

Hidden Parallels in George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* Julius Klesmer, Richard Wagner, Franz Liszt

David A Reibel
Tübingen (Germany) and York (UK)

In this article,¹ I show that there are strong, surprising, and striking thematic and narrative resemblances between three incidents involving Herr Julius Klesmer in *Daniel Deronda*, and several incidents relating, first, to George Eliot's and her partner George Henry Lewes's various meetings with Franz Liszt during their sojourn in Weimar in 1854, and, second, to the first day of Richard Wagner's visit to London from 5 March 1855 to 28 June 1855. He had come at the invitation of the Philharmonic Society to conduct a series of eight concerts which would include a selection of his own musical works.²

There is no suggestion intended here that either Liszt or Wagner provides the sole model, or 'Original', of Klesmer. If there was a dominant model at all, it is more likely to have been Anton Rubinstein.³

¹ This work is dedicated to the memory of Professor John Paynter (1931-2010), music educationist, who encouraged me to continue to write on musical topics, a subject in which I cannot read a note and have no executive skills whatsoever. I would also like to express my deep gratitude to my colleague John N. Green for his patient editorial assistance without which this document could never have been completed.

² For complete details of Wagner's concerts see the entry for 1855 in Foster 1912 pp 241-244.

³ Writing concerning a supposed 'Original' in her Aunt, Mrs Samuel Evans *née* Elizabeth Tomlinson (1766-1849), also a Methodist preacher, for the Methodist preacher Dinah Morris in *Adam Bede* (1859), George Eliot states: 'There is not a single portrait [in it]' (Haight 1992 p 10):

... that is simply the vague easily satisfied notion imperfectly instructed people always have of portraits. It is not surprising that simple men and women without pretension to enlightened discrimination should think a generic resemblance constitutes a portrait, when we see the great public so accustomed to be delighted with *misrepresentations* of life and character, which they accept as representations, that they are scandalized when art makes a nearer approach to truth. (Haight 1992 pp 12-13)

Not only 'imperfectly instructed people' deal in such commonplaces as finding the 'Original' for the fictional character. See Lord Acton 1885 in the Annotated References, for a full inventory of supposed 'Originals' for a plethora of GE's

novelistic creations, and the supposed links.

Starting with Lord Acton (*qv* in References), there has never been a dearth of critics likening Klesmer to Liszt, despite Haight and Longyear to the contrary. Like all her inventions, GE's synoptic portrait of Klesmer reveals a man quite different in temperament, appearance, background and musicality from Liszt. Further, Klesmer is no mere composite, like a collage, but a composition, like the subject of an original painting.

As for Klesmer's *persona*, we have two independent assessments (Longyear 1988 and Haight 1968*b* / 1992). They show decisively that Klesmer's distinctive features are modeled on those of Anton Rubinstein, whom GE and GHL had met at Weimar in 1854.

... they met the young Russian composer Anton Rubinstein (with whom they were to renew acquaintance in London in 1876, by which time GE had already drawn on him for the character of Klesmer in *Daniel Deronda*). (*Journals*, Editors' Introduction to the Diary p 11)

The meeting with Rubinstein in Weimar is recorded in the Weimar Diary (*Journals* p 24):

18 [September 18 1854] Liszt came to dine with us at the Erbprinz and introduced M. Rubinstein, a young Russian, who is about to have an opera of his performed here. (*Journals* p 24)

The reunion with Rubinstein is recorded in several places by GHL:

On 8 May 1876, GHL writes to Mrs. Frederick Lehmann *née* Nina Chambers (c1830-1902) accepting a dinner invitation. Anton Rubinstein will be among the guests. GHL incidentally identifies Rubinstein with Julius Klesmer (GE *Letters*. IX):

...We shall so like to renew our acquaintance with Klesmer — whom we met in Weimar in '54! ...
PS Couldn't you bring Rubinstein here next Sunday?

On 15 May GE and GHL dine with Rubinstein at the Lehmanns'. GHL comments:

In the evening a large gathering and Rubinstein played Beethoven, Chopin, Schumann, and his own compositions. Stupendous playing. Home a little after 12. (GHL, Diary.)

GE's portrait of Klesmer's physical attributes is given in vivid clarity in Chapter V.

"Ah, here comes Herr Klesmer," said Mrs. Arrowpoint, rising; and presently bringing him to Gwendolen, she left them to a dialogue which was agreeable on both sides, Herr Klesmer being a felicitous combination of the German, the Sclave, and the Semite, with grand features, brown hair floating in artistic

fashion, and brown eyes in spectacles. His English had little foreignness except its fluency; and his alarming cleverness was made less formidable just then by a certain softening air of silliness which will sometimes befall even Genius in the desire of being agreeable to Beauty.

After Catherine Arrowpoint proposes to Herr Klesmer, Mrs. Arrowpoint is less sanguine about his virtues. The baptismal certificate ensures acceptance into the salon society, but the ‘Semite’ ethnicity (*aka* ‘race’) lies just below the surface.

On learning of Catherine’s proposal, the distraught Mrs. Arrowpoint’s true feelings about Herr Klesmer’s place in society come out at the end of her diatribe:

... “... Every one will say that you must have made the offer to a man who has been paid to come to the house who is nobody knows what — a gypsy, a Jew, a mere bubble of the earth.”

Klesmer has two strikes against him. First, he is a hired servant in the household. It was every well-born parent’s nightmare that the daughter might run off with the music-master, as did Catherine Arrowpoint.

Second, the Gypsies and the Jews were two anomalies in the system of nationality inherited from Roman law. Every member of some race and/or nationality, no matter where resident, had the right of domicile in the country of which they were citizens or nationals. Your nationality was inherited from your father. The Gypsies and the Jews had no homeland, and so were stateless. Although much of this changed during the course of the 19thC, the image of the two ethnic groups as wanderers on the face of the Earth changed little during that time. The impetus for the Zionist movement to establish a Jewish National Home in Palestine was initially motivated by such considerations.

There is an entertaining journalistic reconstruction — fact mingled with fiction — of the life of the Scottish heiress Rebecca Scott (1751-1826), who married German composer and pianist Johann Samuel Schroeter *né* Schröter (1753-1788), her music teacher, in 1775. The family tried to disinherit her but failed. She was Franz Joseph Haydn’s lady-friend during his two visits to London in 1791 and 1792. See: Peter Hobday, *The Girl in Red. Haydn’s Last Love*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 2004.

In Andrew Davies’ (*b* 1936) three-part TV adaptation of *Daniel Deronda* (BBC 2, 2002), transposed by Davies from 1865 to 1874, in the *soirée* scene (Chapter V), a vigorous Klesmer, well-portrayed by Allan Corduner (*b* 1950), his whole upright body concentrating on his performance, is depicted at the piano playing a snippet from the beginning of the second *épisode*, *Allegro energico*, of Liszt’s futuristic Piano Sonata in B minor (1853), Searle No 178.

This choice of illustrative music is anachronistic in the extreme, not only chronologically, but also stylistically. For a full inventory of its compositional faults as seen by a contemporary critic in the 1880’s, see Appendix V.

There is a very striking oil portrait (1887) of Anton Rubinstein in his 57th year by Ilya Efimovich Repin (1844-1930) showing Rubinstein in half-figure as a conductor, available on internet websites. He is ten years older here than at the time

In this, as in all of GE's writing, the exterior shell of the novelistic structures may have been suggested by or copied from real events, noted and filed away for future reference by her all-encompassing mind with its capacious and detailed memory.⁴ The actual constructions and content with which these shells, as I call them, are filled, however, come from her novelistic imagination, which restructures the atoms of memory and experience into new novelistic events skilfully interwoven with other novelistic and narrative inventions, some suggested, some not, by the 'Original'. The result is the verisimilitude of reality.⁵

of GHL's letters and diary entries. It is possible that Andrew Davies had this portrait in mind when casting Corduner as Klesmer — the resemblance is quite remarkable.

