out that the name could be transcribed as Brawr, Brawr, Brawy and other such versions. Holl at p. 51.
glamour to the social scene of Berlioz's youth, and they met when possible in Paris during the 1820's. By 1830 Berlioz writes that he (Felix) has been made a Lieutenant Colonel, but in February 1833 Dr. Berlioz asks Felix to see what is happening with Hector, who has asked his father for consent to marry. This Felix does and he tries to dissuade Hector, but in a letter to his sister he (Felix) says that he cannot reason with his nephew, who is avoiding him because he knows that he will want to talk about Harriet. By November 1833 Hector writes that his uncle attended his concert but that they have not really met since he got married. He also mentions gambling in connection with Felix, suggesting that neither he (Berlioz) nor anyone else can stop his ruin. It is not until April 1837 that there is mention of Felix being made a Colonel, and that he visits Hector and his family frequently, so it seems that the quarrel between them has been forgotten. Letters during the rest of the year confirm the suggestion that this dedication was an olive branch from Berlioz to his uncle and thus, they also point to the likelihood that the second layer of changes to the title page were not made at least until after the rift was well into the process of being healed.

In contrast, the dedication of the autograph does not seem to have any satisfactory explanation. Hitherto, it has been thought, in general terms, that Berlioz usually took the matter of dedications seriously, with evidence of friendship with the dedicatees extant in correspondence or the Memoirs. In this case, however, there is no trace of a Monsieur Brown in either source, and his identity remains a mystery. The discovery of the 'lost' Messe shows the circumstances of dedication to be similar to those of Waverley. It is now known to have been dedicated to Antoine-Auguste Bessems (1806-68), who had enrolled at the Conservatoire at the same time as Berlioz (to study violin under Baillot) and who played in the performance of the mass, but who is never mentioned otherwise by Berlioz in the Memoirs or

---

77 CG II, no. 314, pp. 71-2.
78 CG II, no. 370, pp. 144.
79 CG II, nos 635, 637, 691, 709, pp. 536, 539, 609 n. 1 and 636 n. 1 respectively.
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correspondence.\textsuperscript{80} Therefore, perhaps, it is time to modify general opinion on this subject and suggest that Berlioz passed on autographs which were no longer of particular interest or significance to him and which may have been requested by interested admirers, while he continued to dedicate the work in published form to people of significance in his life. The dedication to M. Brown also raises a question regarding the provenance of the autograph after it left Berlioz's keeping, as it is not known how or when it came to be returned to the Conservatoire. Neither is it known if it was bound by M. Brown or by the Conservatoire, or by anyone else for that matter. In the absence of any other information, it is assumed that the addition of Berlioz's address to the title page is for the benefit of the elusive M. Brown, since his publisher-elect, Richault, would have known his address.\textsuperscript{81}

\textit{Revisions to the score of Waverley}

This section sets out to look more closely at the layers of changes in the score of the \textit{Waverley} autograph, with the primary aim of describing the scope of revisions undertaken by Berlioz and the secondary one of looking at when the changes may have been made.

\textit{Corrections}

First, mention must be made of corrections to the score, by which is meant, for example, where it is possible to see in the autograph how Berlioz erased the timpani part at bars 111 and 112 (Paper I), redrew the lines with much care and put in the correct (and presumably, thus improved) part (Ex. 6). Such corrections are also to be found in sections using Paper II, as in the 'cello part at bar 339 (Ex. 7). In other places he corrected simply by adding a

\textsuperscript{80} Bessem's name appears in lists of orchestral players c. 1834-5; the date of the dedication on the mass is 1835. It seems he played for nothing, which may account for his being given the autograph. For full details of this discovery see \textit{Nineteenth Century Music}, XVI/3, Spring 1993.

\textsuperscript{81} Holoman in \textit{Cat} (p. 51) suggests that the dedicatee could be the Herr Braun who prepared the German translation of \textit{Le Jeune Pâtre breton}. The full score of this song was published by Catelin in 1839. Although this is possible, the fact that 'Braun' is given the English spelling 'Brown' on the autograph suggests the English connection to be more likely.
Ex. 6 Bar 111-2 showing an erasure and replacement in the timpani part on Paper I.
Ex. 7  Bar 339 showing an erasure and replacement in the cello part on Paper II.
missing accidental or a missing dynamic, which can be identified by a different type of pen and/or colour ink. An example of this can be seen in the string parts at bar 16 (Paper I) where the original dynamic \( p \) has had a second \( p \) added in each of the three staves in use (Ex. 8) and at bar 357 (Paper II) where a natural sign has been added to the viola part and \( mf \) cres to the trombone part, both in a paler colour ink than the rest of the section (Ex. 9). Identification of these corrections is instructive, since it suggests that at one point in the development of the work Berlioz went to great lengths to produce an immaculate fair copy. Bars 278-283 (Ex. 10) are typical of the neatness of the autograph up to the period which included the structural revisions made on Paper II. When compared with the autographs of \textit{Roi Lear} and \textit{Le Corsaire}, it will be seen that they present a different approach.

\textit{Revisions using Paper II}

The changes using Paper II (as far as can be ascertained, since it is possible that other changes between the original and extant layer could have
Ex. 8  Bar 17 showing where an extra $p$ has been added to the string dynamic on Paper I.
Ex. 9 Bar 357 showing the added *mf cresc* to the trombone part and a natural sign to the viola part, both in paler ink than the rest of the page on Paper II.
Ex. 10    Bars 278-83: an example of fair copy of the score.
Ex. 11  Bars 333-8 bis showing the start of the revised section at bar 336 bis.
Ex. 12 Bars 333-8 showing the original material under the colletto.
been made and discarded) begin with a collette\textsuperscript{82} (labelled 30bis/28bis) at bars 333-8, and continue with the following two folios (labelled 31/29 and 32/30) and last two folios (labelled 35 and 36). Comparing the collette (30bis/28bis, Ex. 11) with what is underneath it (30/28, Ex. 12) raises two anomalies which remain unresolved:

1) Why take the trouble to cross out the last three bars on folio 30/28 when the whole page is covered by the collette which is folio 30bis/28bis?
2) Why is the style of C clef on folio 30bis/28bis the same straight-lined style as that on folio 30/28, when the remainder of music on the new paper uses the curved style of C clef?

It is possible that Berlioz set out with different revisions in mind from the final version and that crossing out the last three bars of folio 30/28 was the first step in this process, the rest of which is lost. That in itself does not explain why he covered the whole page, especially given that folio 30bis recto/28bis recto is blank and that Berlioz was notorious for his economical use of paper. It could be seen as further evidence that at the stage when he made these structural changes he was anxious to retain as tidy a fair copy as possible and wanted to cover up the crossed out bars. The second issue is no easier to explain, except to say that it is acknowledged that when copying, one copies what one sees. Hence, in preparing his staves he seems to have worked vertically down the page, copying what he saw, which included a straight line style of C clef. That the two sharp key signature is not copied in the old superimposed fashion and that the 'cello and bass part of bar 335 is not the same on folio 30bis/28bis as on folio 30/28 does nothing to support this argument, except to remind the reader, as pointed out in the Preface, that loose ends like this are often more of a puzzle to the editor than they were problem to the composer.

\textsuperscript{82} A collette is the name given to paper stuck on top of the previous layer. A collette can be anything from one bar long upwards and cover as many or few staves of the score as required.
The content of the structural changes

The position of Paper II in the overall structure of the autograph shows that Berlioz made adjustments to two passages, one leading to the return of the tonic at the reprise and the other leading to the final cadence passage, or Coda, but it is not possible to make any comparison with his original ideas in either case. In the first revision only three bars of the original music are extant under the collette (Ex. 12) and these do not give much in the way of hints as to how he originally continued at that point. In the second there is a bar crossed out between bars 416 and 417 (Ex. 13). It is difficult to see what is underneath the crossings out, but the harmony is the first inversion of B minor over an E flat. It could be that this bar was part of what followed originally or it could simply be a copying error. In terms of content, folios 30bis/28bis, 31/29 and 32/30 embark on a passage which delays the return of the tonic, D major at the reprise. The fortissimo in bar 335 retreats to a subito piano in bar 336 as the music embarks on a series of shifting modulations using a four-note quaver figure from the main theme of the allegro (Ex. 11). This figure is played by each instrument in the string section in turn, accompanied by repeated triplet crotchet chords in the woodwind, a device not seen so far in the overture, but which could have been used in the original version. This passage links back into material on Paper I at the point of return to a triumphant D major (bar 365). The final cadence figure makes much use of the flattened sub-median chord, a relationship which was used at bars 206-7 (then in A major and using the chord of F major).

Revisions involving the reduction in instrumentation

The autograph of Waverley is unique for the major recasting of instrumentation undertaken by Berlioz. In this section the scale of the reduction and the changes which were made as a result will be described. The original specification was for a total of 110 players, as follows: 2 flutes, 2 piccolos, 2 oboes, 4 clarinets, 4 bassoons, 4 horns, 2 natural trumpets, 1 piston

83 This is an area where he made changes in other overtures: see ch. 4 and 7 on Le Roi Lear and Le Corsaire respectively.
Ex. 13  Page showing the crossed out bar after bar 416.
trumpet, not the customary 2, 3 trombones, 1 ophicleide, timpani and strings (30, 20, 16, 15, 13)(Ex. 2). After the reduction had been made, the specification was for two flutes, the second doubling piccolo, and two clarinets, one each in C and A, the other wind and brass instruments remaining the same. The autograph shows that the original string numbers were crossed out and not replaced, (Ex. 2), but the precise reduction is in the printed edition, which shows the numbers 15-15-10-12-9\(^84\) (Ex 14).

It can also be seen on the autograph that for the most part Berlioz did the crossing out of the wind parts as one continuous exercise, because the wavy line undulates with flowing uniformity throughout the score, except in a few places where, it seems, he turned over two pages at once and had to go back and cross out the staves on the missed pages afterwards. This applies to both paper types, but is impossible to show in facsimile, for which reason there is no example. Ex. 15 reflects the predominant method for crossing out throughout the score. Since the crossings-out are on both Paper types, it is clear that this reduction was made after the structural changes using Paper II. Several things happened as a result of the reduction, which are listed with examples and described here:

1) There were changes made in the remaining parts to re-arrange the harmony or accommodate eliminated notes. Bars 91-2 (Ex 16) show how the notes in the lower clarinet stave\(^85\) (parts III and IV) have been crossed out and not replaced. Instead the clarinet II has \(d'\), which has been added in different ink from the upper part. Ex. 17 shows that the original clarinet I part has been scribbled out in bars 57-8. It can be seen that the scribbles in bars 53-55 cover the rests which were originally for clarinet IV. It seems that Berlioz forgot to cross them out in bars 57-8.

2) Further figuration was added to the wind parts in the *adagio*. At Ex. 18, in bar 59, not only have the rests been crossed out but the triplet figure added, echoing that heard in the 'cellos in the previous bar and at bars 47-8 in the woodwind.

\(^{84}\) This could suggest that first Berlioz reduced only the numbers of wood-wind. Close examination of the autograph shows that originally there had been another set of figures under the crossed-out ink figures, although it is not possible to see what they were, even with the help of ultra-violet light.

\(^{85}\) Berlioz numbered the clarinets in pairs i.e. clarinets I and II in A and clarinets I and II in C. Here clarinets I and II in A are parts I and II, and those in C are parts III and IV.
Ex. 14 First page of printed edition showing required numbers of strings.
Bars 231-5 showing predominant method of crossing out.
Ex. 16  Bars 92-3 showing re-disposition of harmony in clarinet parts.
Ex. 17 Bars 53-8 showing changes to clarinet parts.
Ex. 18  Bar 59 showing added triplet figure.
3) The dynamics in the adagio were subject to adjustment. Close examination of bars 67-73 (Ex. 19) shows that at bar 71 the first instruction, 'cresc', was crossed out and replaced with 'dimin' in pale ink and written over again in dark ink. At bar 72 'poco f' and 'diminuendo' (bar 73) have been crossed out in all parts and put in two bars earlier (70 and 71).

4) Two figures eliminated as a result of the reduction are not re-used in any revised disposition of themes and figuration. They are the quaver arpeggio figure used extensively from bar 294 to bar 335 in the original piccolo, flute and clarinet parts (Ex. 20) and the double dotted figure found originally at bars 177-9, 187-9 and 197-9 (Ex. 21).

5) This point needs background explanation. When Berlioz reduced the parts for two piccolos and two flutes to parts for two flutes (flute II taking the piccolo as directed), mostly he eliminated the piccolo parts and left the parts for the two flutes as standing. At bar 364 in the 'reduced' version the second flute is instructed to take the piccolo which is used from then until the end of the overture. By continuing to play the second (and lower) part, but sounding an octave higher than the first flute, at times the piccolo makes a difference to the texture from the original, particularly in relation to violins I. The following examples are not exhaustive but serve to show the anomalies created. Bars 415-6 (Ex. 22) retain the original texture, whereby e'' is the highest note, played by both the piccolo and violins I. The passage beginning at bar 377-8 (Ex. 23) shows how the upper texture has changed, putting the piccolo out of line with the violins I, which had been doubled by the piccolos in the original. The final passage at bars 418 (Ex. 24), repeated at bars 420 and 422, shows that the original effect of the suspension is altered because the piccolo sounds an octave higher and the dissonance is now a seventh apart, instead of a second. This does, however, have the effect of bringing the piccolo in line with violins I.

With these mixed results - retaining the original idea, changing the piccolo so that it is no longer in line with the violins I and changing the piccolo part to fall in line with the violins I - it is impossible to draw conclusions as to Berlioz's intentions here. Did he leave it unchanged deliberately, fully aware of the implications for the piccolo and the upper texture overall or was it left that way because of haste or because by the time he made the reduction he felt it unnecessary to pursue such detail? While this last is possible and may have been the case at that time in Berlioz's life, it is clear, that, certainly in later years, he was aware of the difference the placing of this extra piccolo octave could make, as shown in this extract from the Treatise:

(text continues on p. 177)
Ex. 19 Bars 67-73 showing indecision in dynamic markings.
Ex. 20  Bars 309-14 showing eliminated quaver arpeggio figure in piccolos, flutes and clarinets.

Ex. 21  Bars 197-9 showing eliminated double dotted figure.
Ex. 22  Bars as in autograph.

Ex. 22  Bars 414-5 transcribed in full score before the reduction.

Ex. 22  Bars 414-5 transcribed in full score after the reduction, showing no change in the overall texture.
Ex. 23  Bars 377-8 as in autograph.

Bars 377-8 transcribed in full score before the reduction.

Ex. 23  Bars 377-8 transcribed in full score after the reduction.
Ex. 24 Bars 417-8 as in the autograph.

Ex. 24 Bars 417-8 in transcribed full score before the reduction.

Ex. 24 Bars 417-8 in transcribed full score after the reduction.
Gluck, dans la tempête d'Iphigenie en Tauride, a su faire grincer plus rudement encore les sons hauts de deux petites flûtes à l'unisson, en les écrivant, dans une succession de sixtes, à la quarte au dessus des premiers violons. Le son des petites sortant à l'octave supérieure produit par conséquent avec les premiers violons des suites, de onzièmes dont l'âpreté est là où on ne peut mieux motivée.

**Other revisions**

Examination of the autograph makes it clear that, in addition to the redisposition of harmony made when the instrumentation was reduced, Berlioz made other refinements to the score. Evidence of this is found in the orthographical detail and the colour of the ink, and the way these elements are reflected in the layers of changes.

*Changes to the natural trumpet and timpani parts in the introduction*

There is a section for each of these instruments at bars 52-4 and 72-7 respectively which shows that Berlioz refined the rhythm of these parts twice. Ex. 25 shows the trumpet part as it is in the autograph today and then breaks down, step by step from the first layer, how it was revised and refined twice thereafter. Ex. 26 shows the equivalent changes in the timpani part, by which there is an interesting note by Berlioz on the score, highlighted by a large form of asterisk, saying, 'à corriger ces 4 derniers mesures dans les timbales' (Ex. 27). To whom this reminder was addressed is not known, but it could have been for the engraver or to ensure that the manuscript orchestral part was corrected - again. It is not clear why this says the four bars and not five, since it seems that the second set of changes were made to five bars. A further look at the autograph could clarify this anomaly.

*Pencil workings*

There is no extensive pencil working in the autograph because the original layer represents a fair copy. Two instances, however, are more significant than the occasional pencil marks found here and there throughout the score.

---

*86 Treatise, p. 431.*
Ex. 25 Bars 46-54 transcribed to show process of changes.

Black  Original layer
Red    First layer of revision
Blue   Second layer of revision
Ex. 26 Bars 72-7 Autograph part of timpani with note by Berlioz in the margin.

Ex. 26 Bars 72-7 transcribed to show process of changes.
Ex. 27 Berlioz’s indication to correct the timpani part.
1) In the strings between bars 2 and 26, the pencil work found in the spare stave above the score is the only clue to there having been any forward planning or drafting of revisions. It (the pencil work) can be seen to have been incorporated into the score in ink and careful scrutiny of the draft for violins I in the autograph at bars 25-26 reveals how Berlioz worked through his ideas (Ex. 28).

2) Originally the four bassoons at bars 78-81, the end of the Adagio, moved in descending diminished chords with divisi 'celli. Ex. 29 shows how the upper parts of both have been crossed out. This is one of only a few instances where pencil has been used as an instrument of revision, not drafting (another is at bars 197-9 - and equivalent passages - which can be seen in Ex. 21).

**Changes to flute part at bars 127-8**

The changes to these bars are shown in Ex. 30. The original layer at this point is the same as the printed edition of the orchestral parts (which are discussed in the section on publication), suggesting that they (the printed orchestral parts) were engraved from manuscript parts not updated in line with the autograph score. It is clear that this is a case where the printed orchestral parts are a source of early thoughts, but not a reliable final version. It also points to this change having being made at a late stage.

**The addition of an extra bar at bar 286**

This can best be described with reference to Ex. 31. In the autograph the whole orchestra originally came to an abrupt halt on the fourth crotchet of bar 285, bearing some comparison with bars 173, but without the ensuing rests. There followed a bar and a half of silence before the 'cellos gave the introduction to a reprise of the second theme. It can be seen that Berlioz then made what was bar 286 into 2 bars, i.e. 286 and 287, filling the second half of each bar with a minim chord. This change was not made until after the time of the reduction because there are no rests added in for the eliminated instruments. In addition, the somewhat untidy, hand-drawn line which divides what was bar 286 into two bars suggests a later rather than earlier period for this change, since the score was very neat in its early years.

---

87 Ultra-violet light also reveals signs of experimental chords, possibly for transposition reference, in the empty stave at the top of the first page, but they are not legible.
Ex. 28
Bars 25-26 showing ideas at top of page incorporated into violin I part.
Ex. 29  Bars 78-81 showing elimination of upper bassoon and cello parts.
Ex. 30  Bars 127-8: autograph with changes to flute parts.

Ex. 30  Bars 127-8 transcribed to show original layer.

Ex. 30  Bars 127-8 transcribed to show final version more clearly than autograph.
Ex. 31  Bars 286-7 showing added bar. Note the hand drawn bar line and inconsistencies in altering the rests. The eliminated bars are not affected by this change, showing it to be one made after the reduction.
The changes made to the part for valved trumpet

These changes and the background surrounding them have been discussed at length in Chapter 2. In brief, the revisions to this part reflect the development of valved brass instruments at this time. Berlioz was fully aware of the changes being made, and adjusted the music to accommodate a two-valve instrument, which was being promoted c. 1834, thus replacing the original music which had been written for a three-valve instrument.

Calligraphy

Although the pen or ink type do not in themselves constitute evidence for the timing of any changes, beyond their having been made at a different session from the item altered or corrected, the manner of writing offers clues to the order in which the changes were made, in particular the degree of neatness of the corrections or revisions. An example is the way in which Berlioz draws his dynamic indication, \( p \), which indicates whether or not it belongs to an earlier or later layer. The earlier \( p \) is made very neatly in three separate strokes, characterised by the third which is the small cross stroke at the bottom of the descender. The later and hastier version is done in one stroke, which often creates a narrow V at the bottom of the descender, the loop of the \( p \) starting from the lower end of the circular stroke. Clear examples of the former can be found in oboe and strings at bar 1 (Ex. 2), and of the latter in bar 360, all parts (Ex. 32). In the case of Waverley these observations support the theory that Berlioz began with a neat fair copy, and later changes reflect more haste and less care in presentation.\(^8\)

A possible sequence of events

The layering of the revisions on the autograph to Waverley suggests an order of events, but to get any idea as to when the two major changes - structural and reduction in instrumentation - may have happened in the period between composition and publication, it is necessary to look at letters, chronology and other contemporary sources of information.\(^8\) This is

---

\(^8\) For other aspects of Berlioz's calligraphy see HolCreative.

\(^9\) There is no attempt to discuss other revisions to the score in this context.
Ex. 32 Bar 360 showing $p$ written in haste.
included in order to give as complete a picture as possible about the
background surrounding the times when the revisions could have been
made and to set them into the context. Given the pace of and pressures in
Berlioz's life, it is assumed that all the changes he made would have been
with a particular performance in mind. By the same token, and given the
scale of work entailed in making the structural changes and the reduction, it
is most likely that there was a reasonable time lapse between the two
activities.

Corroborative evidence in the correspondence and reviews suggests
the possibility that the structural changes could have been made during
1829, after the second performance of Waverley, given in February, but in
time for the performance in November. The letters to du Boys and Ferrand
suggest, at the very least, some misgivings with the work as it stood. In the
letter to du Boys in March he states that the effect of the overture (as Berlioz
had heard it in the second performance) was only 'mediocre'. The one to
Ferrand, written after the first rehearsal prior to the November concert,
reveals him to be in a state of excitement and agitation.  He is excited
because there were 110 players in the orchestra at the rehearsal, the number
specified in the first layer of the autograph of Waverley. Berlioz was very
pleased at having mustered such impressive forces: no mean achievement
for a comparatively little known composer. He also enthuses over the
success of his overture Les Francs-juges; he is confident about 'Les Sylphes',
the sextet from Huit scènes de Faust, the only new work by him to be
performed at this concert and he mentions Le Jugement dernier (a version
of the Resurrexit from the Messe solennelle modified with an additional
recitative accompanied by four pairs of timpani) without qualms. Waverley
is the source of agitation; it is not going well, but, he says, it will be rehearsed
again the next day and will surely go better. Of all the problems inherent in
putting on a concert - in particular those which concerned late programme
changes due to the unavailability of performers and the fact the sextet from
the Huits scènes was receiving its first performance - this overture is the
only one to have caused him concern before the event. In the light of this,

90 CG I, no. 117, pp. 236-239 and no. 140, pp. 278-9, March 2 and October 30,
1829 to du Boys and Ferrand respectively.
91 Ironically, this was the one work which failed to make an impression with the reviewers
(partly because the performers were weak) and it was after this concert that Berlioz
withdrew the work, destroying the plates and as many copies as possible.
the reason for Berlioz's concern could be that he was anxious that the revisions he had made to *Waverley* in time for this performance would prove satisfactory. It is worth pointing out that by this time Berlioz's calligraphic style of writing C-clefs had changed: the curved version used in the structural revisions to *Waverley* dates from the time of the *Prix de Rome* cantata *Herminie*,92 which was written in July 1828. As the story of the revisions in *Waverley* unfolds, it will be seen that suggesting a later time when these structural changes could have been made is not as convincing as the time suggested above.

Berlioz does not discuss when he made the reduction to the instrumentation of *Waverley* in any of his letters, but, given that he would only have made the changes with a specific performance in mind, a time can be suggested by piecing together comments made and events mentioned in extant letters from around the time of each performance of the overture. The following detailed account chronicles events beginning with the fourth performance of *Waverley*, which inaugurated *L'Europe Littéraire*. He writes that life is very full with emotional problems, his father's reluctance to consent to his marriage to Harriet being the theme of most of his letters from 1833.93 Although Berlioz mentions that he is writing articles for this new journal,94 he does not so much as mention the concert of May 2, 1833, which contained the fourth performance of *Waverley*, an omission which suggests that concentrating on its instrumental reduction was unlikely to be occupying him at this time.