Rubinstein has left us two invaluable accounts of his views on music and musicians listed in the References. Like Liszt, Rubinstein composed constantly throughout his life. Of this extensive production little is known today except perhaps his *Melody in F, Opus 3, No 1 (of 2)* (1852). YouTube has a representative selection of various works for piano, interspersed with the *Melody in F*.

⁴ Walter Cross, commenting on their reading during the last days of GE's life, remarks:

Her memory held securely her great stores of reading. Even of light books her recollections were always crisp, definite, and vivid. On our way home from Venice, after my illness, we were reading French novels of Cherbuliez, Alphonse Daudet, Gustave Droz, George Sand. Most of these books she had read years before, and I was astonished to find what clear-cut, accurate impressions had been retained, not only of all the principal characters, but also of all the subsidiary personages — even their names were generally remembered. But, on the other hand, her verbal memory was not always to be depended on. She never could trust herself to write a quotation without verifying it.

(John Walter Cross (1840-1924), *George Eliot's Life as Related in Her Letters and Journals*. Arranged and edited by her husband J. W. Cross. In Three Volumes. 1884-1885. Volume III, 1885, p 422.

(Charles-Victor Cherbuliez (1819-1899), Swiss-French novelist and miscellaneous writer. Alphonse Daudet (1840-1897), French writer; Antoine-Gustave Droz (1832-1895), French sculptor and man of letters; George Sand (1804-1876), 'femme de lettres française', pen name of Armandine-Aurore-Lucile *née* Dupin, baronne Dudevant. NB alphabetical order: Cross was a banker. Works by all of these authors listed in Baker 1981.)

⁵ I prefer this home-made term to the contentious pair, 'realism' and 'naturalism', which, like other facile generalizations, tend to take on a life of their own at the expense of the artistic phenomena they are intended to illuminate.

In all three cases, I first quote the novel's text of these portrayals of selected character traits of Klesmer, and then show the parallels in the cognate incidents from GE's stay in Weimar and from Wagner's London visit and their surrounding circumstances. The Weimar incident is taken from GE's *Journals* (Harris & Johnston 1998), while the Wagner incidents go back to their first mentions and not to later biographical works.

The Liszt and Wagner industries, as we may call them, have produced acrimonious claims from all those who saw themselves as the true heirs to the right to portray the authentic life, mind, and work of their subjects, but I have selected the three primary sources, the *loci primi* that provide the first mention of these incidents, and I do not attempt a synoptic collation of all the derivative accounts, which are all to some extent dependent on the original sources. Some of these derivatives are more reliable than others and may add further information; others expend much energy in criticizing the accuracy and reliability, not to mention the *bona fides*, of the primary original accounts and their authors.

Wagner, especially, both before and during his visit to London excited enormous, almost unprecedented, interest and curiosity, and we may safely suppose that the gossip mills of the *salon* society of the day passed the smallest tit-bit of gossip and rumour around with almost salacious glee. We may further assume that GE and GHL heard and mentally recorded these rumours, and when it came time to write *Daniel Deronda* these stories had reached a state of maturation that transcended the original person and subject of Richard Wagner.

While belonging to different spheres of the German society of the day from which they came, Wagner and Klesmer share certain features: both refugees,⁶ both in some way outsiders: Wagner, a political radical forced to seek refuge abroad (Paris; Zürich); Klesmer the Bohemian-German Jew, accepted in polite gentile (Christian) society only with the obligatory baptismal certificate; both musicians of talent, reputation, and promise, on the threshold of greatness; both guests in the treacherous waters of the inward-looking society of the London establishment; both feeling unappreciated and misunderstood; both believing that they represented the highest ideals of German musical art; both dependent on

⁶ Wagner was fleeing the consequences of being on the wrong side of the revolutions of 1848 in Central Europe. With Klesmer, the connection is more tenuous, due to the chronological disharmony between the timing of those events and the over-all time-scale of the novel.

the *largesse* of the society they had come to serve. Wagner was thus the perfect source of grist for George Eliot's novelistic mill.

Nevertheless, these resemblances do not make an 'Original': the two figures are too remote and separate from each other to form a derivational pair.

Episode I

Klesmer presents himself as the consummate musician

Mrs. Arrowpoint is discussing artistic matters with Gwendolen Harleth:

“Catherine has certainly had every advantage. We have a first-rate musician in the house now — Herr Klesmer; perhaps you know all his compositions. You must allow me to introduce him to you.” (Chapter V)

Later, Catherine Arrowpoint confirms to Gwendolen Harleth the Arrowpoints' confidence in Klesmer's musicianship:

“... We will ask him to play to us now: he is bound to show us what is good music.”

To be quite safe on this point Herr Klesmer played a composition of his own, a fantasia called *Freudvoll, Leidvoll, Gedankenvoll*⁷ — an extensive commentary on some melodic

⁷ No edition of *Daniel Deronda* gives a full, complete and satisfactory identification of the title of Klesmer's fantasia.

Handley 1988 has only '*Freudvoll, Leidvoll, Gedankenvoll*: joyful, sorrowful, thoughtful.' (Notes p 699). For my own annotation see Appendix I.

But first, we see what can be done with a string of mere suppositions, suggested by the title of Klesmer's fantasia. The full title, *Freudvoll und Leidvoll, Gedankenvoll sein* ('To Be Joyful and Sorrowful, Thoughtful', etc), is in fact the perfect depiction of the plight of Gwendolen Harleth.

The first example of such an annotation leaves the title unexplained, and continues with the inerradicable supposition that Klesmer must be modelled on Franz Liszt.

7. *Herr Klesmer played a composition of his own.* It has been suggested that Klesmer is a portrait of Liszt, and there are a few details which connect them: susceptibility to women (toned down in Klesmer's case); a Wagnerian dislike of [Vincenzo Salvatore Carmelo Francesco] Bellini [(1801-1835)]; the qualities of his music, in performance and composition; and the Wagnerian reference to 'the music of the future', a catch-phrase of the time we find in Lewes's discussion of Wagner. (Hardy 1967, Note 7 to Chapter V, p 888)

ideas not too grossly evident; and he certainly fetched as much variety and depth of passion out of the piano as that moderately responsive instrument lends itself to, having an imperious magic in his fingers that seemed to send a nerve-thrill through ivory key and

The likeness of Klesmer to Liszt is supported by what Hardy rightly calls mere ‘suggestion’, or supposition. Despite Haight’s telling proposal of Anton Rubinstein as the ‘Original’, not available to Hardy at the time of writing her annotation, this commonplace keeps cropping up, despite its implausibility on the face of the evidence. One does not have to be a Wagner, a Wagnerite, to find a long series of Belliniesque Italian operas tedious. They are in any case best heard on the stage.

Of the enumerated attributes listed here I find the one, ‘susceptibility to women’ the most amusing. Most men can be said only to vary in the degree of their susceptibility. Confronted with Gwendolen Harleth’s charms on their first being introduced to each other at the *soirée* in Chapter V, Klesmer almost dissolves: ‘... his alarming cleverness was made less formidable just then by a certain softening air of silliness which will sometimes befall even Genius in the desire of being agreeable to Beauty.’ (See the full passage under note 2 above.)

It would perhaps be more accurate, in the case of Liszt, to say that it was women who were susceptible to him. This circumstance has not escaped GE’s notice; cf the following jocular remark:

... Klesmer was not yet a Liszt, understood to be adored by ladies of all European countries with the exception of Lapland: ... (Chapter XXII)

The most recent annotation known to me at present is by Cave 1995. It is something of an improvement, but not based on a look at the original source of the title in Goethe’s *Egmont*.

12. ‘Joyful, sorrowful, thoughtful’. The title of Klesmer’s composition may have been suggested by Klärchen’s song from Goethe’s play *Egmont*, Act III, which begins with the same words: it was set to music by Beethoven, Schubert, Liszt and (notably) Rubinstein. Klärchen is a strong and independent-minded woman who joins in her lover Egmont’s resistance to Spanish tyranny and poisons herself when he is sentenced to death. The description of the loving soul as ‘reaching up to the heavens in exultation, sorrowful unto death’ amply meets Klesmer’s demands for ‘cries of deep, mysterious passion’. (Cave 1995 Notes, 11, p 816)

Note the equivocation ‘*may* have been suggested’. It is impossible that the three words of the title to Klesmer’s fantasia could have been arrived at by accident.

Klesmer’s ‘demands for “cries of deep, mysterious passion”’ are from the music that Gwendolen must sing, not from anguished words. As the text of the episode makes clear, Klesmer’s fingers bring forth impassioned music, while Gwendolen has chosen music that ‘... is beneath you’.

wooden hammer,⁸ and compel the strings to make a quivering lingering speech for him. Gwendolen, in spite of her wounded

⁸ GE does not seem to know that the ‘wooden hammer[s]’ of a piano were at that time composed of a wood or leather core covered with a strip of hard felt or leather, but she recognizes that the ‘true tones’ of the piano come into being only when summoned by a consummate musician. Both elements are summed up in these two complementary sentences in the centre of her *Journal* account: ‘For the first time in my life I beheld real inspiration — for the first time I heard the true tones of the piano.’ — sentiments repeated in the account of Klesmer’s playing.

As for Liszt’s unique pianistic accomplishments, *cf* the following from Charles Hallé (1810-1895)

To return [from his discussion of the playing of Chopin and of other, now-forgotten, virtuoso piano players of the time] to my own experiences in 1836, I have to relate that a few days after having made the acquaintance of Chopin, I heard Liszt for the first time at one of his concerts, and went home with a feeling of thorough dejection. Such marvels of executive skill and power I could never have imagined. He was a giant, and Rubinstein spoke the truth when, at the time when his own triumphs were greatest, he said that, in comparison with Liszt, all other pianists were children. Chopin carried you with him into a dreamland, in which you would have liked to dwell for ever; Liszt was all sunshine and dazzling splendour, subjugating his hearers with a power that none could withstand. For him there were no difficulties of execution, the most incredible seeming child’s play under his fingers. One of the transcendent merits of his playing was the crystal-like clearness which never failed for a moment even in the most complicated and, to anybody else, impossible passages; it was as as if he had photographed them in their minutest detail upon the ear of his listener. The power he drew from his instrument was such as I have never heard since, but never harsh, never suggesting ‘thumping.’ His daring was as extraordinary as his talent. At an orchestral concert given by him and conducted by Berlioz, the ‘March [*sic*] au Supplice,’ from the latter’s ‘Symphonie Fantastique,’ that most gorgeously instrumented piece, was performed, at the conclusion of which Liszt sat down and played his own arrangement, for the piano alone, of the same movement, with an effect even surpassing that of the full orchestra, and creating an indescribable *furore*. The feat had been duly announced in the programme beforehand, a proof of his indomitable courage.

If, before his marvellous execution, one had only to bow in admiration, there were some peculiarities of style, or rather of musicianship, which could not be approved. [Details of lapses omitted.] (Hallé 1896, Chapter 1, pp 37-38)

With appropriate alteration of phraseology, the passage beginning ‘Liszt was all sunshine ...’ could be transformed into a portrayal of Liszt’s engagement with other musicians, artists, and acquaintances. There is none of the egoistic self-centredness of a Wagner, the uncompromising parade of artistic ideals of a Klesmer. Liszt treated all whom he encountered with the same democratic equanimity and generosity. This is

egoism, had fullness of nature enough to feel the power of this playing, and it gradually turned her inward sob of mortification into an excitement which lifted her for the moment into a desperate indifference about her own doings, or at least a determination to get a superiority over them by laughing at them as if they belonged to somebody else. Her eyes had become brighter, her cheeks slightly flushed, and her tongue ready for any mischievous remarks.

“I wish you would sing to us again, Miss Harleth,” said young Clintock, the archdeacon’s classical son, who had been so fortunate as to take her to dinner, and came up to renew conversation as soon as Herr Klesmer’s performance was ended, “That is the style of music for me. I never can make anything of this tip-top playing. It is like a jar of leeches, where you can never tell either beginnings or endings. I could listen to your singing all day.” (*Daniel Deronda*, Chapter V)

(‘classical’: ‘Of persons: Learned in the classics, *i. e.* ancient Greek and Latin literature.’ *OED*.)

Young Clintock, with his classical expectations, is puzzled by Klesmer’s style of piano playing and the free musical form of the fantasia, in which musical motives seem to appear out of nowhere, and have not only no final cadence or resolution, but no sense of beginning.

George Eliot and George Henry Lewes meet Franz Liszt She hears ‘for the first time ... the true tones of the piano’

On George Eliot’s and George Henry Lewes’s arrival in Weimar in 1854, where GHL was to work on his *The Life and Works of Goethe* (1855), they very shortly afterwards made the acquaintance of Franz Liszt and his entourage: GE faithfully records some of their meetings with him in her *Journal*. Aside from the longer one given here, they are singularly lacking in detail, except for the mention of ‘chat(ting)’. No topics of conversation are mentioned, and the contact language, surely French, or any other language is never mentioned. These derivative circumstances are rather like the servants: always essential, always present, but never referred to. All biographical accounts of the life of either are ultimately dependent on these records.

the best counter to the sequence of suppositions and assumptions in Walker’s long footnote quoted in Appendix III.

But in the second of these entries given here, we get some taste of GE's exhilaration and almost girlish excitement and enthusiasm that these meetings engendered. They also provide the only account we have that might throw some light on Klesmer's musical introduction at the Arrowpoint's *soirée* in Chapter V of *Daniel Deronda*.

Thursday 10 [August 1854]. About ½ past 10 Liszt called [at the Erbprinz Hotel, where GE and GHL were staying] and after chatting pleasantly for some time⁹ invited us to go and breakfast at his house, the Altenburg. Talking of Mde. D'Agoût, he told us that when her novel *Nélida* appeared, in which Liszt himself is pilloried as a delinquent, he asked her "Mais pourquoi avez vous tellement maltraité ce pauvre Lehmann?"¹⁰

⁹ GE's 'chat' must have been more engaging than the term suggests. The following gives some picture of this, from her stay in Geneva with François D'Albert Durande (1804-1886) and his wife Antoinette dite Julie *née* Covelle (1799-1880).