The mood by the time of the next performance in November 1834, however, is changed. His marriage to Harriet and the safe delivery of their son Louis, offered a framework of contentment within which he was able to re-kindle the spark of inspiration, the first result of which was *Harold en Italie*. Certainly, for instance, as the letter of October 6, 1834 shows, he was too busy to accept an invitation to set some verse.95 The three concerts planned for November, one including the first performance of *Harold*, were

92 F-Pc ms 1185.
93 CG II, nos 314-343, pp. 71-114.
94 To Ferrand, June 12 and August 1, 1833, CG II no. 338, p. 195 and no. 341, p. 109. Two articles appeared entitled 'Concours annuel de composition musicale' I and II, on June 12 and July 19, 1833 respectively. In addition an abstracted and altered version of *Lettre d'un enthousiaste sur l'état actuel de la musique en Italie* appeared on May 8, 1833.
more important. Another project is mentioned in a letter to Bloc, who had conducted the first performance of Waverley but who was living in Geneva at this time. Berlioz says that after the third of this series of three concerts he and Girard are putting on a music festival at the Théâtre Ventadour, the first of its kind in Paris. His letters to his younger sister, Adèle, two months before the concert, and to Ferrand, written just after the concert are of particular significance. In his letter to Adèle he apologises for not writing sooner: he has been furiously busy, but at last, he says, he has no score to orchestrate, no appointment with the director of the Opéra, no work with his librettists, no proofs to correct, no articles to botch (bâcler) and no correcting of his copyist’s work. The letter to Ferrand also mentions copyists, although the first performance of Harold en Italie, given at the same concert as Waverley, and the appearance of Liszt’s arrangement for piano of the Symphonie fantastique dominate events recounted. The receipts for the second concert were double those for the first (Berlioz continues) and he hopes to get more for the third. At present, he says, all the copying is paid for and that the bill was enormous. This would have included parts for the new versions of Sara la baigneuse, La Belle voyageuse, La Captive and Le Jeune Pâtre breton as well as those for Harold. It would be very convenient if the work involved as a result of reducing the instrumentation of Waverley constituted part of the correcting of copyist’s parts. Despite the fact that there had been a lot of copying during this period and even though other letters from this period confirm Berlioz to be busy, optimistic and energetic, it is unlikely that the reduction in the instrumentation to Waverley was undertaken for this concert, the reasons for which will follow.

There are very few letters extant from the period surrounding the performances at the Théâtre Gymnase Musicale, which included Waverley.

---

96 CG II, nos 412 and 411, pp. 203 and 202 respectively.
97 CG II, no. 415, p. 207.
98 CG II, no. 409, p. 198 and no. 416, p. 208, respectively.
99 The matter of copying parts was being taken over gradually during the mid 1830’s by Rocquemont, who became Berlioz’s chief copyist and librarian, undertaking much of the administrative work in connection with this aspect of composition. It is not known with any certainty when he first knew Berlioz, although there was a singer by the name of Rocquemont in the chorus of the Nouveautés when Berlioz was singing there and, if this seems a remote connection, a Rocquemont also sang in the Requiem. (CairnsBiog, p. 531n.) Payment for the copying of the parts for the Requiem and Benvenuto Cellini would have been undertaken by the government. (See also HolBiog p. 232.)
100 Cat 60A and 65A.
on June 25, 1835. Only one, from August 1835, so much as mentions that the two concerts took place, which is something of a mystery since, as mentioned earlier, Berlioz stood to gain a post with a good salary at this theatre. Instead, the eight or so family letters reflect some frustration: with his life as a journalist, when he desperately wants time to compose; with his family, with whom he is seeking reconciliation; with Harriet’s inability to secure work and sympathy for her unenviable position. In this context the instrumentation of Waverley seems a trivial object for his attention during this period. There is evidence, however, that it could well have been otherwise. But before any conclusions are drawn, the final stage in this chronology must be completed.

The last performance of Waverley before its publication was in November 1838, by which time Benvenuto Cellini had failed (September) and Berlioz was looking for ways to restore his public standing. Ever the pragmatist, by October 4 he was planning concerts for November and December. On the face of it, now seems the obvious time for the reduction to have been made, but the letters offer no confirmation or denial, being a mixture of thanks to those who supported him, more frustration with the politics at the Opéra, correspondence with the publisher, Schlesinger and plans for forthcoming concerts. These letters also include talk of a major article on two operas by Vogel, La Toison d’or and Démophon, The correction of proofs (extracts from Benvenuto Cellini) and the fact that he is ill (and would remain so until after the November concert). In theory Berlioz could have made time to do the reduction to Waverley during October 1838, but he would not have heard the result of his changes, because he was confined to his bed at the time of the concert. That in itself does not preclude the possibility of the reduction being made at this point: it is the fact that Waverley would have gone for engraving without Berlioz having heard it that renders this time less credible than an earlier date. Although

101 CG II, no. 440, p. 248. Berlioz says he gave seven concerts that season; in fact it was eight.
102 CG II, no. 574, p. 463. Berlioz’s courage and determination to turn his life around in this way are enviable.
103 CG II, no. 567, p. 454.
104 CG II, nos 569, 570, pp. 456 and 458.
105 CG II, nos 572, 576, 577, pp. 461, 465 and 466.
106 CG II, nos 574, 578-87, pp. 467-475.
this was the situation some thirteen years or so later, when Le Corsaire was published without Berlioz having heard it in its revised version, 1839 was the time of Berlioz's first major foray into publication, for which reason the point made above is considered to be valid.

The letter Berlioz wrote to Ferrand on January 2, 1839 confirms that Waverley is at the engravers. This means that, at the most, there had been less than six weeks for Berlioz to make any final changes to the score after the performance in November. But what a tumultuous six weeks they proved to be! Berlioz recovered his health sufficiently to conduct the concert planned for December 16,¹⁰⁷ after which Paganini had given him the gift of 20,000 francs. As so often happens good fortune begets good fortune and Berlioz was nominated as sous-bibliothécaire at the Conservatoire soon afterwards, on December 22, thus bringing in a further 118 francs a month. All in all, it is apparent that there is little likelihood that Berlioz would have undertaken the scale of changes required by the reduction during this period.¹⁰⁸

Before drawing conclusions with respect to when Berlioz made revisions to Waverley, there is another factor to be considered. That is provided by information regarding the size of orchestras in Parisian institutions between the composition and publication of this overture. The following table shows the various dispositions of instruments at the Opéra (O), the Conservatoire (C) and the Société des Concerts (Soc) in Paris over the relevant period, in comparison to Berlioz's at the time of composition (BCom) and time of publication (P). It will be noticed that Berlioz's requirements are not excessive for the time, matching those of the Conservatoire at the time of composition and those of the Opéra at the time of publication except in his string specification:

---

¹⁰⁷ CG II, no. 593, p. 481, to Adele.
¹⁰⁸ Berlioz's decision to publish Waverley, which also has a bearing on this, is discussed in the section Publication.
Comparison of orchestral forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>O 1826</th>
<th>C 1826</th>
<th>BCom c.1827</th>
<th>C 1828</th>
<th>Soc 1828</th>
<th>C 1835</th>
<th>O 1839</th>
<th>P 1839</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flutes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccolo(s)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(n)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1(p)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1(p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophicleide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violins I</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violins II</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Basses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the light of the foregoing, much of which suggests when Berlioz would not have made revisions to *Waverley* as strongly as suggesting times when he might have, supported by information concerning the changing sizes of orchestral forces and in the absence of other information, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the structural revisions could have been made in time for the performance of November 1829 and the reduction in instrumentation for that of June 1835.\(^{109}\) Chapter 2 recounts how the trumpet parts in *Harold en Italie* were originally written for a three-valve trumpet and revised for the two-valved version before being changed again for the two-valve cornet. It is impossible to ignore the changes made to *Harold* when trying to date the changes made to *Waverley*. In respect of June 1835, reference must again be made to *Harold en Italie* to explain why it has been chosen in preference to November 1834 as the probable date for the reduction in instrumentation. *Harold* had received its first performance at the concert given in November 1834, when *Waverley* was also performed. It is assumed that the trumpet part was played by a three-valved instrument, as seen in the first layer on the autograph and in that case, it would seem logical to assume that the trumpet part for *Waverley* was also played on a three-valve instrument at this performance. Since there is little to support

\(^{109}\) Koury.

\(^{110}\) Further information on the choice of the latter date is found in Chapter 2.
the reduction in Waverley happening later than June 1835 and since Harold was also performed in June 1835, this leads to the conclusion that both parts could have been revised for that concert. This is based on the assumption that Berlioz revised both works at the same time.\footnote{It has not been possible to compare the two autographs for any clues supporting or denying this suggestion.} Of course there are other options: for example, he could have made the Waverley reduction in November 1834, approved of it and followed it up with the revisions to Harold six months later. Finally, the changing size of the orchestra, as shown in the table above corroborates the idea of the reduction to Waverley being made c. 1835.

It is also possible to draw some conclusions about Berlioz's development by asking, for example, why is extreme care taken with the refinements to the trumpet and timpani parts while on the other hand there is seeming lack of care with the elimination of the piccolo parts? Possible answers are twofold. First, the rhythmic changes are clearly audible while the arbitrary nature of the piccolo at the very high pitch is less obvious to the ear.\footnote{When the author gave a paper in which this was suggested, a composer in the audience suggested to her that in general they (composers) take care when adding material, but have some resistance to the elimination of material, which aspect is handled here with less care.} Second, is that perhaps there is a move from Berlioz the idealist - presenting a score of the utmost clarity, even to the extent of making a whole page collette when a few bars would have sufficed - to Berlioz the pragmatist, making changes which are clear but less pristine in appearance, and who, several years after composing Waverley had a much greater understanding of how music worked in practice and who was in a rush, having many other matters upon his mind. There is no doubt that in this autograph the later the layer of the correction, the less tidily has it been made.

\section*{Publication}

The purpose of this section is to establish as far as is possible, first, when and why Berlioz chose to have Waverley engraved and second, to review the versions which appeared as first editions around this period. The necessary background includes aspects of Berlioz's life at this time; information about Parisian music publishers and publishing during the 1830's; and Berlioz's attitude to publishing. The publication of Waverley
happened at around the same time as that of the overtures to *Le Roi Lear* and *Benvenuto Cellini*, each with a different publisher, Richault, Catelin and Schlesinger respectively. At times during the ensuing section, therefore, it will be impossible (and undesirable) to consider only *Waverley* without reference to the other two works; this applies in particular to *Le Roi Lear*.¹³

Berlioz had begun 1838 in a state of poor health, having been overcome by nervous exhaustion after the first performance of the Requiem in December 1837. He withdrew as much as he could from journalism, wishing to keep a low profile while concentrating his energy on *Benvenuto Cellini*, which took up most of his attention until its première in September. Nervous exhaustion had bedevilled him again in the summer, during the orchestral rehearsals for *Benvenuto*, this time turning into bronchitis, which was to plague him for the rest of the year. Earlier in the year, in another attempt to get an official post - a recurring theme in Berlioz's life - he had submitted an application to reorganise the Théâtre Italien, whose home, the Salle Favart, had been burnt down in the small hours of January 17, 1838: this was finally defeated in the Chamber of Deputies in June. By September his poor financial situation prompted him to claim 1,200fr, the annual income from his mother's estate, and to borrow a further sum from Legouve, the dedicatee of *Benvenuto*. Originally Berlioz had sold *Benvenuto* to Catelin, only to have it transferred to Schlesinger, who published it in the form of excerpts for home performance. Schlesinger was also responsible for the handsome edition of the Requiem and both this and the extracts from *Benvenuto Cellini* had been announced as ready before the concert of December 16 (the Requiem appeared in October), after which event Paganini gave Berlioz 20,000fr, as already mentioned.¹⁴ It is soon after this that

---

¹³ This will result in some duplication of information regarding *Le Roi Lear*, which is dealt with in full in Chapter 4.

letter to Ferrand of January 2, 1839,\textsuperscript{115} reveals that three overtures, *Waverley*, *Le Roi Lear* and *Benvenuto Cellini* were at the engraver’s. There are no contemporary advertisements which might give more details as to when *Waverley* was sent to the engravers, that in *La France Musicale* dating from November 26, 1843.

After the July Revolution of 1830 there was a movement which challenged the elitism of all art forms, and which endeavoured to influence the commercial aspects of art to allow for greater dissemination and accessibility.\textsuperscript{116} In the field of music publishing, given that paper and ink were now cheaper than ever and that advances were being made in printing technology, there was a drive to reduce the price of printed music. When it is pointed out that for a time a page of copied music was cheaper than a page of printed music, it will be realised how imperative was the need for change. It has to be noted, however, that although prices did fall, music publishers were, in general, slow to take advantage of new techniques. Nevertheless, some publishers such as Schlesinger, who went to considerable lengths to improve their business techniques (cooperative financing etc.), failed because there was no parallel thrust to encourage and educate publishers to produce what the public wanted or prospective purchasers to buy what was on offer. Thus, it was not until the 1840’s that, in general, music publishers reaped the benefit of the lessons which those of the 1830’s failed to learn.

There are two aspects of the overall process of publication around the 1830’s - 1840’s about which, currently, there is little information, but both have some relevance here. The first is the matter of how long it took to engrave a score and a set of parts. It is known, however, that during the 1880’s, C. G. Rödier’s 136 engravers could produce 200 plates a day. There is no obvious reason why engravers in the 1840’s could not work just as

\textsuperscript{115} CG II, no. 616, p. 513.
\textsuperscript{116} This section has drawn from two main sources, to which the reader is referred for further information: ‘La musique à bon marché en France dans les années 1830’ by Anik Devriès in *Music in Paris in the 1830’s*, ed. Peter Bloom, New York 1987; and *HopParis*. Further historical detail is found in *HopBib* and *Dictionnaire*.  
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quickly. Pursuing this further, it can be seen that, in theory at least, Waverley - score and parts - could have been produced in a day (approx. 100 plates, score and parts). It is unlikely, however, that Richault had 136 engravers at his disposal, but even so (as did Rödier), such information - approx. 1.66 plates per day per engraver - makes the performance of Waverley in London on March 23, 1839 an altogether more feasible proposition than it may at first have seemed. On the other hand, it will be seen that engraving could take an eternity, as in the case of Catelin producing the full score of Le Roi Lear (q.v.), which, although it went to the engravers at the same time as Waverley, was still not ready in January 1840.

The second aspect concerns the mechanisms involved in arranging contracts between composers and publishers during this period. Presumably lesser known or established composers had a hard time getting their work published, unless they paid for it themselves - as, indeed, did Berlioz in the case of the Huit scènes de Faust. On the other hand, to what extent did publishers vie to publish the works of the famous? Did they indulge in the 19th century’s publishing equivalent of gazumping? It is possible that at that this period Berlioz was not, in general, regarded as a good commercial proposition by publishers, since he was classified as a symphonist, when it was operatic works which commanded the market. This could explain why the three overtures published at this time were with three different publishers, no one house being prepared to take sole commercial risk with all three. Perhaps, being aware of this, it was Schlesinger who, having some knowledge of Berlioz since publishing the Requiem, suggested to Berlioz that he publish nine excerpts from Benvenuto Cellini (1838), which proved to be so successful that they were reprinted as a set a year later. Early in 1838

---

117 Alec Hyatt King, Musical Pursuits, London 1987, p. 47. Acknowledgements are due to Professor Paul Banks for pointing out this source.

118 CG II, no. 700, p. 627.

119 1) Dr. Katharine Ellis makes this suggestion with reference to a later period in Berlioz’s life, but it is equally valid here. K. Ellis, Music criticism in 19th century France (hereafter Criticism), Cambridge, 1996, p. 230.

2) Holoman mentions such competition in relation to music journals. HolBiog p. 149.
Richault, who was to be the publisher of *Waverley*, had not shown any interest in the piano arrangements by Liszt of two of Berlioz's overtures, *Les Francs-juges* and *Le Roi Lear*, but it is possible that by the end of 1838 Richault thought it would be good business to maintain contact with Berlioz since Schlesinger had published the Requiem (October). Presumably Richault saw the possibility of some profit from the overture - he had published the score and parts of *Les Francs-juges* in 1836 - but whether it came about because Berlioz approached Richault or the reverse is not known.

There is also Berlioz's attitude to publishing to be taken into account. His letter to Ferrand telling him that *Waverley* and other works were at the engravers also shows an ambivalent attitude to publishing:

> Je ne puis décider à laisser graver *Harold* ni la *Symphonie fantastique*. J'ai trop peur des Concerts Musard où l'on me jouerait malgré moi.\(^{121}\)

The only large-scale work published by Berlioz so far was the Requiem (handsomely so by Schlesinger in October 1838), which was commissioned by the state. The overture to *Les Francs-juges* had appeared in 1836. Otherwise publishing was restricted to vocal music, divided between Catelin and Schlesinger, the *Huit scènes* having been withdrawn after the concert of November 1829 when the Sextet, ‘Concert des sylphes’, had been (poorly) performed and not well received. After these Berlioz chose to publish smaller orchestral works in the first instance - more substantial than the songs and smaller choral works but less difficult than the first two symphonies - because he could not tolerate the thought of the latter works being carelessly under-rehearsed. In fact he was reluctant to allow them to be performed except under his supervision until after his first travels abroad. It is of no surprise that the overture to *Benvenuto Cellini* was chosen since the nine extracts, published separately in 1838, were being sufficiently well-received to be published as a set later in 1839, but there are no obvious

---

\(^{120}\) See Ch. 4 for full details.  
\(^{121}\) CG II, no. 616, p. 513.
reasons for including the other two overtures *Le Roi Lear* and *Waverley*, except as a back-up to this profile-raising exercise. Berlioz was a pragmatist, however, and in his quest to become known, perhaps he was coming to recognize the need for the dissemination of his music by publication.

Holoman justifiably asserts that *Waverley* was 'less striking' than the *Huit scènes de Faust*, but maybe that was precisely why he chose to have it published as 'œuvre 1re'.\(^\text{122}\) It went down well with the public, and would survive the mishandling he feared would happen with other works. Neither *Waverley* nor *Le roi Lear* had been performed since 1835 and both were played in the concert of November 1838, which Berlioz was too ill to conduct.\(^\text{123}\) Perhaps Berlioz had decided to give them both a hearing with a view to making a decision about publishing. This could have been triggered by thoughts of travelling abroad, a practical and attractive proposition to which Lord Burghersh's proposal (he was president of the Philharmonic Society in London) - that Berlioz should give a series of concerts in London - must have contributed. He tells his sister Adèle (on December 5) that Lord Burghersh had been at the first concert and had invited him to London for two months.\(^\text{124}\) That concert had, of course, included *Waverley*, which was performed \(^\text{---}\) by the Royal Academy of Music, of which Lord Burghersh was both Director and Founder. In fact, the proposed visit did not happen for nearly a decade (Berlioz's first visit to London was in November 1848 at the behest of the impresario, Jullien), but at the time Berlioz could have considered publication of the overtures as a useful means of dissemination in advance of his visit. The first performances of *Waverley* abroad seem to confirm this, the one by the Royal Academy, mentioned above, at the Hanover Rooms, London on March 23, 1839, being so soon as to be cutting things fine. If this was the case, however, then Berlioz would not have had to do much to prepare both works (*Waverley* and *Le roi Lear*) for the engravers, since he would in all probability have checked the scores

\(^{122}\) HolBiog, p. 82. Also see paragraph on the opus number below.

\(^{123}\) Such extant correspondence as there is deals in detail with the administration of the concert; there is no mention of any music: CG II, pp. 467-475.

\(^{124}\) CG II, no. 593, p. 481.
and parts carefully for the November concert, in particular because these works had not been heard for four years. And, of course, their publication would have brought in a further few hundred francs, never unwelcome: at this time - early December - Berlioz knew nothing of Paganini’s gift.\(^\text{125}\)

Thus, it must have been agreed to publish these works at some point around the time of the November 1838 concert. Leaving the decision until the time of the December concert (which did not include any of the three works which did go to the engravers) begs the question as to whether or not Berlioz would have proceeded with publishing *Waverley* (and *Le Roi Lear*, for that matter) after he had received Paganini’s gift, if everything had not already been arranged. Hindsight shows that the publications were a useful way of keeping him (Berlioz) in the public eye, while he was busy with *Roméo et Juliette*, the chosen theme for his new dramatic symphony (written as a result of Paganini’s gift), which received its first performance in November 1839, nearly a year later. Berlioz may or may not also have had this in mind. It is likely that arrangements with the engraver had been made earlier. Therefore, the *terminus ante quem* for deciding to publish is late September 1838 and the *terminus ad quem* late November, possibly c. December 5, 1838.

**First editions: score**

It is clear from the autograph that it was a working document. There are crosses in the margins throughout, indicating where players’ parts needed to be changed (Ex. 7, 16, 18), to remind Berlioz (and/or his copyist(s)) to make changes to the manuscript orchestral parts; and Richault used it for the engraving since there are plate-numbers, called ‘cast off marks’ throughout the autograph. These are found along the bottom of the score and correspond to the page numbers of the printed edition (Exx. 10 and 11). It is this which lends authority to the edition because it proves the autograph

\(^{125}\) The contract for *Waverley* is lost (or maybe has yet to come to light among publisher’s archives), but as an example, Berlioz received 100fr in March 1841 from Richault for the *Réverie et Caprice* for violin and orchestra. Acknowledgements are due to Anik Devriès for passing on this and other information about Berlioz’s contracts with publishers.
manuscript to have been the primary source. All the signs within the edition itself, however, are that Berlioz spent little (if any) time correcting proofs, since there are many details omitted by the engravers which are clear in the autograph. On the other hand, details appear in the printed edition which are not in the autograph, in particular extra slurs where A indicates only ties. This is in many ways contrary to Berlioz's general practice; he lavished much care on many of his editions, but the evidence here points clearly in a different direction. Scrutiny of 20 of the 22 copies of the printed first editions listed in Cat reveals no signs of any corrections on the plates or a corrected proof, such as are visible in both the editions of Le Roi Lear and Le Corsaire (albeit in differing ways), or any signs of annotations by Berlioz. In fact most of the copies are unused. Those belonging to the Royal Northern College of Music, the BBC in London, and the Royal Philharmonic Society, held in the British Library, have some annotations but not in Berlioz's hand (it is possible that the copy at the Royal Northern belonged to Sir Charles Hallé). Further to this, although Holoman states that F-Pn Rés. Vm7 523 is Berlioz's own annotated copy of the printed edition of Waverley, there is, in fact, no evidence to confirm this. The annotations to which Holoman presumably refers are to be found only at bar 274 of the copy cited above. This is where the plate in this particular copy did not print properly and someone (there is no evidence to suggest that it was Berlioz) has gone over the faintly printed notes with a pen, forgetting the dynamic f which appears in the string parts of all the other printed copies.

---

126 Some evidence of Berlioz proof-reading his first editions is as follows:- Grande messe des morts, F-Pc Rés. Vm1 243, NBE 10; Symphonie fantastique, F-Pc Rés. F 1029 and F-Pc Rés. Vm7 528, NBE, vol. 16. Although Berlioz proof read Harold en Italie, the first edition is not error free. There are also examples where first editions are used as the primary source for the NBE: Les Troyens, introductory paragraph, vol. 2c, p. 755; Grande messe des morts, Sources, volume 19, p. 151; Symphonie fantastique, Sources, vol. 16, p. 171; Symphonie funèbre et triomphale, ms copy is cited, but all corrections incorporated into first edition, Cat 80, p.211; La Damnation de Faust, autograph and printed first edition are used: editor writes: 'P (printed score) contains final readings A (autograph) often lacks', vol. 8a; Te deum, autograph and first edition proofs cited, vol. 10, p. 163; Béatrice et Bénédict both autograph and printed vocal score are cited, vol. 13, p. 285.

127 For details see relevant sections in ch. 4 and 7.

128 Three of the 20 copies were examined by librarians during discussions about the document over the telephone with the author.

129 Cat, p. 50.
Not only is this copy of the score completely devoid of any other markings, but also there is no evidence of usage, such as one might find in a conductor's score which has seen even the minimum amount of rehearsal, such as worn corners to the pages where they have been turned over. After publication, Berlioz conducted the overture once in Germany and once in Paris and if he had used 'his' printed copy on either occasion, it would be possible to see signs of that. This suggests strongly that Berlioz continued to use the autograph for conducting even after the score was published, but such an idea is contradicted by the dedication of the autograph to Monsieur Brown dated April 16, 1839, as mentioned above. It seems that if Berlioz had had a conducting copy, either it has not yet been discovered or that it has been destroyed.

**First editions: orchestral parts**

The printed parts which were part of the Société des Concerts archive, are, like the printed editions of the full score, without blemish or signs of use, so it must have been that another set was in use at one point. The OBE confirms this when it refers to various legato signs in the first printed edition of the score which 'are either incorrect or hardly practical, some of which it has been possible to rectify thanks to the orchestral parts owned by the Conservatoire, which emanated from Berlioz himself and of which he made use both at Paris and abroad.' It is not clear whether the parts to which they refer were manuscript or printed, but, either way, they are now lost. The printed orchestral parts were probably made from the manuscript orchestral parts, although it has been suggested that they could have been made from a second autograph conducting score, which is now lost. From a practical point of view it does seem, however, that copying parts from other

---

130 This is assuming that the autograph was handed over on the date suggested by the dedication: it could have been back-dated, or simply wrong.
131 F-Psoc. Also see below under *Old Berlioz Edition* (hereafter *OBE*), which is the way to which *Hector Berlioz: Werke*, eds Charles Malherbe and Felix Weingartner, Leipzig 1900-07, 20 volumes, is commonly referred. The edition collapsed, not least because of the deteriorating political situation between France and Germany, before the scores of *Benvenuto Cellini* and *Les Troyens* were published. In this section, the terms 'printed score' and 'printed parts' are to be understood to refer to the first editions.
parts is a much easier process than copying parts from a score and there is
evidence to suggest that this (former) process was the case in Waverley.

A short digression will clarify this. If the parts were engraved from a
full score, it is clear that only one person could work with the score at a
time. To counter this argument there are two things: first, close examination
of the printed orchestral parts indicates that the work must have been
carried out by several engravers, each with their own style of punch for, e.g.,
clef signs. Perhaps one engraver might have had several different punches
for a treble clef, but even so one would expect a degree of consistency within
one work. In the case of Waverley it looks quite possible that the work was
assigned to one engraver, who then decided to subcontract out some of the
work. Where parts use more than one clef, either to accommodate range or for
showing cues, it is possible to assign parts to a specific engraver. The table
which follows gives some details, with examples (Ex. 33) of the different
treble clefs and the parts on which they appear, to illustrate the point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clefs</th>
<th>Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treble clef 1 - used for</td>
<td>Vns I; Hns I and II; Hns III and IV; Tr. (natural); Tr. (piston); alto Trom.; Oph. and Timp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treble clef 1a - used for</td>
<td>Flute I and Flute II. (Tilt the angle of this clef forward a few degrees and it could be Treble clef 1.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treble clef 2 - used for</td>
<td>Vns II; Clars; bass and tenor Trom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treble clef 3 - used for</td>
<td>Bns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass clef 1 - used for</td>
<td>Hns III and IV; Timp.; Oph. and Vc./Cb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass clef 1a - used for</td>
<td>Hns I and II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass clef 2 - used for</td>
<td>Bass and tenor Trom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass clef 3 - used for</td>
<td>Bns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto clef 1 - used for</td>
<td>Vlas; Vc./Cb.; alto Trom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time signatures:</th>
<th>Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Type 1 - used for</td>
<td>Vns I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Type 2 - used for</td>
<td>All remaining parts, except those not playing in the Larghetto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Type 1 - used for</td>
<td>All strings; Fls; Obs; Clars; Bns III and IV; Hns III and IV; Tr. (natural); tenor and bass Trom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Type 2 - used for</td>
<td>Bns I and II; Tr. (pistons); alto Trom; Oph. (NB C Type 1 had a vertical line, C type 2 is missing the line.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text continues on page 206.
Ex. 33 Treble clef 1

Ex. 33 Treble clef 1a

Ex. 33 Treble clef 2

Ex. 33 Treble clef 3
Ex. 33  Treble clef 4
It can be surmised from this, for example, that one engraver was responsible for parts for the violins I, violas, the 'cellos and basses, all the horns, natural trumpets and timpani. The piston trumpet, alto trombone and ophicléide can be added to this, although they have a different 'C' type time signature from those in the first list. Likewise, other combinations can be put together indicating that, for example, it looks as though another engraver took care of the bassoon parts. Second, that the work was performed only ten or so weeks after the letter of January 2, tells that Waverley was probably being engraved by a group rather than a single person. Not only was the performance in London, several postal/travelling days from Paris, but also one imagines the parts to have been there at least a day or two before the concert to allow for one rehearsal of this new work, even allowing for the reputation English orchestras had for avoiding extensive rehearsal as expressed by Berlioz:
...car les Anglais sont d'exécrables musiciens, qui ne veulent pas faire
de répétitions et qui, de même que les Italiens, se croient les premiers
virtuoses du monde.\footnote{CG II, no. 593, pp. 482.}

Whatever the answer is, it is sure that the source for the printed
orchestral parts was different from the extant autograph. The single most
striking piece of evidence for this conclusion is the difference between the
flute parts in the printed score and parts respectively. (Ex. 34) The reason for
this discrepancy is clear when the parts are compared with the autograph
(Ex. 30), which shows that the original layer is the same as that which
appears in the printed parts, while the second layer is that which appears in
the printed score. This supports strongly the suggestion made above, that the
printed orchestral parts were taken from a lost source. The possibility that
they were taken from the autograph before Berlioz made the very late
change to the flute part shown in the above example is counteracted by the
large number of other differences between the autograph and the printed
parts. Three examples are: bar 25, oboe: $ff$ in autograph and printed score,
$poco p$ in printed part; bar 46, flute: $pp$ in autograph and printed score, $mf$
in printed part; and bar 101, clarinet II which has $mf$ in autograph and printed
score and $p$ in printed part. When these are looked at from a performer's
point of view, it is easy to imagine the situation whereby such directions
were added to the manuscript parts by the players at the request of the
conductor, who demanded less or more sound for a particular occasion, and
which remained in the part thereafter. There are other examples involving
slurring to which a similar argument applies. Every performance is subject
to circumstances that prevail for that particular occasion only - dynamics in
relation to the acoustics and number of string players and quality of players
overall, and slurring the same. The manuscript orchestral parts would have
reflected such idiosyncrasies, whereas the score reflects the ideal dynamics
and slurring in an ideal situation. For this reason, although the printed
orchestral parts are both interesting and of use in situations where the
autograph and the printed edition conflict, they are not valid as a prime
source in their own right.
Ex. 34 Flute 1, bars 127-8, printed orchestral part.

Ex. 34 Flute 2, bars 127-8, printed orchestral part.

Ex. 34 Flutes 1 and 2, bars 127-8, printed orchestral score.

NB: See ex. 30 for same passage in autograph.
**Other sources**

The copies of string parts prepared for the Margrave of Detmold do not offer any information about other sources contemporary with the autograph or printed first editions since it is clear that their string parts were taken from a single set of printed orchestral parts. It seems that it was the custom at this court to buy one set of parts and prepare extra copies by hand, as needed. In this case there are nine parts extant: four violin I, two violin II, one viola and two ‘cello and bass parts (combined). The work has been done by four different copyists: one preparing two violin I parts and a violin II part; another doing a solitary violin I part; a third doing a set of four different parts and the last preparing the remaining cello and bass part. This presents an interesting logistic exercise: did copyists share a part? was time of the essence? Whatever the circumstances, the degree of consistency between the copied parts and the printed orchestral parts and between the various copied parts themselves is remarkable. There are numerous instances showing their source to have been the printed parts and not the score, a notable one being the addition of ‘nourri’ at bar thirty-four, an instruction which appears only on the printed orchestral parts.\(^\text{133}\)

**Other versions and printed editions of Waverley**

Although the items in this section are not relevant to the editorial decision-making of the critical edition, they are relevant in terms of giving the reader as complete an idea as possible of the breadth of publications in relation to *Waverley*.\(^\text{134}\)

**The Old Berlioz Edition**

*Waverley* is found in volume IV, no. v, of the *OBE*, at the beginning of which Malherbe lists the sources which have been used, namely the autograph, the first edition score and the first edition printed parts.

---

\(^{133}\) It could have been that the court did not invest in a score and the orchestra was therefore ‘conducted’ by the leader from a violin I part.

\(^{134}\) Such reasoning applies to all the overtures.
Reference is made to the reduction in instrumentation 'to render his work more practical, that is to say more within the reach of the majority of orchestras' and the changes made as a result of this, which are then listed, with musical examples. While this edition was a considerable achievement then, there are factors which make it unwise to follow it too closely today. For example, the ophicleide is replaced by the tuba without comment: bar 20 is said to have been b" for the second sounded note in the bar by violins 1, when the autograph shows that not to be the case. Further on is: 'On Page 8, Bars 4, 5, 6 and 7 Berlioz originally wrote this passage for four bassoons as follows:

![Image of musical notation]

...while the same four-part arrangement was found again in the violoncellos, where it was struck out of the manuscript by the composer.' This implies that the passage remained in four parts, but was played only by the bassoons, not the 'cellos. But, as can be seen, only the top two parts of the passage were struck out in both the cello and bassoon parts, as seen in Ex. 29. The autograph is quite clear in eliminating the top two parts of both instruments, even though the style of crossing out looks different from other similar situations in the score: perhaps Malherbe was looking at another source when he made this comment. The OBE is also dismissive of the first printed edition as already mentioned in the section Orchestral parts. The comments about the existence of a set of parts used by Berlioz have already been noted. Thus it can be seen that the OBE holds a position similar to the printed orchestral parts in the hierarchy of sources. Like the parts, it is of interest, in particular because the preface indicates that it made use of a set of parts now lost and it is regretted that it is not possible to ascertain which items in the OBE score reflect specific reference to this source.
Arrangements for four hands

In addition to the printed full score and parts, there were two printed editions of Waverley arranged for piano duet, which present their own set of unsolved questions. Ostensibly they come from the same source: only minor details of arrangement differ, although they were published in two different formats, but the identity of the arranger(s) is not known (Ex. 35). The one in upright format was published by Richault and that in oblong format by Hofmeister in Leipzig. The Richault edition was advertised in La France Musicale on June 27, 1841, well before the announcement of the score, and again on September 26, 1843. Hopkinson discusses the problems surrounding the timing of this publication at some length.135 One anomaly is the comparatively early plate number of 4661.R., in comparison to the score and parts which are variously 5637 and 5638, with some 5636 and 5639. Also Hopkinson asks why there was no mention of the four-hand arrangement on the title page of the score, which advertised the parts. (It was customary for such arrangements to be thus publicised.) Perhaps the haste with which Waverley was prepared accounts for this oversight. The Hofmeister edition has its own mysteries. The title page announces no less than seventy overtures ‘tirées de Soixante-dix meilleurs Opéras’ - the title and citation of the publisher are all in French, despite its German origin - although Waverley is not, of course the overture to an opera; and it looks likely that not every other item is an overture from an opera, either, since several are identified by œuvre number (not opus number), which is strange, since one would imagine that an opera title would have more selling power than an opus number. Also it is clear that the Berlioz item was an afterthought because the listing is the only one not in alphabetical order.136 It had appeared in his (Hofmeister) own catalogue in September 1839 announced as follows:- ‘Berlioz (Hector) Grande Ouverture de Waverley arr. p. Pfte à quatre mains. Œ1. Im verlage von Fr. Hofmeister in

---

135 HopBib. p. 42.
136 It is possible that number 70 and possibly 69 were also late additions. On the other hand, this is hardly an example of high quality engraving and it could simply be that little time or thought was given to the preparation of this plate.
Title page and opening of Richault edition, upright format.
# COLLECTION des OUVERTURES
dirées de Soixante-dix meilleurs Opéras,
et arranquées pour le Pianoforte à quatre Mains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Auber, le Fiancé</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Beethoven, Muette de Portici</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reissiger, Libella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bellini, i Capuleti e Montecchi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Benedetti, les Portugais à Gaza</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rossini, Elisabetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baudouin, Calif de Bagdad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dame blanche</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gassen Indre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jean de Paris</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Carafa, la Violette</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Italiana in Algeri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cherubini, Lodoiska</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>les deux Journées</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tamerlano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Donizetti, Anna Bolena</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dern, Abu Kara</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Schubert, Faust (Tragédie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eber, C. F.</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Esterhazy, der Sovagard</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Spohr, Alcina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Fesca, F.</td>
<td>Op. 43 posthume</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gretry, la Caravane</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spontini, Ferd. Corina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Graurge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Haydn, Orlando Paladino</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vogel, Dionsophen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Himmel, Fanecon</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>les Septes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Weber, Silvana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Lindpaintner</td>
<td>Die March des Lindes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Berlioz, Waverley</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Weigl, L’amor marinaro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leipzig, chez Frédéric Hofmeister.
Ex. 35  Title page and opening of Hofmeister edition, oblong format.
Leipzig erscheint nächstens mit Eigenthumsrecht.\textsuperscript{137} It was advertised in \textit{AMZ} on 22, July 1840 as number sixty-eight of seventy overtures at a cost of fourteen Gr. (Groschen). There is a complication in that Hopkinson cites Pohl who records the existence of a copy priced at 17.5 Ngr (Neugroschen). The curious thing about this is that the Neugroschen did not come in as legal currency until January 1, 1841, although the law relating to this change dates from July 20, 1840, just two days before the announcement in the \textit{AMZ}. This leads to the conclusion that this collection of duets could have been issued twice, once before and once after the currency change.

In addition, the catalogue issued by Richault in 1859 mentions a piano duet arrangement published by Leibrock of Brunswick, but no copy has been traced, so it is not known whether this is the same arrangement as that already mentioned or a different one.\textsuperscript{138} These duets continue to be listed on the covers of various Berlioz works quite late into the century, indicating their popularity and usefulness as a continuing means of dissemination, despite his professed dislike of them.\textsuperscript{139}

\textit{Conclusions}

The preceding examination of the circumstances surrounding the composition and publication of \textit{Waverley} details all known facts to enable a choice to be made of either the autograph or the first edition as the basis of this edition. Deciding on the source is a difficult decision, but the logic behind the decision made in this case lies with the thinking that, while engraver(s) may make careless omissions (quite often) which may not get corrected, it is not in the nature of their job to add items without specific

\textsuperscript{137} A copy of the catalogue is held in GB-bl, Mic. A. 3575-3586.

\textsuperscript{138} \textit{Cat} also mentions a fantasy for piano duet by Czerny based on \textit{Waverley}, but without making it clear whether Czerny's work derives from Berlioz's music or directly from Scott's novel. It seems to be the latter, the full title being \textit{Première Fant. Romantique d'après le Roman \textit{Waverley} de Sir \textit{Walter Scott}, à 4 mains}. The items immediately following in the listing confirm this. They are: Deuxième ditto, \textit{Guy Mannering de \textit{Sir Walter Scott} à 4 mains}; Troisième ditto, \textit{Rob Roy de \textit{Sir Walter Scott} à 4 mains}; Quatrième ditto, \textit{Ivanhoe de \textit{Sir Walter Scott}, à 4 mains}. Carl Czerny: \textit{Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben}, reprint Baden Baden 1968, no. 240, p. 61. An English translation of the text is in \textit{Musical Quarterly}, xlii, (1956) p. 302.

\textsuperscript{139} See Ch. 4 for more on this topic.
instruction to do so. Comparison of the first edition parts with the first edition score and the autograph shows three distinct primary sources, none of which is complete in itself: many details from the autograph are missing in the printed score, where the engraver(s) made many errors; but, for whatever reasons, the latter were not corrected. The printed orchestral parts, often discrepant with the other two sources, cannot be used a main source for reasons outlined previously. They can only be considered for the occasional mark which both other sources lack or to corroborate either the autograph or the printed score when these two conflict. That leaves two sources, the autograph and the printed score. It is interesting to look at what has been omitted from the printed score although clear in the autograph:

Table showing details in the autograph of *Waverley*, not in the printed score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Autograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 11 Vns 1</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cl. 1</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Vlles</td>
<td>Hairpin dim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cb.</td>
<td>Hairpin dim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Cl. 1</td>
<td>Hairpin dim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63/4</td>
<td>Cb.</td>
<td>Hairpin dim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Vns 1</td>
<td>Hairpin cresc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Vlles, Cb.</td>
<td>Hairpin dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Cl.</td>
<td>Hairpin dim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Strings</td>
<td>Hairpin dim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Cors</td>
<td>Slurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Vlles, Cb.</td>
<td><em>Soli</em> and <em>pp</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But more important is to see what details have been added to the printed edition which do not appear in the autograph:

Table showing details in the printed first edition of *Waverley* not in the autograph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Printed score (P)</th>
<th>Autograph (A)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39-30</td>
<td>Vlles, Cb.</td>
<td><em>Hairpin dim.</em></td>
<td>None</td>
<td><em>P</em> copies Altos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Cb.</td>
<td><em>pp</em></td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td><em>pp</em> taken from Vlles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61/63</td>
<td>Cors</td>
<td>Sideways V</td>
<td><em>Hairpin dim</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105/6</td>
<td>Timb.</td>
<td><em>Inverted v</em></td>
<td><em>Nothing</em></td>
<td>This is the most striking addition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109/10</td>
<td>Timb.</td>
<td><em>Inverted v</em></td>
<td><em>Nothing</em></td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Cors</td>
<td><em>ff</em></td>
<td><em>f</em></td>
<td><em>P</em> is copying rest of woodwind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although there is no firm evidence to support the argument that Berlioz ever corrected the proofs, the addition of details to the printed score which are not in the autograph removes any possibility of choice between the sources for the basis of this edition. Thus, the printed score must take priority over the autograph, using the autograph where the printed edition is in flagrant error or there is some form of conflict. This must be, despite the fact that Berlioz lavished much care on the autograph in the earlier years and despite the fact the importance of the work seems to have diminished in his estimation in later years. One might like to be able to edit *Waverley* as Berlioz, youthful and enthusiastic, had originally conceived it, but his preference for the final revised version as it appeared in the first edition has been respected. This is where the final decision must be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Printed score (P)</th>
<th>Autograph (A)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Bns</td>
<td>Has staccato dots</td>
<td>No dots</td>
<td>A has dots for fl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Vlles, Cb.</td>
<td>Hairpin <em>dim.</em></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>P copies upper strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195/6</td>
<td>Vns, Altos</td>
<td>Slur</td>
<td>No slur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Oph.</td>
<td>Hairpin <em>cresc.</em></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Ob.</td>
<td>Slur</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Vlles</td>
<td><em>ff</em></td>
<td><em>ff</em> in previous bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Bns</td>
<td>Slur</td>
<td>No slur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Cl.</td>
<td><em>pp</em></td>
<td><em>no pp</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Genesis and Composition

Berlioz arrived in Rome as part of the fulfilment of the conditions of the *Prix de Rome* in March 1831. He had been reluctant to leave Paris for musical as well as romantic reasons, having been much preoccupied with following up the first performance of the *Symphonie fantastique*, and consolidating his betrothal to Camille Moke. By early April, having spent less than a month at the Villa Medici, the residence in Rome overseen by Horace Vernet for all the *Prix de Rome* prize winners, he had left for Paris in a state of agitation because he had heard nothing from Camille. He was forced to break his journey for some days in Florence because of an attack of tonsillitis and he recounts in a letter that while recovering he read Shakespeare's *King Lear*, walking by the river Arno in a wood nearby. He was full of admiration for it:

... et j'ai poussé des cris d'admiration devant cette œuvre de génie; j'ai cru de crever [sic] d'enthousiasme, je me roulais (dans l'herbe à la vérité), mais je me roulais convulsivement pour satisfaire mes transports.  

This feeling is reflected in the autobiography he wrote at the beginning of 1856, where he described the work as 'Dramatique, passionnée'. It is not known which edition he read in 1831, although several were available, apart from the first French translation by Le Tourner, which had appeared in 1779. This was revised by Guizot and Pichot in 1821. Le Tourner's translation was published again in Paris in 1821, 'augmentée des commentaires de Voltaires ...'. In 1828 there appeared chez Mme Vergne complete editions in both English and French.

---

2 Camille Moke (1811-1875), known as Marie Pleyel after her short-lived marriage to Camille Pleyel, had a very successful career as a teacher and concert pianist.
3 CG I, no. 223, p. 442. Berlioz's passion for Shakespeare is well-documented, but he deplored adaptations, especially Nahum Tate's ending of *King Lear* when Cordelia marries Edgar. Mem ch. 16, p. 92.
4 CG V, p. 717.
Towards the end of his time in Florence he received a letter from Mme Moke, telling him that Camille was engaged to be married to M. Pleyel. Berlioz resolved to continue his journey to Paris, where he would murder Camille, her fiancé and her mother, and then kill himself. The episode is described at some length by Berlioz in his Memoirs and letters.\(^5\) Mercifully his mission was not accomplished. For political reasons he was compelled to travel by a longer route than he had intended. Thus, by the time he reached Nice he was sufficiently rational to abandon his reckless plan of revenge and take time to recuperate from the ordeal. When he heard from Horace Vernet that he had not forfeited his prize because he had not left Italy, Nice at that time being governed by Italy, he decided to stay there for three weeks, which he records as being three of the happiest weeks of his life. He stayed in a room which had windows overlooking the sea and from where he could hear the waves beating against the shore.\(^6\) It is not surprising that composing played an important part in his recuperation, nor that King Lear was one of the themes he used. This undoubtedly painful episode in Berlioz's life, however, is played down in the Memoirs, where he writes in comic vein: it seems that he was interrogated by the police who thought he was a spy, on account of his sketch book. He explains to them that:

According to Shakespeare he [King Lear] lived some eighteen hundred years ago and was silly enough to divide his kingdom between two wicked daughters, who kicked him out when he had nothing more to give them. You will appreciate that few kings—\(^7\)

The overture Roi Lear is mentioned for the first time in a letter to his family dated April 29, 1831.\(^8\) A few days later, in the postscript of another letter, he writes that he has almost finished the overture, having only the orchestration to complete.\(^9\) Finally, in the letter to Ferrand dated 'Nice 10 ou

\(^5\) Mem, ch. 34, pp. 152-8.
\(^6\) CG 1, no. 224, pp. 445-6. He gives his address as 'Chez Mme Veuve Pical, Maison Clerici, Consul de Naples, Aux Ponchettes, Nice-Maritime'.
\(^7\) Mem ch. 34, p. 157-8. See also CairnsBiog, p. 425ff.
\(^8\) CG 1, no. 222, p. 437.
\(^9\) CG 1, no. 223, p. 446.
11 mai' he says that he finished *Roi Lear* the day before.\(^\text{10}\) Berlioz stayed in Nice until May 19, arriving back in Rome on June 2. Thereafter, Mendelssohn had requested to see the score during one of his visits to the Villa Medici. Before he played it through - with supreme mastery, as Berlioz recalls - he asked Berlioz for the tempo. They had previously argued about the merits, or otherwise, of metronome marks, Mendelssohn declaring that anyone in need of one was not a musician. Berlioz recounts in his *Memoirs* that he took this opportunity to remind Mendelssohn of his earlier comment.\(^\text{11}\)

**Performance**

The first performance of the overture *Roi Lear* took place in the Salle du Conservatoire, Paris, on December 22, 1833, more than two and a half years after its composition, a year after his return to Paris and some months after the only performance of the *Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor* (see Chapter 5), which had also been written during his time in Italy. It was this latter work which Berlioz had submitted as an envoi to the Institute the previous year, and not *Roi Lear*, as might now be expected. There is neither reason or explanation for this choice of envoi nor for the delay in the first performance of *Roi Lear*. It is suggested by Barzun that Berlioz had the parts copied while he was still in Italy because he wanted a performance in Paris as soon as possible and that he asked to leave Rome early for that reason.\(^\text{12}\) The letters from the period, however, make no specific reference to *Roi Lear*, saying only, 'À présent je ne fais que copier des parties', without referring to any particular works, although the Mélologue was the first of the works from the Italian sojourn to be performed in Paris on December 9, 1832.\(^\text{13}\) Returning to December 1833, the concert which included the première of *Roi Lear* was conducted by Narcisse Girard.\(^\text{14}\) Other items in the

\(^{10}\) CG I, no. 225, p. 449. See further references in CG I, pp. 450, 457 and 516. The date on the autograph is May 7.