At D'Albert's request she sat to him for a little portrait sketch, of which he painted a copy for her to take back to England. [The oil-on-canvas copy is now in the The National Portrait Gallery, London.] 'The idea of making a study of my visage is droll enough', she wrote to the Brays. Many lines had been added since Cara [Mrs. Charles Bray *née* Caroline ('Cara') Hennell (1814-1905)] painted her in 1842. Even with the new coiffure and D'Albert's tact she is no beauty. Still, as Ladislaw insists [*Middlemarch* Chapter XIX], 'the true seeing is within; and painting stares at you with an insistent imperfection. I feel that especially about representations of women. As if a woman were a mere coloured superficies! You must wait for movement and tone. [There is a difference in their very breathing: they change from moment to moment. — This woman whom you have just seen, for example] how would you paint her voice, pray? But her voice is much diviner than anything you have seen of her.' Many people were to succumb to the charm of George Eliot's voice and through it first discern that inner beauty. François D'Albert, walking about with her in earnest conversation day after day, could hardly have missed it. Her affection may have gone out to him in the old expansive way.

As spring approached and she had to begin to think of returning home, she knew that she would feel real grief in parting from the D'Alberts. ...

[Accompanied by D'Albert GE] left Geneva 18 March 1850. (Haight 1968a, Chapter III, High Attics, p 76; p 77)

¹⁰ Henri Salem Lehmann (1814-1882), French painter, portraitist, was the model for Guerman Réguier, the inspirationless painter in the novel *Nélida* by Mde. Marie D'Agoût *aka* d'Agoult (1805-1876), *née* Marie-Catherine-Sophie de Flavigny. In 1827 she married comte Charles Louis Constant d'Agoult (1790-1875); married name comtesse d'Agoult; pen name 'Daniel Stern'; mistress from 1833 to 1839 of Franz

On arriving at the Altenburg we were shewn to the garden, where in a saloon formed by overarching trees the déjeuner was set out. [Long list of those present and their qualites and accomplishments and performances omitted.] Then came the thing I had longed for — Liszt’s playing. I sat near him so that I could see both his hands and face. For the first time in my life I beheld real inspiration — for the first time I heard the true tones of the piano.¹¹ He played one of his own compositions — one of a series of religious *fantaisies*.¹² There was nothing strange or excessive about his manner. His manipulation of the instrument was quiet and easy, and his face was simply grand — the lips compressed and the head thrown a little backward. When the music expressed quiet rapture or devotion a sweet smile flitted over his features; when it was triumphant the nostrils dilated. There was nothing petty or egoistic to mar the picture. [Further ruminations of how

Liszt. Her novel *Nélida* (1846), a thinly disguised fictional account of her affair with Liszt, including an attack on his artistic *bona fides* in the form of Réguier, appeared after she had separated from Liszt. They had three children: Blandine (1835-1862); Cosima (1837-1930); Daniel (1839-1859).

¹¹ According to Walker, ‘The main reception-room on the ground floor [of the Altenburg, the residence of Liszt and the Princess] was dominated by Liszt’s Erard concert grand, ...’ There were other pianos in the residence, each it would seem with its own location and distinct function. The Erard, a piano make with which Liszt had a long association, must have been the one that George Eliot heard. Its up-to-date technology guaranteed a tone that was exploited by Liszt in his playing, each parameter contributing to the finished effect.

¹² Probably one of the set of ten *Harmonies Poétiques et Religieuses*, Searle No 173 (1840: 1845-1852), based on the volume of poetry with that title by Alphonse de Lamartine (1790-1869).

The French term *fantaisie*, English ‘fantasy’, denotes here a freely structured composition, not based on traditional classical forms; *cf* ‘Pièce instrumentale qui ne suit pas les règles préétablies d’un genre.’ (*Le Petit Larousse Illustré* 1999). In the case of Liszt’s short musical vignettes or genre pieces, a title or short quotation may serve to provide a kind of programme to the music.

Liszt’s ten *Harmonies* form a nice little suite ranging in length from *ca* 2 mins (No 5, Pater noster) to 14½ mins (No 3, Bénédiction de Dieu dans la solitude).

In the case of Klesmer’s composition, “*Freudvoll, Leidvoll, Gedankenvoll* — an extensive commentary on some melodic ideas not too grossly evident”, the title refers to the words, not directly to Clärchen’s 1. *Lied*, or to any musical setting of them. GE’s penchant for sarcastic tumour was no doubt responsible for her remark “not too grossly evident”, alluding to the mismatch between words and music.

Liszt is depicted in various paintings and account of contents of the room with Liszt's memorabilia omitted.] (*Journals*, pp 19; 22)

Liszt continues to visit GE and GHL at the Erbprinz Hotel as recorded in the Journal entries. The following is of especial interest:

16 [17] Thursday [August 1854]. Liszt dined with us at the Erbprinz and came home with us to take coffee. Much pleasant chat. Afterwards L. and I walked to Belvedere. (*Journals* p 23. For Walker's extensive narrative account see Appendix III.)

Where is the parallel?

At first glance there seems to be little or nothing in the two passages that directly relate them to each other, except that the first is a *soirée*, and the second a *déjeuner*. But prominent in the middle of GE's account of that July morning and the observations and ruminations her experience provokes is the passage about hearing 'Liszt's playing', what I take to be the 'shell' of the Klesmer episode:

... Then came the thing I had longed for — Liszt's playing. I sat near him so that I could see both his hands and face. For the first time in my life I beheld real inspiration — for the first time I heard the true tones of the piano. He played one of his own compositions — one of a series of religious *fantaisies*. ...

Her memory supplies the 'shell' and the contents of the 'Original' supply suggestions, memories, for infinite variation: her imagination, stimulated by her memory, supplies the contents, the Klesmer episode itself. Her imagination takes the meaning of the 'Original' that is stored in her memory, and supplies it with freshly-made form and matter *via* free association. Free association does the rest.

In constructing the analysis below, we first arrange the individual lines of the original narrative, shown in *italics*, to correspond to the order in which they appear metamorphosed in *Daniel Deronda*. The interpolation '*I sat near him so that I could see both his hands and face.*' plays a subsidiary role of a stage-direction, not included in the Klesmer episode.

Then we interpolate the metamorphosed textual elements, shown in **bold**, beneath their corresponding real-life 'Originals'. There is no exact correspondence, of course, between the two: the 'Originals' are

merely distant suggestions for parallel novelistic creations which can take on any cognate form and have virtually any content.

Among the new and original features of the Klesmer episode are the two slightly deprecatory observations, so characteristic of GE, of the narrator, whether by GE, or some abstract omniscient observer. These are extensions to the immediately preceding text and are here shown in *italic bold*.

The interpolated stage direction *I sat near him so that I could see both his hands and face* and her account of Liszt's appearance and behaviour while playing and the further ruminations they provoke, take no part in the Klesmer episode (although there are observations of a cognate nature about Klesmer sprinkled throughout the first half of the novel), and are consequently omitted from the analysis, as they are from the Klesmer episode.

Finally, the method of syntactic deconstruction, which indents every subordinate constituent, shows how these disparate syntactic components are related to each other. It is hoped that this emerges automatically from the geometry of the deconstructed text.

- 1a. *Then came the thing I had longed for — Liszt's playing.*
[Catherine Arrowpoint to Gwendolen Harleth:]
- 1b1. **“... We will ask him to play to us now:**
- 1b2. ***he is bound to show us
what is good music.”***
- 2a1. *He played one of his own compositions —*
- 2a2. *one of a series of religious fantaisies.*
 - 2b1. ***To be quite safe on this point Herr Klesmer played a
composition of his own,***
 - 2b2. ***a fantasia called Freudvoll, Leidvoll,
Gedankenvoll —***
 - 2c. ***an extensive commentary on some
melodic ideas not too grossly evident;***
- 3a. *For the first time in my life I beheld real inspiration —*
 - 3b. **he certainly fetched as much variety and depth of
passion out of the piano**
 - 3c. ***as that moderately responsive instrument lends itself
to,***
 - 3d. ***having an imperious magic in his fingers***
- 4a. *for the first time I heard the true tones of the piano.*

**4b1. that seemed to send a nerve-thrill through ivory key
and wooden hammer,
4b2. and compel the strings to make a quivering
lingering speech for him.**

It seems clear on reflection that GE furnishes the ‘shell’ recorded in her *Journal* with meaningful musical memories of Weimar, Liszt, and later. The originality is in her command of language and the ‘added value’ given to the basic text by the new use and new formulation of the original memories, and the interpolations or extensions to the original structure, suggested by ‘free association’. It is impossible to read this passage without perceiving it as a unified whole. There is nothing superfluous; nothing is wanting. It is a perfect illustration of Coleridge’s statement of the operation of the Imagination:

[It] dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to recreate.¹³

— much in the manner of the pupating chrysalis metamorphosing into an adult insect or butterfly.

Episode II Klesmer the ‘extreme guy’

At the Archery Meeting on 25 July 1865 (Handly p 725) in Chapter X of *Daniel Deronda*, Klesmer shows himself to have bizarre notions concerning English dress appropriate to such occasions.

Fancy an assemblage where the men had all that ordinary stamp of the well-bred Englishman, watching the entrance of Herr Klesmer — his mane of hair floating backward in massive inconsistency with the chimney-pot hat, which had the look of having been put on for a joke above his pronounced but well-modelled features and powerful clear-shaven mouth and chin; his tall thin figure clad in a way which, not being strictly English, was all the worse for its apparent emphasis of intention. Draped in a loose garment with a Florentine berretta on his head, he would have been fit to stand by the side of Leonardo da Vinci; but how

¹³ *Biographia Literaria*, 1817, end of Chapter XIII, ‘On the imagination, or esemplastic [Coleridge’s invention] power’.

when he presented himself in trousers which were not what English feeling demanded about the knees? — and when the fire that showed itself in his glances and the movements of his head, as he looked round him with curiosity, was turned into comedy by a hat which ruled that mankind should have well-cropped hair and a staid demeanour, such, for example, as Mr. Arrowpoint's, whose nullity of face and perfect tailoring might pass everywhere without ridicule? One sees why it is often better for greatness to be dead, and to have got rid of the outward man.

Many present knew Klesmer, or knew of him: but they had only seen him on candle-light occasions when he appeared simply as a musician, and he had not yet that supreme, world-wide celebrity which makes an artist great to the most ordinary people by their knowledge of his great expensiveness. It was literally a new light for them to see him in — presented unexpectedly on this July afternoon in an exclusive society: some were inclined to laugh, others felt a little disgust at the want of judgment shown by the Arrowpoints in this use of an introductory card.

“What extreme guys¹⁴ those artistic fellows usually are!” said young Clintock to Gwendolen. “Do look at the figure he cuts, bowing with his hand on his heart to Lady Brackenshaw — and Mrs. Arrowpoint's feather just reaching his shoulder.”

“You are one of the profane,” said Gwendolen. “You are blind to the majesty of genius. Herr Klesmer smites me with awe; I feel crushed in his presence; my courage all oozes from me.”

“Ah, you understand all about his music.”

“No, indeed,” said Gwendolen, with a light laugh; “it is he who understands all about mine and thinks it pitiable.” Klesmer's verdict on her singing had been an easier joke to her since he had been struck by her plastik.

“It is not addressed to the ears of the future,¹⁵ I suppose. I'm glad of that: it suits mine.

¹⁴ ‘guy’: ‘2. A person of grotesque appearance, esp. with reference to dress; a ‘fright.’” First citation dated 1836. (*OED*) Not in Johnson's *Dictionary*.

‘fright’: ‘2. a person or thing of shocking, grotesque, or ridiculous appearance.’ First citation with a personal sense dated 1809. (*OED*) Nautical use only in Johnson's *Dictionary*.

¹⁵ ‘ears of the future’: note young Clintock's rather clever deduction of what would be required to appreciate the ‘Music of the Future’ — German *Zukunftsmusik* (used in recent German to mean ‘pie in the sky’). (See Clintock's later remark: ‘... croquet is the game of the future.’)

“Oh, you are very kind. ..” (Chapter X)

The aspects of Klesmer’s *toilette* that capture our imagination are the hat and the dress, highlighted by the splendid physiognomy. These echo aspects of two unrelated incidents almost from the day of Wagner’s arrival, summarized in synoptic fashion by Ernest Newman with novelistic embellishments, as if they were two parts of the same episode or character trait.

... The formality of English social life fretted him: a top hat for calls on such people as the Philharmonic directors was one of his first and probably most regretted expenses. Praeger [*qv* below] is perhaps within the bounds of veracity when he describes the difficulty the Regent Street hatter had in finding a top hat that would fit that enormous head. So convinced was Wagner that Englishmen always dressed formally for any occasion out of the common that a day or two after his arrival in London he called at Sainton’s house in full evening dress at nine o’clock in the morning. That must have been a sight for the small boys of the neighbourhood....¹⁶

(Ernest Newman (1869-1959), *The Life of Richard Wagner*. Volume II, 1848-1860. 1937. Chapter XXII, The London Inferno, pp 419-420.)

As for the evening dress, the only witness to that is Francis Hueffer’s one-sentence remark in his article in *The Quarterly Review* (1888 p 82):

¹⁶ The end of this passage is another of those awful Victorian jokes about toffs in top hats. Wagner is presented as a figure of fun. Cf the well-known cartoon by John Leech (1817-1864) in *Punch*, 25 February 1854 p 82. (The cartoons were supplied by the cartoonist, but the captions were added by the editors.) This one goes as follows (from the website from which this information is taken).

The cartoon shows two miners regarding a well-dressed top-hatted gentleman, or ‘toff’, walking past; entitled ‘Further Illustration of the Mining Districts’. The caption runs:

First Polite Native. “Who’s ’im, Bill?”
Second ditto. “A stranger!”
First ditto. ‘Eave ’arf a brick at ’im!”

Wagner arrived in London late in February [*sic*; *sc* 5 March 1855], and after staying for a short time at the house of his friend, Mr. Praeger, took rooms at 22, Portland Terrace, Regent's Park. M. Sainton relates that, one morning in February [*sic*], at 9 A.M., a youthful looking German called on him in full evening dress, in order to pay him an official visit as one of the Philharmonic directors. At first their intercourse was a little formal, and slightly impeded by Wagner's imperfect knowledge of French; but soon the ice began to thaw, and before an hour was over the two were chatting as if they had known each other for years, and from that moment they were fast friends, and remained, during Wagner's stay in London, inseparable.

One can only surmise that Sainton¹⁷ told Hueffer this story himself, as all references to the incident cite Hueffer's account. Praeger confirms that there was such a visit to Sainton, but there is in his account no mention of the evening dress, and some have wondered that he would countenance Wagner's making such a spectacle of himself. (Praeger 1892*a* p 232; 1892*b* p 247)

The only witness for the purchase of the hat is Ferdinand Praeger's *Wagner as I Knew Him*, which gives the fullest account, reproduced below.

Before presenting Praeger's complete narrative, which includes the third of the Klesmer episodes, we first give his explosive reaction to an unintentional insult.