\(^{11}\) *Mem.*, Travels in Germany, fourth letter, p. 292.

\(^{12}\) BarRom I, p. 216.

\(^{13}\) CG I, no. 256, p. 516.

\(^{14}\) It was Girard who had commissioned Berlioz's first Shakespeare-based work, *Fantasie sur La Tempête.*
programme were *Le Jeune Pâtre breton*, *Romance de Marie Tudor* and the *Symphonie fantastique*, plus works by other composers. Berlioz was enthusiastic and excited at the prospect of its début. He writes to Gounet between December 15 and 20, 1833, inviting him to the concert to hear *Roi Lear*, which had been rehearsed most successfully:

\[\text{J'espère que vous viendrez dimanche prochain entendre mon ouverture du *Roi Lear* qui est une chose, ... cette chose a obtenu un succès violent à la répétition de ce matin et j'espère qu'il en sera de \text{même au grand jour.}^{15}\]

Other letters show him sending tickets to an unknown recipient, probably Brizeux, and a formal invitation to Victor Hugo.\(^{16}\) The work was well-received by Joseph d'Ortigue (1802-66), writing for *La Quotidienne*:

\[\text{L'ouverture du *Roi Lear* a fait une vive impression, mais il est impossible de saisir la première fois le fil dramatique de cette œuvre. Quant à moi, je n'ai pas trouvé encore, dans aucune autre composition de Berlioz une inspiration plus soutenue, une instrumentation plus neuve et plus originale des effets plus hardis et plus vigoureux.}^{17}\]

The programme for Berlioz's next concert on November 9, 1834 was the second performance of *Roi Lear*, along with the *Symphonie fantastique* and first performances of *Sara la baigneuse* and *La Belle voyageuse*, the latter being originally part of the *Neuf mélodies irlandaises*, and works by Panofka and Rossini. The two songs were in new versions for male quartet and orchestra. The concert was held at the Salle du Conservatoire and conducted, as previously, by Girard. Fétis in the *Revue Musicale* of November 16 pronounced everything which accompanied the *Symphonie fantastique* as being of little importance, but he does admit interest in the following concert which will include the first performance of a new symphony (*Harold en Italie*). The reviewer in the *Gazette Musicale de Paris* says that he prefers to wait until he has heard the overture several times

\[^{15}\text{CG II, no. 366, p. 139.}\]
\[^{16}\text{CG II, nos 365 and 367, pp. 138 and n., and 140 respectively.}\]
\[^{17}\text{January 17, 1834.}\]
more before making further comment, while the review in La Quotidienne, again written by d'Ortigue, is more positive:

L'ouverture du Roi Lear, par laquelle cette séance a commencé, est peut-être la plus belle traduction qu'on puisse faire de drame de Shakespeare. Toutes les situations du grand poète tragique se trouvent rendues avec une hardiesse, une puissance, une vigueur et une originalité dignes de lui.

J.A. David also reviewed the concert, writing that Roi Lear and the other overtures:

... se rattachent essentiellement au système formule dans la Symphonie fantastique: celle-ci nous suffise donc pour apprécier toute par son auteur, et pour juger des recompenses qui lui réserve de l'avenir.

The review which appears in the Revue des Deux Mondes is written in an elaborate literary style, and its author, who signs himself B.H., complains about the prejudice shown against Berlioz, in spite of the public's interest in his concerts. It is of particular interest because when writing specifically about Roi Lear, B.H. comments on the new theme which appears at the end, which will be discussed more fully below under Revisions:

La phrase qui nait vers les dernières mesures, est surtout pleine de mélancolie et de fraîcheur.

It was at about this time that the poem 'A Hector Berlioz, après avoir entendu son ouverture du Roi Lear', written by Antoni Deschamps after the first performance of Roi Lear, appeared in La Revue de Paris; the third stanza is quoted here:

Lecteur, veux-tu savoir ce que peut l'art divin
Lorsqu'un maître le prend dans sa puissante main?
Entends le roi Lear, chancelant de folie,
 Chercher à pas pesants sa fille Cordélie:

---

18 November 16, 1834.
19 November 12, 1834.
22 It has not been possible to identify B.H. with certainty: it could be Baron Haussee, who had written the article on Sir Walter Scott for L'Europe Littéraire (see Chapter 3, Waverley).
Sa tunique flottante embarasse ses pas,
Il veut marcher, hélas! mais il ne le peut pas.
Sa vue est altérée, et sa tête affaiblie
L'abandonne, ô mon Dieu! Mais voici Cordélie?
Cordélie, ange saint envoyé par les cieux,
Quel nom égalera ton beau nom gracieux!

The third hearing of Roi Lear on December 14, 1834, in the same place and with the same conductor as the second performance, also included the second performance of Harold en Italie, the overture Les Francs-juges, Le Pêcheur and Sardanapale. The Gazette Musicale de Paris of December 14 and 28 concentrates on the performance of Harold en Italie and Roi Lear receives no mention. Two performances followed in 1835. The first of these was given on June 4 at the Gymnase Musicale, conducted by Tilmant aîné, the two other Berlioz works being Harold en Italie and Le Jeune Pâtre breton, in the version for voice and orchestra. Again, it is Harold which receives the comment in the Gazette des Salons, but with not much understanding. The announcement in Psyché concentrates on the fact that the Berlioz concert in question will inaugurate, not before time, the opening of a new purpose-built concert hall in Paris, second only to the Conservatoire. The review of the concert in Le Ménestrel of June 7, 1835 mentions only Harold en Italie.

The same journal reviewed the concert of December 13, 1835, when Berlioz conducted the work in the Salle du Conservatoire, along with Le Cinq mai, the Symphonie fantastique, the second movement of Harold en Italie, possibly some of his songs performed by Mlle Falcon and works by Meyerbeer and Gluck: its comments were not favourable. The overture Roi Lear, it says, contains idiotic music, a burlesque translation of Shakespeare's sublime madness. The Revue Musicale of December 20, 1835, is in contrast,
stating that both *Roi Lear* and the *Symphonie fantastique* had their usual effect on the public, who listened with rapt attention.\(^\text{26}\) The final performance before publication was conducted by Habeneck because Berlioz was ill. Held on November 25, 1838, again at the Salle du Conservatoire, the programme included the *Symphonie fantastique*, excerpts from *Benvenuto Cellini* and the early overture, *Waverley*. The review of the concert by Heller in the *Revue et Gazette Musicale* mentions only the overture *Les Francs-juges* in passing and the *Symphonie fantastique* in some detail.

**Revisions**

‘Nizza, 7 mai 1831’ is written by Berlioz on the bottom of the title page of the autograph of *Roi Lear*, thus recording the date of completion.\(^\text{27}\) There is evidence, however, that Berlioz made both substantial and minor revisions to *Roi Lear*, as well as adding last minute details, corrections and changes immediately prior to publication, which can be seen in red on the autograph. There are five factors which do not date the changes specifically, but do help to assess the extent of the revisions. Details of the piano transcription of the overture, which Berlioz asked Liszt to make for him in May, 1837, require the most explanation and will be dealt with first.\(^\text{28}\)

In June 1837, when writing to Mme d’Agoult, he asks that Liszt should not forget to send Berlioz’s manuscript back to him when sending his transcription.\(^\text{29}\) In December of the same year Liszt mentions the projected publication of the arrangement in conjunction with information

\(^{26}\) 1835, pp. 417-8.

\(^{27}\) Frederick R. Koch Collection, Deposit 250, Beinecke Library, Yale University, CT, USA.

\(^{28}\) CG II, no. 498, p. 348. The transcription has been published by the Liszt Society Publications, London, 1987. The editorial supplement states that ‘Liszt’s transcription was prepared from a copyist’s ms. rather than Berlioz’s original’. Barzun says that Berlioz prepared a ms for Liszt in 1853; this seems not to have been the case. Barzun *Rom* II, p. 51. After discussing these points with Leslie Howard, who is currently recording all Liszt’s piano music, it was decided unlikely that either suggestion was true.

\(^{29}\) CG II, no. 500, p. 352.
about Hofmeister's fee. After that, nothing more of it is mentioned until July 1852, when Berlioz tells Liszt:

P.S. Je vais chercher tes manuscrits d'Harold et du Roi Lear que je suis presque sur de n'avoir plus et d'avoir remis il y a longtemps à Belloni pour te les envoyer, ainsi que ta partition de piano des Francs-Juges.

Further letters show that the score was not found, let alone sent, until nearly a year later, in April 1853, when Berlioz writes to the Princess Caroline Sayn-Wittgenstein:

Ce n'est qu'aujourd'hui seulement qu'il m'a été possible de me livrer à la recherche de l'ouverture du Roi Lear. Comme j'allais désespérer de trouver ce manuscrit, j'ai mis la main au fond d'un tiroir sur un portefeuille que je croyais vide et qui contenait justement le morceau en question. Je l'envoie à Liszt aujourd'hui même.

At the end of that month he writes to Liszt himself about the overture:

J'allais oublier (car la tête me tournait maintenant quand j'écris quelques lignes) j'allais oublier de te dire que depuis que ton arrangement du Roi Lear a été fait, j'ai changé le coda de cette ouverture. Tu en as je crois la grande partition. Prends donc la peine de revoir cette fin. En outre je te prie de chercher une forme de trait de piano pour le passage de la péroration: [Berlioz quotes violins 1, bars 561-2] toutes les fois que ce dessin se présente tu as employé des triolets en octaves. Or le triolet est tout à fait insuffisant à rendre l'effet des croches; le rythme ternaire est là inconciliable avec le caractère échevelé que j'ai voulu reproduire. On ne pourra pas avoir d'octaves, il est vrai, mais c'est un sacrifice qu'il faut faire, et tu trouveras j'en suis sûr quelque terrible et excellent moyen de faire entendre à peu près telles qu'elles sont, les 8 croches que contient chaque mesure.

A comparison of Berlioz's autograph and Liszt's transcription shows that, for reasons unknown, Liszt never did revise the end in accordance with Berlioz's wishes. Ex. 1 shows bars 561-2ff. from the autograph and the equivalent passage in Liszt's transcription (bars 560-1ff), still in triplets; and Ex. 2 shows Liszt's transcription of the original ending at bars 618-636, as

---

30 CG II, no. 525, p. 387.
31 CG IV, no. 1499, p. 181.
32 CG IV, no. 1589, p. 310.
33 CG IV, no. 1593, p. 314-5.
Ex 1: The passage Berling wanted to change.
Ex. 1: Liszt transcription, using triplets, which Berg requested he change.
Ex. 2: Liszt's transcription of original ending.
compared with Berlioz's final version, as seen in the autograph (bars 619-37). In the autograph it is possible to see five of the eliminated bars, which are reflected in Liszt's version.

Continuing with the remaining four factors mentioned at the start of this section:

2) Inconsistent bifolio numbering:

Originally, the overture was composed on stacked, rather than gathered bi-folios and Berlioz numbered the beginning of each bi-folium in the top right hand corner. When the work was revised it appears that some pages were removed, with the result that the numbering of the bi-folios does not now run consistently throughout the autograph.

3) There are two layers of bar numbering:

One is in Berlioz's hand marking every 25 bars and one in another hand marking every hundred bars.

The table which follows combines items 2 and 3 above, indicating the bi-folios which remain, the bar numbers contained therein and the places where the absence of complete bi-folios suggests the removal of pages during the course of making revisions. It also shows the layers of bar numbers, with the actual bar number in brackets, if different. Note that for each of the two main sections, Andante ma non troppo lento ma maestoso and Allegro disperato ed agitato assai, Berlioz begins from one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bi-folio</th>
<th>Actual bar nos Berlioz's bar nos Other bar nos</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28-51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72-81</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82-116</td>
<td>25(110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>117-132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>133-150</td>
<td>50(135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-folio</td>
<td>Actual bar nos</td>
<td>Berlioz's bar nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7bis</td>
<td>151-185</td>
<td>75(161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>186-219</td>
<td>100(187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>220-262</td>
<td>125(211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>263-300</td>
<td>200(286)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>301-331</td>
<td>225(311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>332-363</td>
<td>250(336)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>275(361)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>364-405</td>
<td>300**(386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>406-445</td>
<td>325(411)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>446-480</td>
<td>350(436)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375(461)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>481-518</td>
<td>400(486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>425(511)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>519-550</td>
<td>450(536)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END OF BI-FOLIOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>551-566</td>
<td>475**(561)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500(586)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>567-637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure '551' has been written by Berlioz at the end of the overture, indicating that it was 86 bars shorter than final version.

* Originally the Allegro began at bar 85 because the double bar separating the two sections was in the middle of bar 85. Later Berlioz made the last bar of the Introduction and the first bar of the Allegro separate bars. Thus, he added his numbers before this change was made.

**The 300 has 400 written over it

4) More than one paper type:

The last six folios (bars 567-637) and the collette on the page immediately preceding these six (bars 561-566) have a bell watermark, as does a single folio inserted after bifolio 5 (bars 133-150). The rest of the overture is written on unmarked paper.

5) The article of November 1834 in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, mentioned already under Performance:

The musical competence of B. H. as might be understood today, is unknown, so it is hard to judge what he might classify as a 'new theme', but there does not seem to be anything which could be described as new material to be found towards the end of the score as it stands today. If his word is to be trusted, however, it suggests that part of the revisions Berlioz made to the ending included the elimination of some thematic material different from any of that which survives in the autograph today.

The following chronology summarising when the revisions were made can be suggested by collating all these facts:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1833 November</td>
<td>1st performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834 November</td>
<td>2nd performance: review mentions new material at end, which was - if the reviewer is to be believed - part of what was on the bi-folios following no. 19. Revisions to 2nd subject and 1st set of revisions to coda inserted on bell watermark paper, when the 'new' material was presumably removed: must have been done after November 1834 and before Liszt made his transcription which incorporates these revisions (June 1837). Since Berlioz is unlikely to have made revisions without a performance in mind, the latest performance for which they could have been made is that of December, 1835.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834 December</td>
<td>3rd performance: see comment above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835 June</td>
<td>4th performance: see comment above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835 December</td>
<td>5th performance: see comment above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837 May</td>
<td>Revisions using bell watermark paper done by now because Berlioz requests a piano arrangement of the overture from Liszt and sends him the ms or a copy of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837 June</td>
<td>Liszt's arrangement is completed by now, as per Berlioz’s autograph, incorporating revisions of the bell watermark paper. The 12 bars which were later inserted 7 bars before the end do not appear in Liszt's piano transcription.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838 November</td>
<td>6th performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839 January</td>
<td>Score at engraver's. Final revisions to coda (also a problem in Waverley), which are not in Liszt's transcription, inserted on collette by now. These final changes could have been made at the rehearsal for the 1838 performance, or as a final touch before publication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is interesting that Berlioz revised the peroration and codas in both the Waverley and Roi Lear overtures, and although there is logic in suggesting that they were revised at the same time, there is no particular evidence to support this. If this were the case, however, then Roi Lear would have been revised for the first of the concerts at the Gymnase Musicale in June 1835. The letters from the period offer no clues; he is always without money and without time for composing, spending the time writing feuilletons to earn money.

**Publication and dedication**

When Berlioz wrote to Liszt in May 1837 about the projected piano transcription, he added:

> ... je n'ai pas de raisons comme pour les symphonies de retarder la publication de ce morceau, au contraire, je serais bien aise qu'il parût.\(^{34}\)

---

\(^{34}\) CG II, no. 498, p. 348.
Whether or not this comment embraces the score, parts and the piano arrangement is not clear, but it is sure that some form of publication was on his mind. In February 1838 he writes that Richault is not interested, and indicates to Liszt, who had been talking to Hofmeister about this matter, that he was happy for him (Hofmeister) to go ahead.\textsuperscript{35} In the event, this did not happen and later the score and parts were placed with Catelin as Berlioz’s œuvre 4\textsuperscript{me} (which number had been assigned to Waverley at some point), only for there to be a considerable delay over the publication, of the score in particular, as the following chronology shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January, 1839</td>
<td>Overture to engraver’s\textsuperscript{36}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1839</td>
<td>Impatient letter to Catelin: how long does he have to wait?\textsuperscript{37}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25, 1839</td>
<td><em>La France Musicale</em>: parts advertised in at 18fr. (HolCat says July 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 1839</td>
<td><em>La Gazette Musicale</em>: score to appear soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 1839</td>
<td>Announced for publication on December 3 in programme for <em>Roméo et Juliette</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1840</td>
<td>Performed in Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31, 1840</td>
<td>Letter to Ferrand: he’ll be sending the score soon\textsuperscript{38}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1840</td>
<td>Letter tells Bertin, the dedicatee, that the score is ‘enfin publiée’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Armand Bertin (1801-1854) was the son of the founder of the *Journal des Débats*, for which Berlioz wrote on a regular basis from 1834 to 1864. The pattern of dedication here is different from that of Waverley, because he not only dedicated the published overture Bertin, but also gave him the autograph for safe keeping. He wrote on February 12, 1840:

*La dédicace d’un morceau de musique est un hommage banal qui n’a de prix que par le mérite de l’ouvrage, mais j’espère que vous accepterez celle-ci comme l’expression de la reconnaissante amitié que je vous ai vouée depuis longtemps.*\textsuperscript{39}

Although Berlioz was impatient with Catelin, as seen in the letter he wrote, probably in Spring 1839 - he did not choose to publish *chez* Catelin in order to wait years for his overture to appear: he says he wants a date when the proofs will be ready - other matters, including performances of extracts from *Benvenuto Cellini* and the composing of the dramatic symphony, *Roméo et Juliette*, took his attention. His efforts to improve

\textsuperscript{35} CG II, no. 532, p. 410. It is clear here that he is talking about the piano arrangements.

\textsuperscript{36} CG II, no. 616, p. 513.

\textsuperscript{37} CG II, no. 641, p. 543.

\textsuperscript{38} CG II, no. 700, p. 627.

\textsuperscript{39} CG II, no. 702, p. 629.
Catelin’s business acumen did not seem to have much effect and by January 31, 1840 the score was still unpublished, as seen in his letter to Ferrand. Confirmation of the appearance of the score is in the *Journal des Débats* on March 28, 1840. Apart from saying that the score of *Roi Lear* was now published, and that the parts appeared three months ago, the notice continues to exhort conductors to buy this powerful and original work, ‘indispensable à tous les chefs d’orchestre qui voudraient monter avec soin cet ouvrage digne de tout de que le célèbre compositeur a produit de plus puissant et de plus original.’\(^{40}\) Berlioz’s irritation with Catelin continued to rankle even after the score had appeared. A letter dated November 9, 1840 shows that Berlioz does not think he is doing enough to promote the sale of the overture,\(^{41}\) but the irritation turns to regret within a few months when he writes to an unknown recipient in England that he has misgivings about the engraving of some of his overtures, although he gives no specific reasons.\(^{42}\) Soon after this, in March 4, 1841, there is record of Berlioz writing to Catelin, asking for a change to be made to the title page and requesting that he be sent fifty copies. This letter, the abstract of which does not mention *Roi Lear* specifically, is known only through a catalogue.\(^{43}\) If it is assumed to be genuine, however, perhaps it suggests he was not too serious when he made that comment about regretting publication. This is confirmed as being likely, since there was a second imprint dating from November 1843,\(^{44}\) without any changes to the plates but bearing the legend ‘chez S. Richault, Editeur Boulevart Poissonière, 26 au 1er’.\(^{45}\) There is extant the contract, dated November 21, 1843, in which Berlioz ceded *Roi Lear* to Richault for 700 fr.\(^{46}\) This still uses the Catelin plate numbers (544 for the

\(^{40}\) *CG* II, no. 704, p. 631.

\(^{41}\) *CG* II, no. 735, p. 664.

\(^{42}\) *CG* II, no. 741, p. 679.

\(^{43}\) *CG* II, no. 744, p. 682. Catalogue Pierre Bérès, no. 22, 193. In his footnote, Citron suggests that the work to which Berlioz refers is *Roi Lear*.

\(^{44}\) *Journal des Débats*, November 21, 1843 and *La France musicale*, November 26, 1843.

\(^{45}\) The Hopkinson Collection holds both an early and late imprint (GB-En H. B. 1/9 and 2/14 (1)), neither of which is bound and both of which are in stacked bifolios (i.e. 4 sides of music on 2 pages), rather than the more common gatherings of 8 sides of music on 4 pages. This seems to be because the paper is uncommonly large, being approx. 34.75 x 26.2mm, although the plates themselves measure 25.2x 19.7 mm. Acknowledgements are due to Roger Duce at the National Library of Scotland for taking the time to discuss this.

\(^{46}\) Acknowledgements to Anike Devriès for passing on copies of this and other contracts.
score, except 448 for the title page, which is also the plate number for the parts), Richault having bought plates of Berlioz's music before the end of 1842, when Catelin was in financial difficulties. A third imprint of c.1866 or later, also by Richault, has different plate numbers (14009.R.) but again, close examination reveals no changes or corrections to the plates of the full score. There is no doubting that the quality of the score and parts engraved by Catelin is superior to that seen in *Waverley*.

There are two further points to be mentioned with respect to Catelin. *Roi Lear* was the first piece of orchestral music he produced for Berlioz, the earlier items being vocal, the first having been *Le Jeune Père breton*. After *Roi Lear*, he published one other orchestral piece, ‘Premiers transports’ from *Roméo et Juliette*, which appeared in 1839, in piano and vocal score format. *Roi Lear* was the largest of Berlioz’s works to be published by him. Second, Hopkinson mentions that the imprint 'Editeurs des Compositeurs Réunis' appears after Catelin’s name twice on the title pages of works by Berlioz, of which one is *Roi Lear*. He suggests that this could mean that Berlioz published the overture at his own expense, which would explain, were this the case, his irritation with Catelin. He was, presumably, more interested in promoting works which might improve the financial standing of his business, rather than those for which he was not having to pay.47

It seems that Berlioz did not have a particular conducting copy or, if he did, it is lost or destroyed. All the Catelin copies listed in *HolCat* have been examined and eight of the twelve copies of the Richault imprint, but none of these has any marking which suggests it was used by Berlioz. It seems not to have been of great concern to him, since he was happy to use Griepenkerl’s copy for the concert in Brunswick on October 17, 1853.48 Although seven out of nine of the 1866 imprint have also been examined out of interest and for completeness, Berlioz did not conduct the work after

47 HopBib, p. 195. He does not mention which works have the imprint after Catelin’s name.
48 CG IV, no. 1639, p. 380.
1863, so it is unlikely that he would have had any particular interest in the later imprint.

In 1856 Berlioz discusses a German edition with Rieter-Biedermann, telling him that he does not need Richault's or his permission to publish, but requesting that he be sent the last proofs. From this comment it would seem that it was a full score that was being contemplated, rather than an arrangement, such as that for Roméo et Juliette which was under discussion during this period and which Berlioz asked to be handed over to Lubbeck. It seems not to have happened, however, the subject of Roi Lear disappearing from further letters and Rieter-Biedermann choosing to publish other works instead.

The PO was presumably taken from the set of manuscript parts, now lost or destroyed, but which must have been prepared for the performances which took place before publication. They contain many additions in the form of slurs and dynamics which could have been added in rehearsal and not erased before being sent to the engraver's. The first violin part of PO was printed in the format for a violin leader/conductor, one not found in other Berlioz concert overtures, although is found in that for Les Francs-juges (Ex. 3). It is not known who designed this, but since, as will be shown, Berlioz was obviously familiar with the set of printed parts, it would seem that if he did object, it was not sufficiently strongly to take any action to remove it or change the format later on. Presumably the phrasing of the announcement mentioned above was to discourage conductors from using the cheaper and inferior principal violin part. The set of PO held at F-Psoc consists of some parts with the original Catelin plate number, Ad. e C. (488) and some from the later variant set, plate number 14010 R. The cello part shows that one of two notation corrections were made in a later imprint (Ex. 4), and the dynamic 'p' was removed at bars 146 and 509, but lack of availability of parts from the later imprint has made other comparisons

---

49 CG V, no. 2169, p. 364 and 2175, p. 372.
50 CG V, no. 2177, p. 374 and 2193, p. 397.

Text continues p. 26/
Ex.3: Violin conductor part: Andante...

Violin conductor part: from Allegro
Cello part with early plate number showing Berlioz’s corrections, 3rd system, 2nd bar and 6th system, 4th bar.
Ex. 4  Cello part with later plate number showing the g corrected to a\textsuperscript{b} (3rd system, 2nd bar), but the f without the required natural sign (6th system, 4th bar).
impossible. The Catelin parts were used by Berlioz for his concert in Brunswick in October 1853, as inscriptions show (Ex. 5), but they were also used later by the Société itself for the first performance they ever gave of *Roi Lear* (Ex. 6). For this reason it is not possible to assign all hand written additions to these extensively marked parts to Berlioz. It is clear, however, that he adjusted the numbers for the Brunswick concert, preparing wrappers for the parts (Ex. 7) and that he made other corrections himself (Ex. 8).

**Later performances**

Once the work was published it was performed elsewhere, independently of Berlioz, the first being in Brunswick on January 18, 1840.\(^{51}\) It has to be assumed that this was given from the printed parts, using the violin/conductor's part instead of a score, which had yet to appear.\(^{52}\) This performance was followed by one in Marseilles in April that year, organised by Lecourt: 'Je vous remercie trente-sept millions de fois, de tout ce que vous avez fait pour cette grande ouverture endiablée!'\(^{53}\) Another performance, one of three given in the north of France between 1833 and 1855, was at Lille on June 28, 1840, where it preceded the finale of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony at the *fête communale*.\(^{54}\) The first performance in England was in London on December 7, 1840, conducted by Mr. J. T. Willy at one of his Promenade concerts given in the Princess's Theatre and there followed performances in Bremen, Munich and Frankfurt (all in 1841). That in Munich, which was given on October 6, was mentioned in the *Revue et Gazette Musicale* of November 14, but without comment about its reception or other information.\(^{55}\) Thereafter Berlioz conducted it every time he visited Germany, including on later German tours, for three performances in 1853 and one in 1854. Early responses to the overture were guarded: after the performance in Frankfurt in December 1841 it was decided that the work was acceptable and performed with precision, but the

\(^{51}\) Cat p. 105.

\(^{52}\) It has not been possible to search for reviews for this performance.

\(^{53}\) CG II, no. 712, p. 639.

\(^{54}\) Gosselin, pp. 3-4.

\(^{55}\) EB.
Ex. 5  Ophicleide part showing 1853 inscription

Ex. 5  Trombone part showing 1853 inscription
Ex. 6 Clarinet part showing 1899 inscription
Ex. 7  Showing adjusted numbers of players for Brunswick concert, with some of the numbered parts in Berlioz's hand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2nd Fausti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clarinetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2nd Fausti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ophiclides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1st Flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1st Flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alto Flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3rd or 4th Corni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex. 8 Double bass part: the hairpin dim in the first line is in Berlioz’s hand
Ex. 8 Trumpet part showing Berlioz's correction of 17 to 71 bars' rest
public reaction was not favourable. The concert in Leipzig (February 1843) resulted in a lengthy report in the AMZ which was not favourable at all, Roi Lear being regarded, however, as ‘less extravagant’ than other of Berlioz’s compositions. His second concert in Berlin (April 23, 1843) had only a small audience listening to his ‘over-orchestrated’ and ‘over-charged’ compositions, but Roi Lear was, nevertheless, ‘impressive and powerful in the beginning, later vanishing into mystical regions, probably intended to describe Lear’s madness.’ In May 1845 the AMZ printed a review of the performance given at the Conservatory in Prague, prompting Berlioz to conduct it there himself, which he did in April 1846. This is a lengthy analysis, by no means all favourable and with some reference to the perceived programmatic content:

Berlioz’s overture took the public by surprise, as is the case at all foreign appearances, but it caused a kind of suspense and attention and there was a common wish to hear it again in order to understand it entirely. ... In the oboe’s solo we are likely to retrace Cordelia’s longing for her mis-understood love.

Despite this apparent negative response, it became one of his most frequently heard works in Germany until overtaken in popularity by Le Carnaval romain. It is of interest to note that when Roi Lear was heard in Paris on November 23, 1843, after seven German performances, the reviews in Le Monde Musical, Revue et Gazette Musicale, Le Ménestrel and Le Tintamarre were full of praise:

...nous ne connaissons rien de plus pompeux et de plus solennel que l’introduction ... rien de plus touchant que le chant du hautbois ...(Le Monde Musical)
...disons seulement que jamais Harold, le Roi Lear et l’Apothése ne furent rendus avec une pareille verve (Revue et Gazette Musical)

56 AMZ, February, 1842, no. 6, column 117. See appendix to this chapter for the full version of this and other AMZ reviews mentioned here.
57 AMZ, March 1843, no. 11, column 219. This is of interest in relation to Berlioz’s generally positive and enthusiastic perception of his travels in Germany as reflected in his writings. See appendix to this chapter.
58 AMZ, May 1843, no. 20, column 357-8. The reviewer concludes that Berlioz’s compositions are less appropriate for Germans than for the ‘over-sensitive’ French taste.
59 AMZ, May 1845, no. 21, column 364-5. See appendix to this chapter.
It was not so well-received in New York, where George Loder wrote after the performance on November 21, 1846 by the Philharmonic Society:

Berlioz is a sort of unintelligible Shelley in music; what his admirers dignify by the name imagination is mere commonplace; most people will justly call it sheer raving.61

Nevertheless, it is a work that is mentioned frequently by Berlioz when he writes about his concerts in Germany in both the Memoirs and his letters:62 there are five which mention that the King requested the work to be played in the concert given on April 1, 1854 at the Royal Theatre, Hanover.63 It was also a piece about which he was willing to acknowledge a programmatic element, as when talking about the use of the timpani at the end of the Andante and when recounting the King of Hanover's interpretation of the work, which he did not deny.64 It remained a work which surprised and pleased him in later years, as shown in the Memoirs. The Prince of Hohenzollern-Hechingen requested that Roi Lear was included in the concert he invited Berlioz to give at Löwenberg in April 1863:

On the conductor's desk is the score of King Lear. I lift my baton and begin, and from the first everything goes with precision and accuracy and spirit. The most extreme irregularities of rhythm in the allegro are attacked and mastered without hesitation; and I inwardly exclaim as I conduct this overture, which I have not heard for ten years or more: 'This is tremendous! Did I write this?'65

---

60 November 23, 26, 26, and 26 respectively. The word 'tintamarre' is defined colloquially as 'din, racket, noise', but its obsolescent meaning is 'mock serenade'.
61 Evening Mirror, November 25, 1846.
62 Mem, Travels in Germany, fourth letter, p. 390; Postscript, p. 480; CG IV, no. 1651, p. 399.
63 CG IV, nos. 1706, 1716, 1717, 1720 and 1726 on pp. 477, 490, 492, 495 and 500 respectively.
64 CG V, no. 2320, p. 601; Mem. ch. 59, p. 472.
65 Mem Postface, p. 493.
Other versions and editions$^{66}$

As was often customary when publishing orchestral works, piano versions were made as a means of encouraging dissemination of the overture. The Liszt transcription, published only recently, has been discussed already. In addition to this there was another version for solo piano arranged by J. A. Liebrock, which appeared in Brunswick, published by G. M. Meyer Jr., c.1854. It appeared much later in Paris (c.1862) chez Richault, who had published a four-hand arrangement, also by J. A. Liebrock, in 1843. The first four-hand version had appeared three years earlier in Brunswick, published by Edouard Liebrock.$^{67}$ When Richault re-issued Liebrock's solo arrangement in 1862, he re-issued the four-hand version at the same time. Although Berlioz later expressed a dislike of four-hand arrangements because they are often too thick in the bass,$^{68}$ he nevertheless sends a message to Leibrock via Griepenkerl, thanking him for such a well-arranged reduction.$^{69}$

The OBE is of interest because it does not mention A in its preface (volume IV, no. x, p. 87), stating that the edition of Roi Lear is from P and PO. The later edition is listed, correctly, as being a reprint of the first one. It then lists the string requirements, as seen in P, finally informing the reader that 'no serious mistake or important alteration has to be signalised herein'. It qualifies that statement by saying that some forgotten signs of expression have been added and some legato signs modified, 'in order to render them more practically suitable to the bowings'. Since the OBE was unable to use A, it is discounted as a source for this edition, but is mentioned here for completeness and as an indication of editorial practice a century ago. It seems that although the autograph was thought to be lost at the time the

$^{66}$As in the case of Waverley, the Detmold holding of Roi Lear consists of a set of copyist string parts: vlns 1 (4); vlns 2 (2); vlas, cellos and double bass; double bass (HolCat, p. 104). It has not been possible for these or the copyist's score held at Lübeck to be examined.

$^{67}$It has not been possible to establish any relationship between J. A. and Edouard Leibrock, although it seems likely there was one. FétisBiog (2nd ed., vol. 5, p. 258), says that J. A. was the son of Auguste and born in Brunswick in 1808. He mentions his compositions and positions held, but says nothing about arrangements (EB).

$^{68}$CG V, no. 2100, pp. 266-7.

$^{69}$CG III, no. 915, p. 193.
OBE was prepared, by 1934, when Constantin talks about it in his book on Berlioz, which includes a facsimile of the collette (bars 619-630) inserted in the coda, it was in that author's collection.

**Conclusion**

There are three possible sources for this edition, A, P and PO. The printed orchestral parts show variants indicating that they were made from another source, presumably the manuscript orchestral parts, and will not be considered as an option, although reference can be made to them where necessary. The printed score shows some signs of intelligent interception, in relation to the autograph. For instance, where Berlioz uses one dynamic marking in the autograph to do duty for the line above and below it, the printed score shows the mark below each appropriate instrument. Maybe it was that if Catelin was concerned about his business, particular care was taken in the preparation of the plates. Berlioz does ask to be sent proofs, although it is not known either if he was, or, if he was, whether or not he made any corrections to them. There do not seem to be any, although changes (not quite the same thing), have been made. It is possible to see that, in bars containing only a semibreve, it has been moved from the middle of the bar to the beginning. Examples begin at bar 123 in the wood-wind and continue through to bar 604. This confirms that the cosmetic appearance of the score could have been an important consideration to Catelin, and, indeed, it is without doubt a superior looking score beside the printed first edition of *Waverley*. This quality of presentation is also reflected in PO. Despite this, it is unfortunate that Catelin's quality control did not extend to checking for accurate content, since P lacks many details of slurring and thus, it fails to reflect Berlioz's intention as seen in the autograph. This seems to be a particular problem in this score, in which the strings are often in unison, in that the printed score fails to show that all parts have the same

---

70 CG II, no. 641, p. 543.
71 This can be seen clearly in any copy of the printed edition, but is not clear in reproduction, for which reason there is no illustration.
slurs at the same time for the same music, which the autograph shows to have been Berlioz’s intention. For this reason it is the autograph which will be used as the primary source for this edition, given that reference is made to the printed score where necessary.
Although the reviews which follow are of secondary importance in respect of preparing a critical edition, they are interesting in terms of broadening the understanding of the reception of Berlioz's music in Germany, reflected in German attitudes to music at this time. Acknowledgements are due to Dr Jens Rosteck for preparing these, which are translations with the passages shown in square brackets having being paraphrased, because literal translations would have been cumbersome.

Translation and paraphrase of AMZ, March 1843, no. 11, column 217

[concert on February 4 including romances interpreted by the female singer Recio]

The concert has been less visited than one should suppose it would have, and the applause was dominated by uncertainty and hasn't been unanimous at all. The offertorium, extract of the Requiem, seemed to be more appreciated . . . [perfect performance, Berlioz's conducting very sure and precise]. In general though, we tend not to believe that Berlioz has succeeded to establish a lasting place for his music in Germany by giving these concerts. [It is irritating to listen to several short pieces of the same author during one evening, as it would be listening to many poems by the same poet instead of seeing one single tragedy.] Hector Berlioz's compositions are all the time coloured in a very sinister manner, they are unpleasant to the highest degree, only very seldom a beautiful passage is likely to appear. Most of it - by far! - is dissonance; dissonance of the hardest and even unbelievable kind. He doesn't want to please us; he wants to be characteristic. Although there can't be any doubt concerning the energy and virtuosity of his presentation in these character pieces, the artistic justification of his will can be judged with very different opinions. Berlioz looks for a freedom of his art which doesn't tolerate borders or ties, he
receives the laws/rules of his will in a free way, from his imagination, which has got enthusiastic about the picture he wants to express to us. [Beethoven, Haydn, Mozart took the same freedom, but music has to remain decent, moral, beautiful, even when passionate or ecstatic and even if it tends to look into the future of the development of the arts, it has to respect certain moral or aesthetical rules.] . . .

. . . Berlioz's compositions may find the support of some single admirers, depending on the point of view. [The danger is that the beauty can easily turn into its contrary, into ugly and "unhappy" art when going too far while giving a portrait of the literary subject behind it.] . . .

. . . Berlioz's music resides at the most extreme borders of the beautiful, he doesn't often let us see a small aspect of heaven, but opens the gates of hell very often. [Beethoven does so, too, but also shows peace and paradise.] In Berlioz's musical character there is not one single healthy passage: song and lover are poisoned. Even if grace is about to appear, or a melody trying to develop or flourish, it will get attacked by rhythmic and harmonic violence until it suffers a total breakdown, throws itself into the depths of hell and disappears underneath boiling and burning waves, towards an endless suffering. . . Compared to the witches' sabbath in the Symphonie Fantastique we should call Weber's Wolfsschlucht a cradle song. . . [To be considered less extravagant was, amongst other compositions, the overture to King Lear, an early work of Berlioz.]

. . . [This compares certain passages of Berlioz's music to sudden appearances of the sun amidst a troubled, threatening storm sky: it considers Berlioz's art as being obsessed rather than free or inspired.] It is well known that Berlioz is a man of the finest education/culture, that he is an experienced writer. His friends appreciate his benevolence and kindness, his sureness in artistic matters (as a critic or judge) but he always tended to praise the fantastic. [The critic doubts that these works presented by Berlioz
might have an enduring place in the repertory; he thinks they are just compositions of transitory importance.]

*_Translation and paraphrase of AMZ, May 1845, no. 21, column 364*

Berlioz's overture took the public by surprise as is the case at every foreign appearance, but it caused a kind of suspense and attention, and there was a common wish to hear it again in order to understand it entirely. However, we had to listen to the worst of the musicians' complaints, too. The critic of _Bohemia_, normally known as a rather cautious, discreet and thorough reporter, says of it: "I can't consider this overture of Berlioz's as music, it is lacking the singing soul and a harmonically shaped body. In this noise of instruments I tried in vain to find a message." - What does the oboe solo in the introduction mean, being repeated by the other wind instruments or the cantilene in the allegro, following the cadence in G? It is not possible either to claim that this overture is without any form, on the contrary: we discover in it the traditional form, but in rather colossal dimensions. After the long magnificent introduction, generally in C major while generally shifting not very often to other keys, the allegro starts as well in C major, followed by a modulation to G, producing a half cadence, followed then by a new cantilene in B minor which already returns to G . . .

. . . in the 5th bar it also closes in this same key after having been made more important by many ellipses, suspensions and hesitations. After a middle section using both of the allegro motives, not in a contrapuntal but characteristic way, there is another entry of the main theme of the allegro in C again, this time interrupted by the beginning of the introduction and both of the diminished allegro motives. Let's go on to the musical characteristic: the wind's motif - the beginning of the introduction - is really majestic. [In the oboe's solo we are likely to retrace Cordelia's longing for her non-understood love.] In the opening allegro we see the rising wrath of Lear which suddenly calms down to a sad longing. Then we hear the beginnings of his troubled mind; the re-appearing motif of the basses
from the introduction haunts us like the expelled old man who can't forget that he has once been a king. A deep sensation causes a moment of general silence, expressing the exhausted decline after the wildest excitement. Unusual transitions, which don't keep at all to the traditional rules, do appear above all at the end, the effect is almost "hair-raising" when Berlioz applies once the modulation using the chromatic scale, but Shakespeare hasn't told Lear's madness with mild colours either! Or could we recall the painful call, with which Beethoven starts the last movement of his 9th symphony a consonance? The construction in periods is also very strange at several places, and it needs to be heard several times in order to have a good look at it. During the whole overture we could discover only 2 spots which we would like to be avoided as they are mere plain, "gap-fillers": the figure producing the half-cadence in G major in the allegro, and the 3 bars at the very end of the G-major-movement which reappear later also in C major. We don't want to dare, after a single hearing of an overture, to give a justified judgement of Berlioz's importance in the arts, but like only to give our opinion about the mentioned work. But we admit however, that it has caused us a good deal of respect towards Berlioz and has given rise to the wish to get to know his other works. Time will tell and decide on the value of it by applying Luther's saying "if it's true art, it shall remain, if it's rubbish, it will be drowned".
CHAPTER 5: INTRATA DI ROB-ROY MACGREGOR

Genesis and composition

The Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor is the second of two works by Berlioz which were inspired by Sir Walter Scott's novels, his first concert overture, Waverley (q.v.) being the other. Before either of these had been contemplated, however, there had taken place an extended correspondence between Léon Compaignon and Berlioz, over their planned opera based on Scott's The Talisman. There is no evidence of any music having been written for this project: the correspondence deals with the problems in the libretto. In the only reference that confirms that Berlioz read Rob Roy, he writes about:

...Helen MacGregor, an armed virago, bounding barefoot over the rocks, her hair streaming to the winds, dark cloak flashing with gaudy trinkets, or dreaming to the roar of the elements, terrifying the women with her baleful glance and maddening the men, but not to love.

The overture is one of the handful of works to have been produced during Berlioz's residence in Italy, one of the conditions of the Prix de Rome, which Berlioz had won in 1830, at his fourth attempt, with the cantata Sardanapale. The two most substantial, in addition to the Intrata, are the overture Le Roi Lear, written just prior to it, and Le Retour à la vie, written at around the same time. Others include the first version of the Méditation religieuse (August 1831) to a prose translation of a poem by Thomas Moore, the Quartetto e coro dei maggi (early 1832) to an anonymous text and the first version of La Captive (February 1832), a setting of words by Victor Hugo. Although there is no evidence showing when he may have read Rob Roy, one of the reasons for his choosing to write an overture based on this particular work could have been that he had heard that an old friend and collaborator, the one-time director of Figaro and editor-to-be of L'Europe Littéraire, Victor Bohain, was adapting it for the stage. This was in the form of a play by Joseph Moore entitled, MacGregor, ou les montagnards écossais, also, it is assumed, derived from Scott's novel. The wording of the title of Rob-Roy is something of a curiosity and is of some relevance here. It

1 See Chapter 3: Waverley for more details about this project.
2 Mem, Travels in Germany I, p. 279.
3 For details of the Prix de Rome see Chapter 4, Le Roi Lear.
4 Details of these may be found in NBE vols 7, 13 and 15, and 12b respectively. Berlioz also reworked the Scène des champs from the Symphonie fantastique while in Italy.
5 BarRom vol. I, p. 206. Earlier references to Bohain may be found in CG 1, no. 86, p. 185n. and no. 103, p. 217, both alluding to a possible project concerning music for a Faust ballet.
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has been suggested that Berlioz called it 'Intrata' as a mark of admiration for Gluck, who used the word at the head of his opera Alceste. Another idea presents itself, however: Berlioz could have meant to use the Italian word 'intrada' ('intrata' being old Italian), which is the equivalent to the French 'entée'. One definition of this from Rousseau's dictionary (1767) is 'an instrumental piece before a ballet', thus returning to Berlioz's possible intention for the overture to preface Bohain's proposed production.

The first direct mention of Rob-Roy is in a letter to Gounet in which Berlioz writes that his sojourn in Nice has been enriched as he puts it, by three compositions, the overtures to Roi Lear (q.v.), that of Rob-Roy and Le Mélologue. He had already hinted at the conception of Rob-Roy in a letter to his father where he writes:

Je viens de commencer un nouveau travail, après avoir bien revu et retouché ma partition du Roi Lear; c'est encore de la musique instrumentale; en attendant que mon retour en France me permette de réaliser un grand projet de musique dramatique, j'augmente mon répertoire de concert.

A few days after writing this letter, however, Berlioz left Nice to return to Rome, during which time he set aside Rob-Roy and began work on Le Retour à la vie. In a letter to Hiller of January 1, 1832, he writes that:

...j'ai eu le bêtise de montrer à Mendelssohn, à mon corps défendant, avant qu'il y eu eût la dixième partie de fixée.

He continues to say that Rob-Roy MacGregor was sketched in Nice and finished and orchestrated in the mountains round Subiaco. It is not difficult to understand why Berlioz found that area attractive. It is still very isolated, haunted by memories of St. Benedict - the cave in which he lived as a hermit for some years can still be visited - and is best traversed on foot, following the sheep trails. Its grandeur has captured the imagination of others: 'Some echo of an earlier world was in the sound ... as of man the wanderer, passing to his restless destiny.'

---

6 Acknowledgements to Professor Peter Bloom for pointing this out.
7 CG I, no. 231, pp. 457.
8 CG I, no. 228, p. 450.
9 CG I, no. 256, p. 516.
10 Mem, ch. 38, p. 176.
11 Anne Macdowell, In the Abruzzi, London, 1908.
Félix fils took over the work of Félix père when the latter took up his post as head of the Conservatoire in Brussels in 1833.
One of the conditions of the *Prix de Rome* was that compositions had to be sent back annually to the Institute in Paris for adjudication. *Rob-Roy* formed part of the *envoi* of 1832, together with the *Quartetto e coro dei maggi* (*q.v.*).12 Berlioz had ordered the copy to be made towards the end of his stay in Rome, for which there is a receipt dated May 31, 1832.*

**Performance and reception**

On March 13, 1833 Berlioz wrote to the committee of the Société des Concerts, asking if they would perform one of the works he had composed in Italy and which had yet to be given a hearing, proposing the *Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor*. He asked that, if the reply was favourable, he be told as soon as possible since the parts had yet to be copied. The autograph letter has a note in the margin saying that he received a reply on March 15.13 Thus it was that the only known performance of this work to take place in Berlioz’s lifetime and in his presence was on April 14, 1833 in the Salle du Conservatoire, conducted by Habeneck. There was no other music by Berlioz in the programme, which included works by Beethoven, Meyerbeer, Cherubini and Franchomme. Apart from the concert on April 15, 1849, which included excerpts from *La Damnation de Faust*, this was the only occasion in Berlioz’s lifetime when his music was performed by the Société des Concerts.

Edouard

It was not very well received. Fétis was in sarcastic mood,14 hinting that the work, the most inferior to be presented by Berlioz, might have been written before the overture *Les Francs-juges*, which had been written in 1826. In the fragments already heard from this young composer, Fétis continues, there has always been something of merit, but here, regrettably, there is nothing. He continues:

Soit fatalité, soit calcul, le mépris de toute pensée unitaire y est poussé au-delà de ce qu’on pourrait croire. C’est une vague d’idées qu’aucun mot ne saurait dire, et un chaos de phrases heurtées qui n’a pour terme que la conclusion du morceau. Si M. Berlioz s’est trompé en écrivant cette ouverture, s’il a compté sur des effets qui ne sont pas rencontrés à l’exécution, il faut désirer qu’il réussisse mieux une autre fois. Si c’est un

---

12 F-Pc ms 1512; the *OBE* says, incorrectly, that the original ms. is at the Paris Conservatoire. His first *envoi*, favourably judged, had been a copy of the Resurrexit from the early *Messe solennelle*, the only surviving part of the mass until the discovery of the autograph in 1992, *NBE* vol. 23. It is possible that the *Quartetto* is a reworked version of the *Marche religieuse des mages*.

13 CG II, no. 328, p. 91.

14 *Revue Musicale*, April 20, 1833. See opp. for *Iva*.

* At the *Villa Medici*, Rome.
dessin qu'il a outre une manièure qui lui a été dite mauvaises, il a pu juger, par l'effet qu'a produit son œuvre devant un auditoire non composé d'amis de ce qu'il doit espérer du système d'après lequel il travaille.