Episode III **Klesmer the unappreciated musician** **takes umbrage at a fancied slight**

Meanwhile enters the expectant peer, Mr. Bult, an esteemed party man who, rather neutral in private life, had strong opinions concerning the districts of the Niger, was much at home also in the Brazils, spoke with decision of affairs in the South Seas, was studious of his parliamentary and itinerant speeches, and had the

¹⁷ Prosper Philippe Cathérine Sainton (1813-1890), French violinist, settled in London in 1845 and held the post of first violin (leader) of the Philharmonic Society orchestra and other notable musical institutions. See the article on Sainton and his wife the singer Charlotte Helen Sainton-Dolby (1821-1885) by Robin Humphrey Legge (1862-1933) in *DNB* (1897).

general solidity and suffusive pinkness of a healthy Briton on the central table-land of life. Catherine, aware of a tacit understanding that he was an undeniable husband for an heiress [he has designs on her fortune for purposes of furthering his political career], had nothing to say against him but that he was thoroughly tiresome to her. Mr. Bult was amiably confident, and had no idea that his insensibility to counterpoint could ever be reckoned against him. Klesmer he hardly regarded in the light of a serious human being who ought to have a vote; and he did not mind Miss Arrowpoint's addiction to music any more than her probable expenses in antique lace. He was consequently a little amazed at an after-dinner outburst of Klesmer's on the lack of idealism in English politics, which left all mutuality between distant races to be determined simply by the need of a market: the crusades, to his mind, had at least this excuse, that they had a banner of sentiment round which generous feelings could rally: of course, the scoundrels rallied too, but what then? they rally in equal force round your advertisement van of "Buy cheap, sell dear." On this theme Klesmer's eloquence, gesticulatory and other, went on for a little while like stray fireworks accidentally ignited, and then sank into immovable silence. Mr. Bult was not surprised that Klesmer's opinions should be flighty, but was astonished at his command of English idiom and his ability to put a point in a way that would have told at a constituents' dinner — to be accounted for probably by his being a Pole, or a Czech, or something of that fermenting sort, in a state of political refugeism which had obliged him to make a profession of his music; and that evening in the drawing-room he for the first time went up to Klesmer at the piano, Miss Arrowpoint being near, and said —

"I had no idea before that you were a political man."

Klesmer's only answer was to fold his arms, put out his nether lip, and stare at Mr. Bult.

"You must have been used to public speaking. You speak uncommonly well, though I don't agree with you. From what you said about sentiment, I fancy you are a Panslavist."

"No; my name is Elijah. I am the Wandering Jew,"¹⁸ said Klesmer, flashing a smile at Miss Arrowpoint, and suddenly

¹⁸ 'Wandering Jew:'; cf *GE's Daniel Deronda notebooks*, p 350:

making a mysterious wind-like rush backwards and forwards on the piano. Mr. Bult felt this buffoonery rather offensive and Polish, but — Miss Arrowpoint being there did not like to move away.

“Herr Klesmer has cosmopolitan ideas,” said Miss Arrowpoint, trying to make the best of the situation. “He looks forward to a fusion of races.”¹⁹

Belief about Elijah’s reappearances the origin of the Legend of the Wandering Jew

Baring-Gould ii,

Titles of two other Jewish sources in Sabine Baring-Gould (1834-1924), *Legends of Old Testament Characters from the Talmud and Other Sources*. 2 vols, London: Macmillan, 1871, Vol. II, omitted. No Baring-Gould titles in Baker 1981.

‘Owing to his ubiquitousness and to the universal belief that he remained after his departure from the earth the ever-ready helper of the Jew, Elijah the prophet became the prototype of the Wandering Jew.’

(Article on ‘Elijah’ in the <JewishEncyclopedia.com>, 1906 edition online.)

Not intended is the Christian legend of the ‘Wandering Jew’: ‘This legend has been widely popular ever since its first appearance in a German chap-book of 1602’ [based on predecessors going back to the 13thC]. See New Advent *Catholic Encyclopedia* <Literary or Profane Legends> online.

Klesmer may have been intending an ironic reference to his ambiguous status as an émigré Jew in a strange land.

¹⁹ In Chapter XIV, *Daniel Deronda*, Blind (1883) treats the Zionist longings of Mordecai, Mirah Lapidoth, and Daniel’s mother, Princess Leonora Halm-Eberstein. Regarding ‘the fusion of races’, including GE’s views, Blind writes:

... If there were never any breaking up of old forms of society, any fresh blending of nationalities and races, we should soon reduce Europe to another China. This unwavering faithfulness to the traditions of the past may become a curse to the living. A rigidity as unnatural as it is dangerous would be the result of too tenacious a clinging to inherited memories. For if this doctrine were strictly carried out, such a country as America, where there is a slow amalgamation of many allied and even heterogeneous races into a new nation [the ‘Melting Pot’], would practically become impossible. Indeed, George Eliot does not absolutely hold these views. She considers them necessary at present in order to act as a drag to the too rapid transformations of society. In the most interesting paper of ‘Theophrastus Such,’ that called ‘The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!’ she remarks:

“The tendency of things is towards quicker or slower fusion of races. It is impossible to arrest this tendency; all we can do is to moderate its course so as to hinder it from degrading the moral status of societies by

“With all my heart,” said Mr. Bult, willing to be gracious. “I was sure he had too much talent to be a mere musician.”

“Ah, sir, you are under some mistake there,” said Klesmer, firing up. “No man has too much talent to be a musician. Most men have too little. A creative artist is no more a mere musician than a great statesman is a mere politician. We are not ingenious puppets, sir, who live in a box and look out on the world only when it is gaping for amusement. We help to rule the nations and make the age as much as any other public men. We count ourselves on level benches with legislators. And a man who speaks effectively through music is compelled to something more difficult than parliamentary eloquence.”

With the last word Klesmer wheeled from the piano and walked away.

Miss Arrowpoint coloured, and Mr. Bult observed with his usual phlegmatic solidity,

“Your pianist does not think small beer of himself.”

“Herr Klesmer is something more than a pianist,” said Miss Arrowpoint, apologetically. “He is a great musician in the fullest sense of the word. He will rank with Schubert and Mendelssohn.”²⁰

“Ah, you ladies understand these things,” said Mr. Bult, none the less convinced that these things were frivolous because Klesmer had shown himself a coxcomb. (Chapter XXII)

Wagner’s first morning in London

a too rapid effacement of those national traditions and customs which are the language of the national genius—the deep suckers of healthy sentiment. Such moderating and guidance of inevitable movement is worthy of all effort.” (pp 195-196)

²⁰ Franz Peter Schubert (1787-1828) and Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy (1809-1847) are not accidental associates. They reflect the best of the conservative taste of the mid-19thC English musical public. In no sense, no matter how innovative they were, could they be considered protagonists of the new ‘Music of the Future’, which in any case post-dated them. Mendelssohn tried unsuccessfully to introduce Schubert’s Symphony No. 9 in C major, D. 944, known as the Great, to the Philharmonic Society orchestra. It was first conducted by Mendelssohn in Leipzig in 1838 and first published in 1840.

Despite efforts on their behalf, Wagner and Liszt did not attain any following or general acceptance until the end of the 19th C, and even then many notable English musical figures held out against them.

Ferdinand Praeger, *Wagner as I Knew Him*, 1892
Chapter XVIII. 1855.

III.A Praeger's narrative

Wagner arrived at midnight precisely on Sunday, the fifth of March.