The Institute had the final word on October 12, at the prize-giving for the Prix de Rome winners, during which ceremony the most recently received envois were evaluated. It stated that after its reception at the performance by the Société des Concerts, at which the work had been judged by the public, it was not for them to comment. Not surprisingly, Berlioz did not attend: he had married Harriet Smithson only nine days previously and they were staying in Vincennes until October 16. Although he went into Paris every day because he was already planning a benefit for Harriet to pay off her debts before their projected trip to Berlin that winter, going to the prize-giving was not on his agenda.

**Authority and authenticity**

The copy Berlioz had made for him in Italy, to be sent back to the Institute, is the only extant contemporary source for the work and survives because the Institute kept all copies of envois received from Rome. There is no doubting the authenticity of the document; it existed with Berlioz's full consent and the title page is in his own hand. The matter of authority - that is, how closely the copy reflects his original intentions - cannot be resolved fully unless other sources come to light. Careful examination of the copy reveals one or two inconsistent additions in a slightly different ink from the majority of the copy, for example at bar 127 and possibly 125 and 133. Of more significance, however, is the crescendo poco a poco under the viola part at bars 505-10, which is in Berlioz's hand. This suggests that at least he looked through the score and was satisfied with it, thus establishing the authority of the document. The errors of notation in the copyist's score, however, as well as the inconsistencies in dynamic and phrase marks, show that Berlioz's examination of the copyist's score was only cursory.

---

16 CG II, no. 352, p. 123.
17 As discussed with Professor Hugh Macdonald.
Self-borrowing and borrowing

Berlioz made a practice of re-setting material he thought too good to lose permanently and this happened to *Rob-Roy*. After the poor reception of the work, the lifting of two good themes could be seen as a consequence of his pragmatism, and they were used with great success in *Harold en Italie*, which received its first performance on November 23, 1834. Evidence of this transferral is to be found in a letter dated March 4th, 1839. Berlioz recounts that he wrote Harold’s theme and part of the introduction (to the symphony) in Nice, but without the viola solo. It was two years after this that he conceived the idea of replacing the cor anglais with solo viola, in response to Paganini’s suggestion that he should write something for him.

This score also contains an unusual instance of Berlioz borrowing from another source, as a way of setting the Scottish scene. In 1802 the melody *Scots wha hae wi’ Wallace bled*, which appears at bar 10 of *Rob-Roy*, was published in volume three of George Thomson’s *Original Scottish Airs*, with an accompaniment arranged by Haydn. It seems to be the melody to which Berlioz refers in his only article for *Le Correspondant* in 1830, extolling Romanticism - the only article he wrote in such vein:

The melody of Clan MacGregor ‘We are Scots’, among others, is admirable; you do not need to hear the words of this highland song to recognise the inhabitant of that mountainous land exulting in his energy and his freedom.

18 ‘... a melody, being a pearl fished up from mysterious depths, must not be thrown back, but set and reset until it finds its perfect place.’ Barzun Rom, 1, p. 248. This also applied to the *Messe Solennelle* and *La Mort d’Orphée*, among other works.
20 This letter, which is identified as being from the ‘Librairie ancienne Bruno Sépulchre, 7 rue Cassette, Paris 75006, s.d.’ in an auction catalogue of Autumn 1992, is of doubtful authenticity. It is not possible to offer further information as to its source. It reads: ‘J’écrivis à Nice le thème d’Harold et une partie de l’introduction mais pour orchestre et sans alto principal [Berlioz’s italics, if the letter is genuine]. C’est deux ans plus tard que, l’idée de mettre en évidence cet instrument m’ayant été suggéré par Paganini, je changais [sic] la disposition de ma partition pour donner à l’alto solo ce qui auparavant était à un cor anglais [Berlioz’s italics, if the letter is genuine].
21 Acknowledgements are due to Professor Hugh Macdonald for the information on the Scottish aspects of ‘borrowing’.
22 Kerry Murphy, *Hector Berlioz and the Development of French Criticism*, Ann Arbor and London 1988, p. 43. Ms. Murphy notes that 1830 is the year of Hugo’s *Hernani*, Stendahl’s *Le Rouge et noir* and Berlioz’s *Symphonie fantastique*: an appropriate year for Berlioz to choose to write about Romanticism.
23 *Le Correspondant*, October 22, 1830, pp. 110-12.
Not only does Berlioz’s version differ from Thomson’s, which is quoted below, but also there does not appear to be a Scottish tune called *We are Scots* nor any reason to connect *Scots wha’ hae* with Clan MacGregor. It could be, however, that the possible use he had in mind for the work, in conjunction with the stage play or ballet, caused Berlioz to include an overtly atmospheric theme:

![Musical notation]

There is another thematic connection which does not, strictly, come under the heading of borrowing, but which merits being mentioned. In a letter to Mme Le Sueur written in July, 1831, he transcribes a *ranz des vaches*, echoes of which one might choose to hear in *Rob-Roy*, as a musical thumbprint which permeates some of its themes. The follows extracts show the *Ranz des vaches* and the main themes from *Rob-Roy*:

---

24 The melody was already known in France from earlier times and can be found in *Vieilles chansons, vieux airs et vieilles marches de soldats de France*, ed. L. Chomel, 1911. This is cited in *Scotland’s Music*, John Purser, Edinburgh 1992, p. 63.

25 CG I, no. 233, p. 464. See also Cairns *Biog*, p. 453.
The *ranz des vaches* was later transposed and adapted for the last concert Berlioz organised for the journal *L’Europe Littéraire* on June 6, 1833, where it was called *Le Chasseur de chamois*. This is not the only musical connection Berlioz makes with Subiaco. The melody which Berlioz uses for the chorus ‘Bienheureux les matelots’ in *Benvenuto Cellini* (no. 26) is taken from a tune sung to Berlioz by a peasant who had befriended him during his stay in the mountains.  

**Instrumentation**

In addition to the standard orchestra of the time, Berlioz includes parts for cor anglais, harp and one piston trumpet, this last being as in *Waverley* (*q.v.*). Unlike the other overture scores, he does not specify the exact number of strings required, but this could have been an omission on the part of the copyist or because of carelessness or lack of interest in the *envoi* by Berlioz as his stay in the mountains.

26 NBE, volume 1a, p. XIV.
27 In both cases Berlioz uses only one piston trumpet, not the more usual pair.
Rome drew to a close. The trompette à pistons part is written for a three valve instrument, and uses the full range of notes theoretically available. The harp part, although exposed, is not as demanding technically as the parts written for the *Symphonie fantastique* some eighteen months previously. Unusually for Berlioz, the score does not specify four bassoons (which omission could have been the copyist’s error), neither is there writing in more than two parts at any point in the overture.

*Destroying the score*

On March 31, 1838 Berlioz wrote to Rellstab that *Rob-Roy* no longer existed and that he had destroyed it after hearing it at the Conservatoire. He writes in similar vein to Ferrand on September 20 of the same year. The comment in the *Memoirs* bears this out, where he describes the overture as ‘long and diffuse’ and ‘very badly received’ and says, as he did to Rellstab, that he destroyed it immediately after the concert.

Before examining reasons why Berlioz destroyed this overture, the matter of when he may have done this and what ‘destroying’ might mean needs to be clarified. It has been seen that when Berlioz talks about ‘destroying’ scores he is often referring to the parts, rather than everything connected with the work, the *Messe solennelle* being a prime example: such works could then be subject to self-borrowing, as mentioned above. *Rob-Roy* survives because it was kept at the Institute, in the form of a scribal copy, while other works were given away in the form of presentation scribal copies, like the Prix de Rome cantata, *La Mort d’Orphée* and the *Scène héroïque*. Berlioz was well-aware of where they were and, had he been determined to detroy these works completely, it is likely he would have found some way of so doing. Therefore, one has to balance the term ‘destroying’ between a literal and a figurative interpretation. This leaves the possibility that sources of *Rob-Roy*, probably in the form of parts, could be lost rather than destroyed.

---

28 See Chapter 2 for more on this subject.
29 CG II, no. 549, p. 432 and no. 570, p. 459. Previously Citron cites February 20, 1834 as the date upon which Berlioz destroyed the score of *Rob-Roy*, keeping the two extracts to be used in *Harold*. There is no letter of that date to confirm this, neither does Citron present any evidence to corroborate his statement.
31 HolBiog, p. 82 suggests that Berlioz undertook a major conflagration between 1846 and 1848.
32 This presents itself as a practical option when the circumstances surrounding the rehearsal of *La Mort d’Orphée* are considered. Did players keep parts between the last rehearsal and the performance, which was cancelled at the last minute because of the indisposition of Alexis Dupont? What happened is simply not known.
It does not seem that the question as to why Berlioz 'destroyed' the score, in whatever form that destroying might have been, has been explored fully. Neither the question as to why Berlioz submitted this overture as an *envoi* instead of *Le Roi Lear*, nor why he asked for it to be performed by the prestigous Société des Concerts seems to have been asked, particularly in view of the fact that *Le Roi Lear* is, as hindsight now dictates, the superior work. It seems that he must have thought well enough of *Rob-Roy* to request the performance, even if he did not feel inclined to submit his best work to the Institute. Had he viewed *Rob-Roy* as inferior to *Le Roi Lear*, he is hardly likely to have risked humiliation at the hands of the Société des Concerts by submitting the former for performance. Berlioz may have described the overture as 'long and diffuse' in the *Memoirs*, which were written fifteen years after its performance. In fact, it is no more diffuse than, for example, *Les Francs-juges* or *Le Roi Lear*, and is shorter than both of these and there is nothing from the period which tells how he felt about the work. Could it be that its bad reception was a greater disappointment to him than he acknowledged publicly and that he felt misjudged (again). Perhaps at the time Berlioz had thought *Rob-Roy* to be of equal quality to *Roi Lear*, but had offered it to the Société because he thought it the more suitable and congenial work for performance at that time. Given the climate of opinion towards him, one cannot dismiss the possibility that, had he submitted the overture *Roi Lear* as an *envoi*, it could have met the same fate as *Rob-Roy*.

**Conclusion**

This piece is 'more sinned against than sinning' and deserves more attention than currently it receives, although there are caveats to be considered. One is to honour Berlioz's wish that the work be deleted from his opus; the other is that since the two predominant themes are re-used, is there any point in referring to their original setting other than as a curiosity? On the other hand, *Rob-Roy* has undoubted charm and merit in its own right. The free structure, with its sudden pauses and tempo changes, does not present a problem and it retains verve and freshness when re-visited. While not a 'special pleading', this is an opportunity to present a different viewpoint and maybe on this occasion Berlioz's judgement was clouded with disappointment when he made his decision to destroy the piece. Nevertheless, whether seen as a curiosity or as a

---

33 HolBiog, p. 143.
34 Cairns suggests that Berlioz treats the episode of his rejection by Mme Moke as an *épisode puffon*, and was determined to play it down. CairnsBiog, p. 418. In the same way, it could be that Berlioz also reduced the significance of the rejection on *Rob-Roy* by playing it down in later years.
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piece in its own right, the scribal source has to be the basis of the edition, with reference to the *OBE* where appropriate.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{35} *OBE*, Volume IV.
CHAPTER 6: LE CARNAVAL ROMAIN:
OUVERTURE CARACTÉRISTIQUE 1

Genesis, composition and performance

The idea of a second overture based on material from the failed opera, Benvenuto Cellini,2 seems to have been in Berlioz’s mind by c. June, 1843. Nine morceaux détachés from the opera had been published as separate items in 1838.3 The overture Benvenuto Cellini followed in 1839, as did the nine extracts, this time as a complete set. The autograph full score of Le Carnaval romain, as Berlioz called this second overture, is lost, although an autograph fragment of 63 bars for the solo cor anglais part transposed for oboe is extant.4 There is also an autograph entry 56 bars long of the Mardi Gras theme in his German diary entitled, Souvenirs-Bêtises-Improvisations.5 Underneath he has written, ‘Thème d’All’ d’ouverture du Carnaval Romain, H. Berlioz Paris 18 juin 1843.’ At the very bottom of the page he has written, ‘Quand donc iron-s-nous ensemble voir danser les Transtèverins à la Villa Borghese ……… jamais?’6 (Ex. 1. For more on both these see Other sources) The theme as it appears in the notebook is not used in that exact continuous form in the overture, although all the material in the autograph appears in the overture at some point. For this overture Berlioz moulded the saltarello from the Mardi Gras and the strophe from Cellini’s aria in act I, ‘O Teresa, vous que j’aime plus que ma vie7 into what became one of his most popular works, which he conducted more times than the rest of his overtures put together. It is one of his most popular works, even more so, some say, than the Symphonie fantastique.

1 Author’s note. This thesis has been closely connected to the preparation of Volume 20 of the NBE, and for various reasons this overture was not initially included in those to be studied. By the time it was added, it was no longer possible to do the travelling to see all available sources and copies of first editions, as had been undertaken in respect of the other overtures.
2 September, 1838.
3 Advertised in the Gazette musicale, no. 44, November 4, 1838.
4 F-Pn ms 1170.
5 F-CSA, German diary, p. 23 and Cat. 93.
6 As transcribed by Glyn Court in his article, ‘Berlioz and Byron and Harold in Italy’, Music Review, 1956, p. 231. He suggests that the last word is ‘Marie’ instead of ‘jamais’.
7 NBE, 1a, pp. 218ff. and 1b, pp. 572ff: from the Trio in Tableau 1(no. 4) and the Carnaval romain (no. 12) from Benvenuto Cellini. See also under Self-borrowing for further details.
Ex. 1 Facsimile of autograph entry in German diary
It has been suggested that Berlioz wrote it because he had no new works for the forthcoming concert season, 1843-44, for which reason, '... he undertook in September [1843] the fashioning of a concert overture on the themes of Benvenuto Cellini', but it has not been possible to corroborate this with any primary evidence. The first six months of the year 1843, however, had been taken up with a long tour in Germany, after which his creative energy was at a low ebb, partly because of the continuing decline of his relationship with Harriet Smithson and partly because of the time taken up with writing articles about his travels for the Journal des Débats. He was also putting the finishing touches to the Treatise which was published in December 1843, but which had already appeared as a series of articles in La Revue et Gazette Musicale between November 21, 1841 (no. 60) and July 17, 1842 (no. 29). He writes:

Malheureusement je deviens plus en plus comme Gulliver à Lilliput, des milliers de liens imperceptibles s’unissent pour me retenir à la même place, je souffre par défaut d’air et d’espace, et je puis pas même composer! ...

Between Les Nuits d’été (1840-1) and La Damnation de Faust (1845-6), Berlioz spent a great deal of time travelling extensively, giving a large number of concerts, for which reason he wrote comparatively little. It could be, therefore, that the impetus for writing the overture Le Carnaval romain was the wish to renew the interest of Parisian audiences in him after his first prolonged absence abroad (apart from the time in Italy as winner of the Prix de Rome). The first mention of the work in a letter is from September 24, 1843, when Berlioz wrote to M. A J. Benacci-Peschier acknowledging his request for some prospectuses for the Traité d’Instrumentation, to be given to potential subscribers in Lyon, where he (Benacci) had a publishing business. After thanking him for his trouble, Berlioz tells him that currently he is writing an overture called Le Carnaval romain and indicates

---

8 HolBiog, p. 302.
9 CG III, no. 848, p. 115. See also CG III, no. 849, p. 117, to Lipinski.
10 Between September 1842 and May 1843 he gave 16 concerts abroad; from November 1843 to April 1845 he gave nine concerts in Paris; and between November 1845 and April 1846 he gave a further 17 concerts abroad.
that he would be very pleased for Benacci to publish the work that winter, after he has had the chance to hear it in one of his concerts.\textsuperscript{12}

It was not until January 1844, however, that the work was completed. Berlioz wrote to Schlesinger on January 10\textsuperscript{13} that he was on the point of finishing the overture, but the proofs of \textit{Le Cinq mai} were waiting to be corrected. By January 28, 1844, less than three weeks after the letter to Schlesinger, Berlioz wrote to Louis Schlösser, a fellow student from Le Sueur's classes at the Conservatoire in the 1820's, about the concert planned for February 3, to be held in the Salle Herz, the Salle du Conservatoire now being unavailable to him, which concert was to include the first performance of \textit{Le Carnaval romain}.\textsuperscript{14} The all-Berlioz programme was: Weber's \textit{Auferordnung zum Tanze} (arranged by Berlioz); \textit{Hélène} (in a new arrangement for male quartet and orchestra); the \textit{Chant sacré} (in a version for six Sax instruments); three excerpts from \textit{Romeo et Juliette}; the \textit{Marche des pèlerins} from \textit{Harold en Italie} and 'Absence' from \textit{Les Nuits d'été}, sung by his mistress, Marie Recio.\textsuperscript{15} Berlioz, who also conducted the concert, was worried because there was only to be one rehearsal for the new overture and - in the event - this was without a woodwind section. In the Memoirs he recounts the first performance, referring to Habeneck's shortcomings as a conductor because he had failed to catch the lively tempo of the saltarello in \textit{Cellini} in 1838. He remembers, however, that his new work was encored, despite the lack of rehearsal.\textsuperscript{16} It must have been a busy period for Berlioz, since there were several works which needed parts to be copied and checked, including the new overture.

\textsuperscript{12} This seems not to have happened, although the work was performed twice in Lyon during July, 1845. The only other letter Berlioz is known to have written to him was in October 1845, where he apologizes for not writing because he is about to travel to Germany. CG III, no. 997, p. 282.
\textsuperscript{13} CG III, no. 878, p. 137.
\textsuperscript{14} CG III, no. 881, p. 160.
\textsuperscript{15} These items can be found in \textit{NBE} vols 22b, 12a, bis, 18, 17 (forthcoming) and 13 respectively.
\textsuperscript{16} Mem, ch. 48, p.244. Hallé, it is thought, both exaggerates and misremembers when he recalls that Berlioz 'forgot' to rehearse the overture, because the concerto which he (Hallé) was playing (Beethoven no. 4 in G major) took a lot of rehearsal. He is confusing it with a concert in the Cirque Olimpique a year later (for which the listing in HolBio is the Emperor concerto). He is, however, in great admiration of Berlioz's conducting skills. C.E. and M. Hallé eds, \textit{Life and Letters of Sir Charles Hallé}, London 1896, R/1975, p. 68. David Cairns writes, 'It must be pointed out, in Habeneck's defence, that the music was originally written in 3/8, like a Beethoven scherzo, and only later notated in 6/8. Mem, p. 597.
It is not known if the first performance was given using the manuscript or printed score and parts, but from a timing point of view the former is assumed. There is some logic in using a performance as an opportunity to correct any errors before sending the score to the engraver’s.

The overture was favourably reviewed in Le Courrier by Amédée Achard on February 20, along with a detailed announcement of the forthcoming Traité d’instrumentation, even though this latter had probably appeared by this time.17 Maurice Bourges described the concert as ‘bon et beau’:

Une ouverture redemandée avec transport, et bissée à l’instant même, à la grande satisfaction de l’auditoire, n’est pas chose ordinaire; une composition magnifique a seule ce pouvoir d’entraînement; et certes je ne crains pas de qualifier ainsi l’ouverture du Carnaval romain.18

He continues with a lengthy description of the work, naming tempi, keys and instrumentation peppered with a endless variety of epithets, quoted in full here because it offers an interesting perspective of how critics at the Revue et Gazette Musicale saw their job as being one of educating their readers as much as criticising the music in their comptes rendus:

The overture in A major, is divided into three sections. The first, a very fast Allegro in 6/8, briefly states the energetic theme which later plays such a significant role. The second is an Andante in C major in 3/4. We notice with admiration the skilful variations in the presentation of delicious melody taken from the vocal trio of Benvenuto Cellini. Stated first by the cor anglais with a pizzicato off-beat accompaniment, then repeated in E major by the violas underneath a counter-melody in the first flute and clarinet, this noble theme appears in canon at the octave to surprisingly rich effect. The group of bassoons, cellos and violas, which state it together, is imitated at a beat’s distance by the violins, the flutes and the oboes together. The expansive and full wind writing, which floats in various patterns under this majestic theme, acquires a more piquant interest by the unusual rhythm and the carnival-like sonority of the two tambours de basque, cymbals, timpani and triangle. The third section, Allegro vivace in 6/8, begins muted with a phrase which is delicate, light, murmuring and mysteriously frisky in character. This section of the overture, written with such skilful use of wind instruments, contrasts well with the explosion of the fortissimo, which bursts out in E major. There is nothing warmer, more vigorous, more intoxicated than the second delirious,

17 Schonenberger, Paris, 1843.
18 Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris, no. 6, pp. 43-4, February 11, 1844.
wanton theme. There is nothing more amazing or more skilled than the way he treats it. The electric shock given by this outstanding idea grows in intensity after the development, where the two motifs of the Allegro are heard again and again, combined, contrasted with a hundred beauties of detail which cannot be included in such a brief analysis.  

The unsigned review in *Le Ménestrel* is equally enthusiastic, but in fewer words than the *Revue*.

Nous avons gardé pour le bouquet l’ouverture du *Carnaval romain* composé sur *Benvenuto Cellini*. Quelque admiration que nous professions pour la première ouverture portant le titre de cet opéra, nous sommes forcés de convenir que celle-ci le laisse bien loin en arrière, et l’auditoire partage sans doute notre avis, à en juger du moins par les braves frénétiques et les cris de *bis* mille fois répétés qui l’ont accueillie.

It received another performance on April 6 in the *Concert spirituel* for Palm Sunday at the Opéra-Comique also conducted by Berlioz. Thereafter, in addition to Berlioz’s plan to take it to Darmstadt with him for a second visit, which failed to materialise, the overture received a third performance that season, this time at the Théâtre Italien in a concert Berlioz put on jointly with Liszt, which Berlioz declared to be the best concert to take place in Paris for 10 years. Two other overtures by Berlioz, *Les Francs-juges* and *Waverley* were played (the only time Berlioz conducted *Waverley*), as were the *Symphonie fantastique*, both in full by the orchestra and the second movement, *Le Bal*, arranged and played by Liszt. Urhan was the soloist in *Harold en Italie* and Liszt played other virtuoso piano works by himself and Weber. Berlioz reviewed the concert himself, with a mixture of caricature of himself and praise where due:

---

19 As translated in Ellis*Criticism*, p. 224. She cites this as the best ‘antidote to the carping of anti-Berliozian critics’.

20 *Le Ménestrel*, no. 526, February 11, 1849. It is strange that Henri Maréchal writes as follows about another performance some twenty or so years later: ‘A cette époque, les concerts symphoniques du dimanche, avec leurs trois seules années d’existence, n’avaient pas encore déplacé l’axe. La musique dite de théâtre était donc la seule qui comptât en France. Chez Pasdeloup les vivants ne se risquaient qu’en tremblant! Le public se fâchait souvent tout de bon à leur égard, et j’entends encore l’ouverture de *Carnaval romain* huée et sifflée devant Berlioz lui-même, qui baissait la tête, le pauvre grand artiste, comme laisser passer le tempête!’ Le *Ménestrel*, 1906, p. 198.

21 CG III, no. 895, p. 175. The whereabouts of the autograph of this letter is unknown and the reference to *Le Carnaval romain* is in the introduction to the extract quoted by Tiersot in *Le Ménestrel*.

22 CG III, no. 902, p. 181.
Maintenons parlons de l’orchestre, de ce malheureux orchestre que M. Berlioz brise, tord, souffle, gonfle et crève de tant déplorables façons ... Je crois fermement que ce orchestre est le plus admirable qu’on puisse trouver en Europe ... M. Veny a joué avec un sentiment et un goût exquis le solo de cor anglais du Carnaval romain.23

Pixis arranged Le Carnaval romain for 8 hands on 2 pianos, which was also performed twice during this season, on April 1 and May 11 (1844), by Döhler, Hallé, Heller and Wolff.24 The overture was included in a concert given in Arras on August 26, 1844.25 At another performance in Vienna the following year, the allegro was taken at far too slow a tempo - much to Berlioz’s impatience - but he conducted there soon afterwards with much success.26 In fact the orchestral version was played at sixteen out of the nineteen concerts given by Berlioz from July 1845 until April 1846. He makes several references its success in 1853, particularly after a concert where it was played and then cheered by the players, who did not realise at first that Berlioz was present.27 It became traditional to perform Le Carnaval romain before Act II of Benvenuto Cellini for revivals of the opera in London (1852) and Weimar (1853), and as such draws inevitable parallels with Beethoven’s overtures for Fidelio. In Berlioz’s catalogue for 1859 it is listed as ‘destinée à être exécutée avant le second acte de cet opéra’.

Publication

There was little delay between Berlioz completing the overture and it going to the engraver’s. Not only is interesting to speculate when there was time for this autograph score and parts to be with the engravers at Maurice Schlesinger or his outworkers between the performances of February 3, April 6 and May 4, 1844, but also to notice that this is the only overture to have been published without revision. Waverley, Le Roi Lear, Les Francs-juges (although not

23 Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris, May 12, 1844, no. 19, p. 167. It continued to be well-received elsewhere, as in London, during Berlioz’s second season there. It was performed twice in February 1848 and announced in June of the same year (Musical World, June 27, 1848), as being ‘descriptive and suggestive [and] is alone worth the price of admission, were it only to hear its final cadence of original harmony’.
24 Acknowledgements to Professor Hugh Macdonald for this information.
25 Gosselin, p. 6.
26 Mem, ch. 56, p. 435-6. The orchestral performance in question was given on December 17, 1845. The last performance conducted by Berlioz was in St. Petersburg on December 14, 1867.
strictly conceived as a concert overture, it became one) and later, Le Corsaire, were all subjected to varying degrees of changes; but in the case of Le Carnaval romain Berlioz was sufficiently satisfied with the work from the first performance onwards not to feel that major revisions were necessary - and with complete justification. Returning to the question of publication, one would guess it was engraved between the first and second performances. The work was designated opus 9 and the score and parts, along with the four-hand version by Pixis were all advertised in La France Musicale on June 2 and 23, 1844 and in the Revue et Gazette Musicale on June 30, 1844. This latter also contained notice of Pixis's arrangement for eight hands at two pianos. The advertisement of June 2 gives the prices of 18 francs for the score and parts and 15 francs for the four-hand version, but no copies of these have ever been found. By June 30, the price for the score and parts was 24 francs each, the same as that seen on the extant copies; and that of the duet version 10 francs. It seems that these were the only prices at which the works were initially published. A letter to Griepenkerl written in July 1844 confirms the publication of at least the score.\footnote{CG III, no. 915, p. 193. See volume II for full details of printed editions.} There were two issues of this version, the later one having the metronome marks added.

There is not the same help given about the precise dating of the appearance of the German editions of the score and parts, but plate numbers and reference in correspondance suggest 1845.\footnote{CG III, no. 1009, p. 293. See also HopBib, no. 32 and Cat no. 95.} The AMZ did not, it seems, advertise the score until June 23, 1847; it could have been to promote a second issue of the overture, but there is no firm evidence to confirm this. Berlioz had given a performance of La Damnation de Faust in Berlin on June 19, his only visit to Germany that year. Perhaps the advertisement was so timed in the hope of boosting sales of his most frequently performed work. On the other hand, the four-hand version had already been advertised in Die Signale of July 1844. The reason for this happening before that of the score - again, not confirmed - could be commercial, since duet format was the one of the most common means of dissemination at that time.
Primary sources

Berlioz makes no mention of the fate of this autograph, as he did other works like the Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor, La Mort d'Orphée and the Messe Solennelle. Currently, therefore, it is not certain if the autograph score and parts (which latter could have been made by Berlioz's copyist, rather than Berlioz himself) are lost, destroyed, or a mixture of the two. The assumption made above, in the first section, that the manuscript material was used for the first performance leads to another assumption, namely that the printed score (P) was made from the autograph score and that the printed orchestral parts (PO) were made from the ms. parts. The latter seem to be reasonably accurate in relation to the printed full score, as comparison of the two printed sources shows. Many of the discrepancies which are to be found could have been caused by players making one or two additions to their ms. parts during rehearsal, which were then copied by the engravers without checking against the autograph score. As in the case of Waverley, the use of several different punches suggests that several engravers were involved in the preparation of the plates for the parts; for example, at least three styles of treble clefs and two of the C clef can be identified.

30 It has not been possible to check flute or oboe parts against the printed score; they were not on the microfilm available, neither has it been possible to check other microfilms. Their absence is not noted in Cat, so it is not clear if it was an oversight in the making of the film, or if the parts are missing. It seems, however, that the parts on the microfilm seen were from the set used for the concert in Bremen in 1853.
There is also evidence that Berlioz looked at least at two of the parts, although this does not necessarily mean that he checked them at the proof stage. On the cornet à pistons part it looks like his characteristic three-stroke $p$ at bar five, and at the bottom of the first page of the cello/bass part, Berlioz has written out the five bars which are over the page, to make for a better page turn, as follows:

![Musical notation](image)

**Secondary and other sources**

An assessment of the other sources, which are of varying importance and length is as follows:

**Autograph fragments:**

1) From the notebook (Ex. 1): this is clearly by Berlioz, and gives a good idea of the allegro thematic material he uses in *Le Carnaval romain* overture, but because the themes do not appear as in the score, it is not possible to include this fragment as a source for the edition.

2) The cor anglais part transposed for oboe (Ex. 2): again, clearly this is by Berlioz. It is not known at which performance there was no cor anglais, but since he praises the cor anglais player in the Paris performance of May, 1844, one possibility is that he prepared it out of necessity, while on tour. Comparison with the printed edition, shows some twelve or so minor variants, mostly in the slurring. Some possible reasons for the inconsistencies could be that Berlioz copied the markings carelessly, wrote from memory or copied from another source, possibly his autograph or PO. Because there is no certainty here, however, the source must be ignored as far as the edition is concerned.
Ex. 2: Cor anglais part, transposed for oboe, by Berlioz
Manuscript material: 1) First 60 bars of the viola part, held at Detmold: comparison with P and PO shows that this part was most likely copied from PO. At bars 43 and 46-7 the slurring and dynamics match those found in PO, not P.

2) First 69 bars of the oboe part, also held at Detmold (Ex. 3): this is more problematic than the viola part, because it has the transposed part for cor anglais incorporated in it, and so cannot be compared to directly to a printed source. This part begins as per oboe I in P and then follows the pattern of Berlioz’s transposed part from the point where the cor anglais part begins, and continues thus to the end of the fragment. It can be seen that this part has had other dynamics added, presumably by players at rehearsal. The one addition (bars 57-8 poco cres.), and two slur variants (bars 26-7 and 53-4), which are not in P suggest its source as being from elsewhere, although it does not appear to be directly from Berlioz’s transposition, since there are several minor differences including additions in bars 28-9, 32, 55 and 57.

3) Scribal copy of first six and last five bars of Le Carnaval romain arranged for wind band: this has the name of Mohr at the top of page 1, who was conductor of the Garde Impériale in Paris and was discovered after Cat was published. Mohr may be responsible for the wind band arrangement, which he certainly conducted on December 4, 1853, in a concert where it was played by a band founded by Sax. The second performance, given in honour of Sax on February 17, 1859, confirms Berlioz’s involvement, since he was present and gave a toast to ‘M. Mohr, a lively man, we drink to Mohr’, after the performance. It is not possible for this to have any bearing on the edition, but it casts an interesting light upon Berlioz’s attitude to such arrangements, since he had also arranged his Scène héroïque for wind band some twenty-six or so years earlier.

Scribal copies of full score: 1) Only the opening 16 bars (2 pp) of full score, held at Detmold were seen (hereafter Detmold): the copy could have been made from the first issue of P, since, like it, it lacks the metronome mark. This is by no

31 All music for Le Carnaval romain by the copyists in Detmold is held under D-brd-DT Mus. n 352. It has not been possible to look at all the Detmold material, but it did not seem appropriate to ignore what has been seen. See Cat p. 255 for full listing of the Detmold holding.
32 D-brd-B Mus. ms 1550. Much of the information in this section has been taken from David Whitwell, ‘An unknown Berlioz band fragment’, Winds, 1990. See also CG IV, p.259n and CG V, p.164n.
Ex. 3: Oboe part from Delmold
means certain, however, because the order of the instruments down the page is different from \( P \), which would make copying tedious. Also, but less significant, they are named differently from \( P \), using a mixture of Italian and French (see below). Apart from the omission of the metronome mark, however, there is only one variant which is where the trill sign for violin II at bars 9-13 is missing in Detmold. (It could be that Detmold was taken from the later version of \( P \), and the metronome mark omitted in error.) The extract is too short to draw an overall conclusion as to its accuracy. It is interesting, however, to consider why and how this score came to exist in this format.

2) Copy of complete score belonging to Dr Paul Banks (hereafter Banks): came to light since publication of \( \text{Cat. 33} \). It is signed at the top ‘Carl O [?] Hamilton’, and is in oblong format, 18 staves and 68pp. There are some similarities in copying style to the \( \text{Waverley} \) and \( \text{Carnaval romain} \) Detmold parts, which suggest that it is of German origin. Like the Detmold copy, the listing of the instruments is different from that in \( P \), but it is also different again from the Detmold copy (Ex. 4). In relation to \( P \) and \( \text{PO} \), there are differences between Banks and \( P \) which suggest \( \text{PO} \) closer to \( \text{PO} \). At bar 76, for example, like \( \text{PO} \), it lacks a note for violins I, violas and ‘cellos, which is in \( P \).

It would be interesting to know whether, along with the metronome marking, these notes were also missing from the first issue of the score, or not. Also at bar 77 the demi-semi-quaver upbeat in \( P \), seen in violas and ‘cellos, is written as a semi-quaver triplet in \( \text{PO} \) and Banks. Perhaps the most interesting differences which pull this copy closer to \( \text{PO} \) than \( P \) are as follows: at bar 121, \( P \) has the instruction ‘Otez les Sourdines’ for the upper four string parts. In \( \text{PO} \) that for violin 2 is ‘sans sourdines’ and it is reflected this way in Banks, where the instruction has also, logically, been moved forward a bar (Ex. 5). Another example shows that at bar 438, (violin 2) and 439 (viola), the Banks copy follows the notes as is \( \text{PO} \), not those in \( P \) and there are other places showing how Banks could come from \( \text{PO} \). If Banks was made from a set of printed parts, it

\[ \text{Dr Banks bought the copy from an Antiquarian Book Dealer in South London; he has no further information on the provenance of this copy. It would be interesting to know whether or not it was connected with the score of \text{Roi Lear} held at Lübeck.} \]
Ex. 4: Comparison of listings in Banks, Detmold & P
Ex. 5 Showing Banks or P0 differ from P
must have been a very difficult copy to make, even for an expert. It is outside the scope of this study to pursue questions about this copy any further.

Out of curiosity and for completeness, below is a comparison of the instrument listings of the two copy scores listed above. They are all in Italian unless marked ‘F’ (French) or ‘G’ (German).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed score</th>
<th>Detmold</th>
<th>Banks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;er&lt;/sup&gt; Flûte</td>
<td>Flauti</td>
<td>Flauti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;me&lt;/sup&gt; Flûte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;er&lt;/sup&gt; et 2&lt;sup&gt;me&lt;/sup&gt; hautbois et Cor anglais</td>
<td>Oboi (Cor anglais (F))</td>
<td>Oboi et Cor anglais (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;re&lt;/sup&gt; et 2&lt;sup&gt;me&lt;/sup&gt; Clarinets en La</td>
<td>Clarinetti in A</td>
<td>Clarinetti in A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;er&lt;/sup&gt; et 2&lt;sup&gt;me&lt;/sup&gt; Cors en UT</td>
<td>Corni, I, II in C</td>
<td>Corni in C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;me&lt;/sup&gt; et 4&lt;sup&gt;me&lt;/sup&gt; Cors en MI#*</td>
<td>Corni III, IV in E</td>
<td>Corni in E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quatre bassons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;er&lt;/sup&gt; et 2&lt;sup&gt;me&lt;/sup&gt; Trompettes en RÈ</td>
<td>Cornets à pistons in A (F)</td>
<td>Cornets à pistons in A (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornets à Pistons en LA</td>
<td>Trombi in D**</td>
<td>Trombi in D**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;er&lt;/sup&gt; Trombone</td>
<td>3 Tromboni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;me&lt;/sup&gt; et 3&lt;sup&gt;me&lt;/sup&gt; Trombones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cymbales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tambours de basque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbales LA MI</td>
<td>Timpani in E, A</td>
<td>Timpan (sic) in E, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Tambours de basque</td>
<td>Deux Tambour (sic) de Basque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triangulo</td>
<td>Triangel (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr. Casse***(F)</td>
<td>Cymbales (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piatti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trombone Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tromb. Tenor et Bass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Detmold and Banks the strings are labelled in the usual manner, in Italian. In P they are in French, with the minimum numbers required.

* '#’ is incorrect.
** Incorrect Italian plural: should be ‘Trombe’.
*** Error; bass drum not used in Le Carnaval romain; maybe it was a discretionary addition.

**Printed edition: OBE:** In the very short preface the printed first edition is cited as the source for the edition and is followed by a short paragraph quoted here in full:

In the absence of the autograph, which seems to have disappeared long ago, it is impossible to reproduce the variations and transformations which this work possibly underwent, before it received its present form. The
French edition, however, was correct, and as such, it could be relied upon in every respect.\textsuperscript{34}

Finally, the string specification is listed. In fact, the OBE has failed to follow the first edition with consistent care and attention to details of slurring and dynamics and is therefore not considered as a source for this edition.

\textit{Self-borrowing}

This work, along with the opera from which it is derived, has been found to contain material from the \textit{Messe solennelle}, the score of which was re-discovered in 1992. With respect to \textit{Le Carnaval romain}, the Carnival theme, now 6/8/not 3/8/, is lifted from its original setting to the words, 'Laudamus te, benedicimus te' (bar 63 of Gloria, \textit{NBE}, volume 23, p. 50). The opening 8 bars of the overture are based on another passage from the Mass not used in \textit{Benvenuto Cellini} (\textit{NBE} 23, p, 66). Bar nine of the melody for cor anglais, taken from Cellini's air, was heard originally in the Prix de Rome cantata, \textit{Cléopâtre} (\textit{NBE}, volume 6, bars 93-95, and throughout the cantata).

\textit{Dedication}

The overture was dedicated to Friedrich-Wilhelm-Constantin, Prince Hohenzollern-Hechingen (1801-1869), whom Berlioz had met at Hechingen earlier in 1843, while he was travelling in Germany. He gave a concert there on January 2, 1843 after some skilful adaptation of parts, like pencilling missing horns parts into the violas during five rehearsals in three days.\textsuperscript{35} The Prince himself stood over the timpanist to ensure he counted his rests correctly. Berlioz writes most warmly and not without humour about his short visit.\textsuperscript{36} The Prince moved to Löwenberg, Silesia and invited Berlioz there in 1863, where \textit{Le Carnaval romain} was performed as part of a concert of Berlioz's works. Dr Banks has suggested the possibility that the Prince may have been given the autograph, although Berlioz seems to have been in the habit of giving his autographs away with less concern.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{34} OBE, XI, p. 139.
\textsuperscript{35} The programme included \textit{Le Roi Lear}, movements from \textit{Harold} and the \textit{Symphonie fantastique} and \textit{Le Jeune Pâtre breton}.
\textsuperscript{36} Mem, 2nd letter to Narcisse Girard, pp. 279-82.
about the dedicatee (see, for example, *Waverley* and the *Messe solennelle*), than the thought given to the person who was honoured in the published edition. The Prince’s obvious interest in Berlioz and his music, however, presents a valid opportunity for an exception.

*Instrumentation*

*Hautbois and Cor anglais*: There are three factors to discuss here with reference to the exact instrumentation required by Berlioz. First, in a letter he wrote to Hogarth, the secretary of the Royal Philharmonic Society in London, he states that the cor anglais solo does not require a special player, but that it should be taken by the first oboist.\(^{37}\) Second, however, the score is ambiguous in this respect. The listing at the beginning has ‘1\(^{e}\) et 2\(^{me}\) Hautbois et cor anglais’ without specifying which oboe should play the cor anglais. Where the score states ‘Prenez le Cor anglais’ at bar 19, there are only two bars rest, making the change of instrument possible but inconvenient, and with no room for any mishap. Thus it seems that he sanctions a third player, even though all three are never used at the same time. The third factor is that from a musical point of view, to cut short the first oboe player’s note just before the fermata is to deprive the harmony of the third of the chord (G\#) being heard in the treble, the only third apart from that being played by bassoons I and II. The existence of the cor anglais part transposed for oboe in Berlioz’s hand implies that oboe was an acceptable alternative in the absence of a cor anglais.

*Bassons*: The score specifies four bassoons, although they never play in more than two parts.

*Conclusion*

In the absence of substantial autograph sources to this overture, there are only printed sources from which to choose for the edition. The evidence that several people were involved in the preparation of the parts and the likelihood that the inconsistencies therein were produced by markings added by players in rehearsal renders PO unsuitable as the main source. This leaves the printed first edition score as the basis of this edition.

---

\(^{37}\) *CG* IV, no. 1567, p. 281.
CHAPTER 7: OUVERTURE DU CORSAIRE

Genesis I: La Tour de Nice

It used to be thought, as proposed by Barzun, that Le Corsaire was drafted during Berlioz’s first stay in Nice in 1831;\(^1\) Holoman suggests differently, assigning it to the second visit there in 1844, ‘one of the few substantial works between Roméo et Juliette and Faust’:\(^2\) Barzun mentions that Berlioz was inspired to compose this overture by his admiration for Byron’s poetry and, indeed, it is known that Berlioz was reading the French translation of Byron’s Le Corsaire in 1831.\(^3\) This Byronic connection is also mentioned by Citron, who writes in connection with Berlioz’s first visit to Nice, ‘Byron est sans doute un de ceux à qui Berlioz pensera en écrivant son ouverture du Corsaire’.\(^4\) Berlioz also mentions Byron when writing about travelling in a letter to his family in August 1831, to his grandfather in September, and to Ferrand in March 1832.\(^5\) In addition to this Byronic connection, however, the first two titles for the work, Ouverture de la Tour de Nice (now crossed out) and Ouverture du Corsaire rouge (rouge now crossed out)- to be found on the (second) title page of the autograph (Ex. 1) - indicate that there were other associations, emanating from his visit(s) to Nice and from James Fenimore Cooper (1789-1851), referred to as ‘le Scott américain’. He had lived in Paris, was a long-standing favourite of Berlioz and was very popular generally, sending scripts to his publishers for translation into French so that they could appear simultaneously with the English version. Berlioz had written to Nanci in 1827 about La Prairie:

...je l’ai dévoré incontinent, et arrivé au dénouement à sept heures du soir, j’étais encore à 11 heures pleurant sur le piédestal d’une colonne du Panthéon.\(^6\)

It is clear that Berlioz was well-acquainted with both these writers by the time he visited Nice for the first time in 1831, when he wrote the overture Roi Lear and drafted the Intrata di Rob-Roy MacGregor.\(^7\) In this respect, therefore, Le Corsaire

---

1 Barzun Rom II, 49-50n.
2 HolBiog, p. 312.
3 Cat, p. 262, where Holoman also asserts that there is no evidence for Berlioz having composed Le Corsaire at this time. See also Mem ch. 36 and R.M, January 16, 1840.
4 CG I, no. 148, p. 293, n. 3.
5 CG I, nos 238, 240 and 267, pp. 479, 485 and 543 respectively.
6 CG I, no. 75, p. 156.
7 See Chapter 4: Le Roi Lear for details of the earlier visit.
could also have been conceived during that period. When Berlioz returned there for a recuperative holiday in 1844, however, it is equally possible that the association of the Martello tower in which he was staying may have triggered the idea of an overture, in combination with the fact that in one of Cooper’s novels, *The Red Rover*, called in France *Le Corsaire rouge* (1828) and which Berlioz undoubtedly would have read, there is a tower on a rocky coastline which is of importance to the story. As with the other overtures studied in this thesis, the circumstances surrounding the composition of *Le Corsaire* make an important contribution to the overall picture surrounding the work, but do not necessarily affect decisions concerning the sources to be used for the edition. So it is in this case: exactly when Berlioz drafted and/or composed *La Tour de Nice* does not affect any decisions about the sources to be used for the edition.

**Composition and performance of La Tour de Nice**

For his second visit, Berlioz spent more than a month in Nice and its environs, from late August to October 1844, recuperating from jaundice (diagnosed as typhoid by Berlioz’s former teacher from medical school, Jean-Zuléma Amussat), brought on by physical and emotional exhaustion. The former was a result of the intense labour required to organize and conduct the concert involving over 1,000 performers, which took place in the Cirque Olympique pour l’Exposition des Produits de l’Industrie on August 1, 1844, after the Exhibition of Industrial Products; and the latter because of the continuing deterioration of his marriage to Harriet Smithson. A letter of August 24, 1844 to his sister Nanci tells how he has had to resort to sleeping in a room away from his home, to escape the constant barrage of complaint from Harriet. He was, he writes, expecting to travel to Germany (to give some concerts) the following Wednesday.

---

9 Holoman describes May-October 1844 as the nadir of Berlioz’s relationship with Harriet. HolBiog, p. 307.
10 CG III, no. 920, p. 199.
In fact, as the Memoirs tell,\textsuperscript{11} he went south to Nice, which was now Sardinian, not Italian as it had been when Berlioz stayed there thirteen years before. The room in which he had written his overture \textit{Roi Lear} in 1831 was now occupied by an English family, so he lodged further up, in the Martello tower perched over the Ponchettes rock. There are no letters extant from the time he was in Nice, although there is evidence that he wrote once to Harriet,\textsuperscript{12} and only nine have been found from the period between his return to Paris and the end of the year (1844). He had passed the time revisiting old haunts and swimming, but does not mention composing in any of these letters, except to tell Nanci on November 5, that he had written a new overture for his next concert series, presumably \textit{La Tour de Nice}:

\begin{quote}
Je n'ai pas pu ces jours-ci te répondre, n'ayant réellement pas eu un instant pour rester seul avec moi-même. J'ai eu des articles à faire, une foule de morceaux de musique à composer et je suis loin d'avoir fini. J'ai fait une grande ouverture pour mes prochains concerts, j'écris la musique indiquée par Shakespeare pour \textit{Hamlet} dont on monte à l'Odéon une traduction en vers de Léon Wailly. Je dois avant quinze-jours avoir terminé un petit recueil de morceaux pour l'orgue-mélodium, qui m'ont été demandés par le facteur de ce nouvel instrument... En même temps j'ai eu à courir pour chercher un appartement, à monter peu à peu le personnel de mes concerts du cirque etc.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

The overture received its one and only performance with the title \textit{La Tour de Nice} on January 19, 1845 in a concert conducted by Berlioz and announced in \textit{L'Artiste} as the 'première grande fête musicale au Cirque des Champs Elysées'. It was also announced in \textit{La Presse}, \textit{La Sylphide}, \textit{Le Monde Musical}, \textit{Revue et Gazette Musicale de Paris}, \textit{Le Tintamarre}\textsuperscript{14} and \textit{La France Littéraire}. The programme included excerpts from the Requiem, the \textit{Carnaval romain} overture and other works not by Berlioz. It was reviewed in \textit{La Sylphide} (January 21), \textit{Le Tintamarre} (January 26) and \textit{L'Avant-Scène} (January 20) without mention of \textit{La Tour de Nice}. Both \textit{Le Monde Musical} (January 30) signed A.M. (Auguste Morel), and the \textit{Revue et Gazette Musicale} (January 26) by Maurice Bourges, however, refer to it, Bourges

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11} \textit{Mem} ch. 53, p. 364.
\item \textsuperscript{12} \textit{CG III}, no. 921D, p.200.
\item \textsuperscript{13} \textit{CG III}, no. 924, p. 203. Of the remaining eight letters, one is an apology for not writing while away, five are formal letters about the forthcoming concert series, one is to his sister Adèle and the other, a second letter to Nanci.
\item \textsuperscript{14} \textit{CG III}, no. 937, p. 223.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
stating that the work was written ‘pendant son dernier voyage dans le Midi’ and that it was ‘trop confusément exécutée’ and Morel saying that one hearing is not sufficient upon which to make a serious judgement. The reviewer in Le Ménestrel (January 26), agreed: ‘La nouvelle ouverture de La Tour de Nice n’a pas été aussi heureuse...’ 15 Gautier in La Presse (January 20) devotes four paragraphs to the concert, praising La Tour de Nice and exhorting the public to support Berlioz in this series of concerts. It was also reviewed in the AMZ, but with emphasis on the Requiem. 16

*Genesis II: from La Tour de Nice to Le Corsaire by way of Le Corsaire rouge*

Although an inventory of works found in a pocket book belonging to Berlioz and dating from 1845 17 lists his last overture as Tour de Nice (sic), by October 1846 it is listed in the Labitte catalogue as no. 28, Le Corsaire rouge, where it also says that the work has not been performed. During this period (between the date of the pocket book, 1845, and October 1846, when the Labitte catalogue appeared), it is assumed that the overture was revised but the revisions had yet to be heard. 18 There is no mention of anything to do with the revisions, however, in any letters up to the appearance of the Labitte catalogue; they are preoccupied with the composition of La Damnation de Faust, revising and publishing Roméo et Juliette, revising the Requiem and all this while pursuing a hectic schedule of concert-giving with its accompanying social activities during his travels to Marseille and Lyon (June, July 1845), Bonn (August 1845 as a journalist) and Vienna, Prague etc. (October 1845-May 1846). Upon his return to

15 January 26, 1845.
16 AMZ, March 1845, vol. 47, column 167. The comments about the Requiem are worth recording here as an indication of what the German journals chose to include about Berlioz. The report quotes Charivari: ‘We advise an alteration of this instrumental army’s battle order. The brass, for instance, is placed on the flanks, at four different points. As a result their attack is not co-ordinated. If this disposition of the army is retained, then General Berlioz must at least have adjutants at his side who can relay his commands to the respective outposts on horseback.’ Acknowledgements are due to Dr John Warrack for the translation.
17 F-CSA.
18 The Labitte catalogue appeared in the back of the libretto for La Damnation de Faust and is so-called because Labitte were the publishers of the libretto. Cairns writes: ‘Berlioz wrote the first draft of the Corsair overture; he performed it the following January [1845] under the title of La Tour de Nice, and then set it aside for two years.’ Mem ch. 53, p. 364. It is not clear why Cairns says it was set aside for two years, when it was, in fact, revised within two years.