... It became my duty to acquaint Wagner that a so-called "Necker" hat (*i.e.* a slouched one [*sic*; *sc* Hecker²¹]) was not becoming for the conductor of so conservative a society as the Philharmonic, and that it was necessary that he should provide himself with a tall hat, indeed, such headgear as would efface all remembrance of the social class to which his soft felt hat was judicially assigned, for, be it known, in some parts of Germany the soft slouched felt hat had been interdicted by police order as being the emblem of revolutionary principles. I think it was on the strength of the accuracy of this last statement that Wagner gave way, and I at once followed up the success by taking the composer of "Tannhäuser" to the best West End hatter, where, after an onslaught on the sons of Britannia and their manias, we succeeded in fitting a hat on that wondrous head of the great thinker. (pp 228-229)

We drove from the hatmaker straight to the city, ... [finally] alighting at Nottingham Place, the residence of Mr. Anderson.²² The old gentleman possessed all the suave, gentle manner of the courtier, and all went well during the preliminary conversation about the projected programme, until Mr. Anderson mentioned a prize symphony of [Franz] Lachner [(1803-1890), composer, Kapellmeister] as one of the intended works²³ to be performed.

²¹ Named after the revolutionary Friedrich Franz Karl Hecker (1811-1882).

²² G. F. Anderson, Honorary Treasurer of the Philharmonic from 1840 to 1876. Wagner records in his autobiography *Mein Leben (My Life)* (definitive German edition 1963 p 526; second English translation 1983 p 513) how Mr. Anderson had come to see him in Zürich in January 1855 in order to secure his services as a conductor for the Philharmonic Society.

²³ Hans von Bülow (1830-1894), fellow musician and acolyte of Wagner, who remained faithful to him even when his wife did not and left him to marry Wagner, when he was told of a *preisgekröntes Werk*, 'a prize- / award-winning work' (from German *preiskrönen*, literally, 'to crown with the prize' + *Werk* 'a (musical) work'), remarked: *Je preiser gekrönt, desto durcher fällt es.* (This *mot* due to Artur Schnabel

Wagner sprang from his seat, as if shot from a gun, exclaiming loudly and angrily, “Have I therefore left my quiet seclusion in Switzerland to cross the sea to conduct a prize symphony by Lachner? no; never! If that be a condition of the bargain I at once reject it, and will return. What brought me away was the eagerness to head a far-famed orchestra and to perform worthily the works of the great masters, but no Kapellmeister²⁴ music; and that of a ‘Lachner,’ bah!” Mr. Anderson sat aghast in his chair, looking with bewildered surprise on this unexpected outbreak of passion, delivered with extraordinary volubility and heat by Wagner, partly in French and partly in German. I interposed a more tranquillizing report of the harangue and succeeded in assuring Mr. Anderson

(1882-1951), during one of his autobiographical talks given at the University of Chicago in Autumn 1945. Not in the published version of these talks, London, Longmans, 1961.)

Impossible to translate. Von Bülow has made the prefixed noun *Preis* ‘prize’ into a comparative adverb by adding the comparative suffix *-er*, as in English. Similarly, he has taken the prepositional prefix *durch* from *durchfallen* ‘to fail’, literally, ‘to fall through’, and added the suffix *-er* to make a comparative adverb. Both of these creations are pure inventions. Neither is an actual German word. The construction is completed by joining together the two parts with the particles *je* ‘by so much’ + comparative, and *desto* ‘by that much’ + comparative.

Wagner, confident of his superiority in every way, must have felt the same when told that he was to conduct a ‘prize symphony’, *ein preisgekrönte Symphonie*, by his archenemy Lachner.

²⁴ *Kapellmeister*: literally ‘master of musical forces’ = ‘director of music’, ‘musical director’. Here and below used contemptuously: the reference is to the imputed inferiority or mediocrity of the music written by the *Kapellmeister* of the numerous musical establishments in the German states that formed the German Empire. Cf the following, where C. V. Stanford, an inveterate enemy of the ‘New Music’, is dissecting the deficiencies, as he sees it, of Richard Strauss (1864-1949) and his later musical style. With delicate irony Stanford turns praise into denigration by a carefully placed *but*.

... Strauss began work as a writer of chamber-music, which to any eye of average critical ability is but “Capellmeistermusik” of a fairly distinguished order.

Sir Charles Villiers Stanford (1852-1924), Professor of Composition and Orchestral Playing in the Royal College of Music (1883-1924); Professor of Music in Cambridge University. 1922. *Interludes. Records and Reflections*. London: John Murray. VIII, ‘Music and the War’ (1916), p 109. Stanford taught a generation of 20thC English composers familiar to us.

that the matter might be arranged by striking out the “prize” composition, to which he directly most urbanely acceded. Wagner, who did not fail to perceive the startling effect his derisive attack on the proposed work had produced on poor Mr. Anderson, whose knowledge of the French language was fairly efficient in an Andante movement, but quite incapable of following such a *presto agitato* as the Wagner speech had assumed, begged me to explain the dubious position of prize compositions in all cases, and certainly no less in the case of the Lachner composition, and Wagner himself laughingly turned the conversation into a more general and quiet channel. After thus having tranquillized the storm, the interview ended more agreeably than the startling episode had promised. (pp 230-231)

... I never could well understand how the Lachner episode became known, but it is certain that it did, for the German opposition journals, and there were many, made great capital out of the refusal of Wagner to conduct a prize symphony.

Our next visit was an unclouded one. We went to call on Sinton, ... As Sinton had always been very intimate with Costa,²⁵ and was his recognized deputy in his absence, he accompanied us on the first visit to the Neapolitan conductor, Wagner expressing a wish to make Costa’s acquaintance. This was the only visit of etiquette Wagner paid. He sternly refused to pay any more, no matter to whom, ... (p 232)

Original German version
Praeger 1892b Chapter 18 pp 244-246

... Wagner trug nämlich einen sogenannten „Heckerhut“, das Abzeichen eines politischen Freidenkers der damaligen Periode; das passte damals durchaus nicht zu der Würde eines Dirigenten der Philharmonie und hätte grossen Anstoss verursacht, war doch der Heckerhut in manchen Theilen Deutschlands (so hiess es wenigstens) polizeilich verboten. Das gab einen harten Strauss; aber Wagner gab mir schliesslich doch Gehör, und so fuhr ich mit

²⁵ Michael Costa (1810-1884), important composer and reforming conductor; born in Naples. In the autumn of 1829 he came to England. In 1846 he was appointed conductor of the Philharmonic concerts, resigning because of the pressure of other obligations and engagements at the end of 1854. Wagner was then invited to conduct the series of concerts referred to in the main text. See entry for 1855 in Foster 1912.

dem Komponisten des „Tannhäuser“ siegreich zu einem der berühmtesten Hutmacher in Regent Street, wo unter den vielen vorrätigen Kopfbekleidungen keine so recht passen wollte; aber schliesslich kamen wir doch zum Ziele, wenn auch nicht ohne eine lange Attacke Wagner's gegen den Konservatismus der englischen Gesellschaft. Darauf liess ich den Heckerhut sauber einpacken, mit dem Bemerkten, dass für jetzt alle revolutionären Ideen mit dem Hute für volle vier Monate eingepackt blieben, ... (p 244)