*CG II, p. 220n.*
Paris he was composing the *Chant des chemins de fer* (June 1846), writing the usual reviews, revising the Requiem in August, and completing *La Damnation de Faust*, whose libretto appeared in October, prior to the first performance in December (all 1846).

That *La Tour de Nice* had been revised by the time the title was changed to *Le Corsaire rouge*, i.e. by October 1846, is confirmed by the existence of a complete set of orchestral parts (hereafter R), with this second title in Rocquement’s hand.¹⁹ Only two passing comments from the letters between the performance of *La Tour de Nice* and the appearance of the Labitte catalogue can offer ideas as to when the revisions were made and this set of parts prepared. In March 1845 there is a letter from Berlioz to Rocquemont, his copyist, telling him simply to stop copying because the concert has been cancelled.²⁰ There are no other details about this projected event, but it is possible that R was among the items being copied at that time, suggesting that Berlioz had revised the work soon after its only performance as *La Tour de Nice*. He would neither go to the trouble of revising music nor arrange for a set of parts to be copied without a performance in mind, so it is possible that the revised overture was to have been a part of the unknown, cancelled event. The other suggestion comes from later during this period, in September 1845, when he writes to George Hainl, who had done so much to make his visit to Lyon successful, that currently he is working on two pieces.²¹ Citron suggests in his footnote to the letter that these are the *Marche d’Isly* and *La Damnation de Faust*. This latter is unlikely since he did not start work on *Faust* until he started travelling in October 1845, but it is possible that he had wanted to take new works with him and one of the pieces being worked on could have been *La Tour de Nice*, renamed *Le Corsaire rouge*.

Berlioz might also have considered publication of *Le Corsaire rouge* in the aftermath of the failure of *Faust*, a year or so later (end 1846-early 1847) in order to restore his reputation by performing a ‘new’ work. As had happened before,

---

¹⁹ F-Pn D 17534. Discussed below.
²⁰ CG III, no. 954, p. 238.
²¹ CG III, no. 996, p. 281.
however, plans changed and travelling and then politics became more important. He left for what was a successful visit to St. Petersburg in mid-February 1847 and upon his return in July was almost immediately taken up with the possibility of a post at the Opéra, which ultimately he declined. Thereafter, the overture, unperformed since January 1845, remained that way until March 1851, by which time the title had been changed again to Ouverture du Corsaire, as seen in the list of compositions which Berlioz submitted to the Institute in support of his application for the vacant chair.\textsuperscript{22} It is possible that soon after this time Berlioz did whatever last minute tidying up of the score was needed prior to publication, as the letter written in January 1852 to Général Alexey Fyodorvich Lvov suggests:

\begin{quote}
J’ai fini l’an dernier trois partitions nouvelles, et à l’heure qu’il est, je n’ai pas pu trouver l’occasion d’en entendre une note, et pas un éditeur n’a osé les publier.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

It is difficult to identify to which three works Berlioz is referring: certainly Le Corsaire was a work which he had not heard in its final form, but for the others, it is possible that he either made an error or exaggerated.

\textit{Revisions: from La Tour de Nice to Le Corsaire, by way of Le Corsaire rouge}

At this point it is necessary to turn to the autograph sources of which there are two, namely, the complete autograph (A) and a fragment (AF).\textsuperscript{24} The fragment is 67 bars long written on three folios of sixteen stave oblong format paper. The complete autograph is written on 78 numbered pages of the same size paper as the fragment. It is clearly the working document, subjected to a host of revisions by Berlioz with some of the changes and occasional additions in Rocquemont’s hand. One of the most striking and significant features of the autograph is the fact that Berlioz uses three types of C-clef such as Holoman

\textsuperscript{22} CG IV, no. 1389, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{23} CG IV, no. 1443, p. 104 and n. See also CG III, no. 1344, p. 733; CG IV, no. 1725, p. 498.
\textsuperscript{24} F-Pn ms 1159 and F-Pc ms 1519.
describes in *HolCreative*, (Ex. 2), in which he assigns them to approximate periods in Berlioz's composing life as follows.²⁵

Type 2, although assigned mainly to the early 1840's, was the style also used by Berlioz in the autograph of *Waverley* (1827). A curious occurrence is when types 1 and 2 occur not only one on each side of the same folio, recto and verso, but also both on the same side of a page (Ex. 3). The following table shows the use of the different C-clefs throughout the autograph; one asterisk indicates that clef types 1 and 2 appear on different sides of the same folio and two asterisks that they appear on the same side of a folio in that section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar nos.</th>
<th>Clef type</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Followed by 4 crossed out bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-171</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>Rocquemont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172-89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clef 2 at bar 169 on same side of folio as clef 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-8</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>200-218 are on one folio, with a different clef on each side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209-18</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219-27</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>219-237: as for 200-218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228-66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is a crossed out bar between 258-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284-88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Under 267-272 there is a 7-bar long discarded passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289-316</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>Between 283-4 is a discarded bar using 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317-24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>These bars stuck on to page after the first crossed out bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324-48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>289-93 is a collette, with 2 crossed out bars before 289; clef 2 on same side of folio as clef 1 at 290, 294 (Ex. 3) and 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349-65</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>317-24 is a collette under which are 8 bars using clefs 1 and 2 on same side of folio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁵ *HolCreative* pp. 81 and 105.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar nos.</th>
<th>Clef type</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>366-79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rocquemont; 366-9 is a collette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380-424</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 crossed out bars (1 complete side), between 424-5, including evidence of reprise of what was originally a Largo in triple time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425-46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 crossed out bars between 425-6; 11 crossed out bars between 446-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447-8</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>As for 200-218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449-54</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>6 crossed out bars between 454-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455-63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other signs of revisions are several groups of crossed out bars which have C-clefs 1 and 2, indicating rejected material (between bars 266 and 267 for type 1 and 258 and 259 for type 2); whole page collettes (bars 84-93; 190-199; and 366-379), which have been prepared by Rocquemont; and passages by Berlioz of several pages in length using clef type 3 (see table above), as well as additions and corrections throughout in the form of accidentals, dynamic markings, altered passages and other instructions. The AF is written using clef type 2 with the exception of one appearance of type 1 on folio 2r. There are signs of pencil working in the woodwind and Rocquemont has written the heading ‘Ouverture du Corsaire Rouge Autograph de Berlioz’ (Ex. 4). Close examination of A and AF reveals distinctly different ink types on the pages which use C-clef types 1 and 2. This, along with the way in which the barlines down the pages of both documents are broken up, suggest strongly that the pages were completed in stages.

The first layer of A constituted a skeleton of music, sometimes only one line, sometimes only one set of instruments (wind, brass, strings), with only the necessary clefs being filled in. Where this involved a C-clef, it was type 1 that was used. Thereafter Berlioz completed this skeleton, which also entailed the completing of the clefs on the hitherto incomplete pages. When this stage required a C-clef, he used type 2. An example of how the music evolved on the page can be seen on page 1 of A. The clefs for the strings were written at a different time from the rest of the instruments. Bar 1 began life with only the quaver figure in the violins, the initial crotchets being added at a later stage, or - more likely - two later stages, the wind first and the pizzicato lower strings later.
Ex. 4 Page of autograph fragment of *Le Corsaire* showing clef type 2, with Rocquemont's hand at the top
on. Such differences can be traced throughout the pages which use clef types 1 and 2.

Barring two exceptions, the result of these two ‘sessions’, no matter how close or how far apart in time they may have been, was *La Tour de Nice*. The exceptions, which both use clef type 1, are the sections which cannot be accounted for in the violin 1 part prepared by Rocquemont for *La Tour de Nice*. They are the passages between bars 266 and 267 of *Le Corsaire*, and three bars in 3/4 time and labelled *Largo* just before bar 425 (Ex. 4a and 4b). It would seem from the second one that Berlioz had thought to bring back the slow theme first heard at bar 26 of *La Tour*. Equally puzzling is the rest of the passage between bars 266 and 267, which remains in draft form, with only the violin part completed. What happened to the rest of the score for those bars? These passages suggest that Berlioz rejected material between the initial drafting and completion stages, before *La Tour* was given its only performance.

Although the music using types 1 and 2 has been subject to adjustments, all the major revisions that were made afterwards, which included work on the peroration - also troublesome in *Waverley* and *Le Roi Lear* - used clef type 3. Thus, it is clear that there was only one substantial set of revisions to the work and they were done between the first performance as *La Tour* and the appearance of the Labitte catalogue in October 1846, when the title was *Le Corsaire rouge*. This is supported by the evidence clearly seen in the set of parts prepared by Rocquemont. The title pages of the set confirm that the change from the *Le Corsaire rouge* to *Le Corsaire* was in title only. For example, on violin I part no. 9, the only part which survives from the set made for the performance of the work as *La Tour de Nice*, it is possible to see where the words *La Tour de Nice* have been erased and *Le Corsaire rouge* written over them, and although the music is that for the overture *Le Corsaire*, the word *rouge* has not been deleted or crossed out (Ex. 5). The following list shows which copies were given the new title, *Le Corsaire*, and which retained that of *Le Corsaire rouge*, even though all the music contained therein belongs to the overture *Le Corsaire*.
**Ex. 4a:** Rejected draft between bars 266 and 267
Ex. 46: Rejected draft between bars 424 & 425.
Ex. 5
Title page of violin part for *La Tour de Nice* prepared by Rocquemont. On the original it is possible to see where *La Tour de Nice* has been erased.
As can be seen, only one of each string part had its name changed and, on closer examination, it can be seen that these were the parts which was used by the engraver. More of this will be discussed below. The overtures Waverley and Roi Lear have autographs showing revisions, supported by reported performances at which Berlioz heard the results of revisions before deciding to publish. In contrast, Le Corsaire is exceptional among the concert overtures, because evidence currently available shows that it was published before Berlioz heard the results of his revisions. It is possible that he dropped rouge from the title to avoid too specific a connection between the overture and Cooper’s novel, but was happy to retain the seafaring link suggested by the final title.

An added hindrance to understanding fully the revisions Berlioz made to this work is the modern binding of the autograph, which makes it impossible to ascertain the gatherings or to match accurately the holes for the string or ribbon by which means the autograph was originally held together. Also many pages have traces of glue spots in a variety of colours, the matching of which could also help to produce a more accurate piecing together of the layers than is possible at present.

---

26 CG IV, no. 1725, p. 498.
27 It seems that Berlioz did not feel constrained to keep Cooper’s title as a tribute after his death in 1851.
28 Between July 1995 and April 1996 the autograph was rebound without any opportunity to see its gatherings and fascicle structure being provided and such examination now is an impossibility.
Publication and dedication of Le Corsaire

In March 1852, Richault published a broadsheet entitled \textit{Œuvres complètes de Hector Berlioz}, which also appeared in the \textit{Monthly Record} of the London Musical Union at around the same time. Both the score and parts of \textit{Le Corsaire} (along with a four-hand version by an unnamed arranger, of which no copy has yet been found), are mentioned in the catalogue, which Berlioz mentions in a letter to Liszt from April 1852,\footnote{CG IV, no. 1471, p. 138.} remarking that the list also includes \textit{Tristia} and the \textit{Te Deum},\footnote{NBE vols 12 and 10 respectively. Could these be the works to which Berlioz was referring in his letter to Lvov (see under \textit{Genesis II}?} none of which he (Berlioz), has heard: at the same time \textit{L'Enfance du Christ}\footnote{NBE vol. 11.} has also been sold to Richault.\footnote{CG IV, no. 1510, p. 201.} All this is only of passing interest: Berlioz is more concerned that Joachim is not able to play for his forthcoming concerts. In August, Berlioz was able to send the score of \textit{Le Corsaire} to Liszt\footnote{CG IV, no. 1514, p. 205.} and in September he wrote to J. W. Davison:

Richault vient de publier une nouvelle ouverture que j'ai pris la liberté de te dédier. Je te l'envoie.\footnote{CG IV, no. 1514, p. 205.}

Berlioz met James William Davison (1813-1885), who was chief editor of the \textit{Musical World} and music critic of \textit{The Times}, in London and he was one of only three non-relatives that Berlioz addressed as 'tu' (from 1852) in later life, the others being Liszt and d'Ortigue. It is apparent from their correspondence that they regarded each other in both high esteem and deep affection.

The printed copy of \textit{Le Corsaire}, held in F-Pn, Rés. 2572, shows corrections by Berlioz which are reflected in copies listed in \textit{Cat} as belonging to the same imprint. Ex. 6 shows where a semibreve has been changed into a dotted minim and a crotchet rest added in the wind parts. Four copies have been seen which show this in printed form (GB-Lbl Hirsch; GB-Lcm; US-BA-pi and US-Bp). The changes Berlioz made to the cello part at bars 150 and 275 can be seen in printed form in F-Pn Ac e\textsuperscript{10} 1086. In Ex. 7 a crotchet has been added to bassoons, horns, cornets à pistons and trombones in a hand which is not Berlioz's. The autograph

\footnote{The contract for \textit{Le Corsaire} was signed on Feb. 25, 1852. Archives \textit{Estallat}, Paris.}
Ex. 6  Autograph corrections in printed score of *Le Corsaire* (last bar).
Ex. 7 Non-autograph corrections in printed score of Le Corsaire (4th bar).
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shows that these notes were the original thought - they are underneath the 
crossing out at that point - but it is not clear why they are added to the printed 
score, nor by whom. These changes (non-Berlioz) are not reflected in later 
variants of the published score, while those in his hand are. The orchestral parts 
appeared at the same time as the score and show an advance in engraving 
techniques: it is no longer possible to see different punches being used, as was a 
feature of Waverley, Le Roi Lear and Le Carnaval romain. The set held at F-Psoc has 
autograph wrappers, the violin I wrapper having a note, not entirely legible, 
which seems to be a reminder to make all the corrections to the supplementary 
parts (Ex. 8), suggesting that PO was in need of corrections. It also suggests that 
this was the set which Berlioz used for both of the performances he conducted in 
Germany after publication (see below), particularly as the oboe part has an 
accidental added in Berlioz’s hand (Ex. 9).34 This set also has impromptu 
drawings by players on some of the inside covers (Ex. 10).35 All the parts have 
been extensively marked up in pencil, presumably also by the players, with a 
variety of dynamic and accidental reminders; some parts have had extra notes 
added, presumably at the direction of conductors after Berlioz, shown as follows:

C. à p. Bar 386ff: instruction to play an octave higher; extra notes towards 
the end.

Tromb. I Bar 91: there is ms insert of the tune, to play with Bns, Vlles and 
Cbs.

Timb. Note to have three - ‘sol, do and re’ - and instruction to play at bar 
409: ‘8ème et suite (sur 5 mesures) du Con Fuoco continuer la 
sequence en jouant des Ré, sauf sur le 1er temps de la 5e mesure 
(do#).’

The extent to which these printed parts have been marked by players and the fact 
that they were used for performances conducted by Berlioz suggests that he 
encouraged the marking of parts to ensure complete accuracy and clarity for his 
performers.

34 There are also possible autograph additions to the clarinet, bar 138, where the last quaver is 
changed from c" to d", and bassoons I, bar 179, where the second crotchet has flat added; this 
sign is missing from A and the early issue of P, but is in bassoons II part and later issues of P.
35 Copies of the drawings were examined at the Prints and Drawings dept of the British Museum 
and dated as mid-19th century. It is possible they belong to an era later than Berlioz’s.
Ex. 8 Autograph wrapper for PO Vn I, showing as clearly as is possible Berlioz's note to make corrections.
Ex. 9 Autograph correction to oboe I part (2nd bar) of Le Corsaire.
Ex. 10 ∞

For amusement: a violinist (a), flautist (b), and oboist (c, censored; the complete picture is not suitable for reproducing here) while away the time during rehearsal.
**Performance as Le Corsaire**

As far as can be ascertained, Berlioz only conducted *Le Corsaire* twice, the first time being in Brunswick on April, 1854. The extract from the letter Berlioz wrote to the dedicatee, Davison, about the forthcoming performance reflects the spirit of the work:

...Nous venons d'exécuter pour la 1ère fois à Brunswick ton ouverture du Corsaire, qui a très bien marché et produit beaucoup d'effet. Avec un grand orchestre et un chef au bras de fer pour le conduire ce morceau doit se présenter avec une certaine crânerie...  

This was, presumably, the first time that Berlioz had heard the work since he made the revisions some nine to ten years earlier. He writes to Brandus later in the month that it is to be included in the third Dresden concert (of which the fourth concert was a repeat), but this does not seem to have happened. The only other time, if this is the case, that Berlioz conducted the work was in Weimar in February, 1856, when he mentions that 'nous avons répété longuement l'ouverture du Corsaire pour le prochain concert de la cour'. Berlioz never did conduct the work in France, although it was performed by the Société Sainte-Cécile on April 1, 1855, while he was travelling out of the country, against his wishes. He writes to Gaetano Belloni on March 28, while in Brussels:

Voulez-vous me faire le grandissime plaisir d'aller tout de suite chez Pasdeloup, le prier de ma part et très énergiquement de ne pas exécuter à son concert de Dimanche prochain mon ouverture du Corsaire. Son orchestre n'est pas de force, je n'ai pas encore moi-même fait exécuter cette ouverture en France et vous concevrez que je ne sois pas bien aise de la faire entendre ainsi pour la première fois.

**Later versions**

There is a variant of the full score incorporating Berlioz's corrections, with a new price (8fr., no date) and one dating from 1866 with the imprint of Richault's new address. Bülow asked Berlioz in February 1856 if he might be

---

36 CG IV, no. 1730, p. 506.
37 CG IV, no. 1747, p. 523. HolBiog p. 623 lists this concert as including *Le Carnaval romain*, but it has not been possible to clarify this conflicting evidence. *Le Carnaval romain* was not included in any other programme on this tour.
38 CG V, no. 2100, p. 266.
39 CG V, no. 1930, p. 45.
given the task of arranging Le Corsaire for four hands, particularly since he regarded the one made for Roméo et Juliette as very unsuccessful. Berlioz replies:

Je vous remercie de vouloir bien arranger cette ouverture ... mais je crois qu'elle est réductible pour le piano à deux mains, et cela vaudrait mieux.40

He continues to explain his dislike of the thick texture often created in four-hand music by excessive bass chords, which can be avoided when a two-hand version is possible. The two-hand version, with which Berlioz was very pleased, appeared in 1857 (Ex. 11).41 Eventually Bülow made a four-hand version, which appeared in 1866. André Simiot also made a two-hand arrangement which was not published until 1879.42 Comparison of these two is of passing interest, since Simiot's arrangement is easier than Bülow's in some places, as, for example, in the Adagio sostenuto (Ex. 12). Thereafter, it seems that Simiot did not appreciate the true tempo of the music, since he writes semiquavers for the left hand (Ex. 13) and passages of repeated quaver chords, impossible to execute at anything approaching a reasonable speed (Ex. 14). Presumably it is precisely this type of arrangement which would have caused Berlioz aggravation had he been alive to know about its existence.

[Continued ... after illustrations for this page]

40 CG V, nos 2098 and 2100, pp. 264 and 266 respectively.
41 CG V, no. 2218, p. 444. Also no. 2177, p. 374, where Berlioz requests that this version retains the dedication to Davison.
42 This date is ascertained from the plate no. 16769. 16758 was from 1879 and 16805 from 1880. Dictionnaire.
Ex. 11  Title page of von Bülow's arrangement of Le Corsaire for piano solo.
Ex. 12  Comparison of Adagio sostenuto from Simiot’s arrangement with that of von Bülow’s.
Adagio sostenuto. $\text{\textit{Adagio}}$ sostenuto. $A_{\text{s}}$.

von Bülow
Ex. 13  Comparison of Simiot's semiquaver passages, with equivalent passage in von Biulow's arrangement.
Ex. 14  Comparison of Simionf's repeated quaver passage with equivalent passage from von Bülow's arrangement.
During the course of outlining the history of the genesis, possible drafting, composition and publication of this overture, four sources have been mentioned, namely A, R, P and PO. The importance of R lies in its connection as the vital link between the overture in its original form as *La Tour de Nice*, and its final form, *Le Corsaire*; but as a source for the edition there are other considerations. For instance, as suggested above, it looks as if the parts were never used, since there are one or two startling omissions of accidentals: it is impossible to imagine a situation in rehearsal and performance when orchestral players would not add missing signs to the music, as the printed orchestral parts to, e.g. *Le Roi Lear*, show and, indeed, as can be seen in Ex. 9. The exception is the violin part which was originally for *La Tour* and which has had flat signs added, clearly in Berlioz's hand, but such additions are missing in other parts. The following table lists uncorrected errors of notation found in the set prepared by Rocquemont:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Bar no.</th>
<th>Rocquemont's note</th>
<th>Correct note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vns I</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vns II</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D# (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altos</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altos</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D# (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cb.</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl.</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B# (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl.</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>Ab (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb.</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Eb (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl.</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Eb (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bns I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>B natural</td>
<td>Eb (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor IV</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>B natural* (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oph.</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C (as in A and PO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This was originally flat in the autograph and then crossed out: perhaps the copy was made before this alteration was made.

There are also many other discrepancies between R and PO in the form of additions and omissions, although it is clear that this set was used by the engravers because it is possible to see the cast off marks. The largest number of differences is found in the string parts, especially violins I and II and PO shows considerable signs of intervention in the form of added slurs (bars 9, 10, 13, 15 and equivalent passages throughout) and dynamics (bars 180, 182 and 300 among others). For this reason neither of these sources can be chosen as the primary source for the edition. Although the printed edition shows variants with

---

43 For example, see facsimile of this in appendix I of Volume II: p. 1 of music, 3rd system, 2nd bar, last quaver; p. 2 of music, 6th system, last quaver.
the autograph, the fact that the first issue was corrected by Berlioz and those changes were incorporated into the second issue makes it the choice for the basis of this edition. There are, as the readings show, occasions where reference has been made to the autograph to clarify the occasional errors and variants in dynamics and articulation.