Vom Hutmacher, ... fuhren wir direkt zurück nach Nottingham Place, der Wohnung des Mr. Anderson, des „Jupiter tonans“ der Philharmonie. Unterwegs gab es Gelegenheit zu unzähligen Bemerkungen, und ich war nicht wenig erfreut, als Wagner mir freundlich auf die Schulter klopfte und sagte, „ich sehe bei jedem Ihrer Worte mehr, wie gut wir uns verstehen werden!“ Der alte Herr Anderson war ganz Hofmann und sehr geschmeidig und höflich, deshalb waren die ersten Empfangsreden so glatt und polirt als möglich, auch von Wagner's Seite. Die vorzunehmenden klassischen Werke wurden genannt, und alles ging ruhig vorüber, bis Anderson von der projektirten Aufführung einer preisgekrönten Symphonie Lachner's sprach; da sprang Wagner mit seiner gewohnten Heftigkeit vom Stuhle auf, dass dieser schallend auf den Boden fiel, und rief laut und wüthend aus: „Bin ich deshalb aus meinem ruhigen Zürich übers Meer nach England gesehelt, um eine Preissymphonie von Lachner zu dirigiren? Nun und nimmermehr! Wenn das eine Bedingung meines Kontraktes sein soll, so breche ich ihn, und gehe auf der Stelle zurück in die Schweiz. Das Einzige, was mich herbrachte, war die Begierde, an der Spitze eines weltberühmten Orchesters zu stehen, und die Werke der unsterblichen Meister auf würdige Weise aufzuführen, aber keine Kapellmeistermusik und am allerwenigsten die eines Lachner!“

Mr. Anderson war ganz ausser sich vor Erstaunen über diesen jähen Gefühlsausbruch, der sich aufs leidenschaftlichste in einer höchst zornigen Rede mit unglaublicher Heftigkeit halb französisch und halb deutsch Luft machte. Ich nahm gleich das Wort, und in besänftigenden Wendungen schlug ich vor, einfach die Preissymphonie auf die Seite zu setzen, und damit den Stein des Anstosses wegzuräumen, was Mr. Andersson auch gleich zusagte, denn wiewohl er das Französische ziemlich verstand und im Andante-Tempo selbst sprach, so war es ihm im Presto-Agitato von Wagner's Aufregung scheinbar gänzlich unverständlich geworden. Ich fuhr fort, Anderson das allgemeine Vorurtheil

gegen preisgekrönte Werke zu erklären, und dies besonders auf Lachner zu beziehen, und wusste die Sache so ins Komische zu ziehen, dass Wagner selbst seinen guten Humor wiederfand; und nach einigen allgemeinen Bemerkung endete diese erste Begegnung so freundlich und höflich, als ob die drohende Episode gar nicht stattgefunden habe. (pp 245-246)

... Ich habe nie erfahren können, auf welche Art und Weise die Lachnerepisode bekannt wurde; doch bekannt wurde sie, und die deutschen Oppositionszeitungen, und das waren damals viele, machten viel Lärm über die Sache, dass ein Wagner es abschläge, eine preisgekrönte Symphonie eines Lachner zu dirigieren!

Unser nächster Besuch war ein durchaus angenehmer: wir suchten Prosper Sainton auf, ... Da Sainton sehr intim mit Costa, dem früheren Dirigenten der Philharmonie, der italienischen Oper, der Sacred Harmony Society etc., war, so bat er Wagner, diesem einen Besuch zu machen, wozu ich auch anrieth. Der Besuch wurde auch gemacht, aber dies war der einzige Schritt, den Wagner thun wollte, indem er es zur Regel machte, niemand zu besuchen. (pp 247-248)

English translation

Wagner happened to be wearing a so-called "Hecker hat", the emblem of a political freethinker of that period. It scarcely enhanced the dignity of a conductor of the Philharmonia and was like to have given great offence, as the Hecker hat was reputed to have been banned by the police in many parts of Germany. It was no mean undertaking, but Wagner consented at last to listen, and I took the composer of Tannhäuser forthwith to one of the most reputable hatters in Regent Street, where none of the numerous items of headgear in stock seemed to fit him. At last, we attained our goal, albeit after a sustained attack by Wagner on the conservatism of English society. Whereupon, I had the Hecker hat neatly parcelled up, with the observation that for the time being all revolutionary ideas should be packed away with the hat for a full four months.

From the hatters [...] we drove straight to Nottingham Place, the dwelling of Mr. Anderson, the "Sound and Fury" of the Philharmonia. On the way, we exchanged numerous remarks, and I was no little delighted when Wagner tapped me amiably on the shoulder and said, "With every word you utter, I see how well we shall understand each other!"

Old Mr. Anderson was a true gentleman, suave and courteous, so that the openings of our conversation could not have been smoother or more polished, and this on Wagner's part too. The classical works to be included were duly named, and everything was progressing well, till Anderson spoke of the intention to perform an award-winning symphony of Lachner's. At that, Wagner sprang with his customary energy from the chair, which clattered to the floor, crying out angrily: "Have I really left my peaceful Zurich and sailed across the sea to England only to conduct a prize symphony of Lachner's? No! Never! If it be a condition of my contract, I abjure it and will at once return to Switzerland. The sole reason that brought me here was the desire to stand at the head of a world-famous orchestra and to perform the works of deathless masters in worthy fashion, but no Kappellmeister music, and most certainly not that of a Lachner!"

Mr. Anderson could scarcely contain his astonishment at this abrupt outburst, delivered with angry passion and unbelievable vehemence, half in French and half in German. I seized the initiative, making the emollient suggestion of setting aside the prize symphony and circumventing in this way the bone of contention — to which Mr. Anderson readily assented, for though he could quite well understand French and even speak it in *Andante tempo*, he had apparently found Wagner's excited *Presto agitato* wholly incomprehensible. I continued to enlighten Anderson on the general prejudice against award-winning works and to lampoon Lachner's in particular, and contrived to turn the matter into a jest, so that Wagner soon regained his good humour. After further general discourse, this first encounter ended in as amicable and polite a fashion as if the threatening episode had never taken place.

... I have never been able to discover by what means the Lachner episode became known, but it surely did. The newspapers of the German opposition, of which there were many, made much ado over the fact that a Wagner should refuse to conduct a prize-winning symphony of a Lachner.

As Sinton was an intimate friend of Costa, the former Director of the Philharmonic, the Italian Opera, the Sacred Harmony Society and others, Wagner requested his company on a visit to the same, to which I too happily assented. This visit did indeed take place, but it was the sole formal engagement that Wagner would countenance, as he had a firm rule never to visit anyone. [JNG]

III.B More background to Wagner's well-founded dislike of Lachner Praeger Chapter XVI, 1850-1854

Prior to the full report of Wagner's outburst on hearing that he is to conduct the 'prize symphony' of Lachner, Praeger gives this earlier truncated account.

On Richard Wagner's fortieth birthday, 22 May, 1853, a grand Wagner festival was held at Zurich, musicians from neighbouring towns being invited. All the principal theatres responded with the exception of Munich, which through its conductor, Lachner, refused to permit orchestral members of the theatre to attend, giving as the flimsy pretext that journeymen,²⁶ *i.e.* orchestral performers, could not be granted passports. Lachner as a composer has found his level, and there it is wise to leave him. I will only note the curious fate which later made Wagner supreme at Munich and, further, how odd it was that when Wagner was conducting the Philharmonic concerts in London [in the Spring of 1855], Mr. Anderson [the Secretary of the Philharmonic Society of London] informed him that it was the wish of the directors he should produce a prize symphony of Lachner. The proposition startled Wagner and perhaps, somewhat contemptuously, he exclaimed, "What! have I come all this way to conduct a prize symphony by Lachner? No! no!" and he would not either, not because the composition was superscribed "Lachner," but because of the really wretched Kapellmeister music it was. (pp 201-202)

German version

²⁶ *Journeyman*: 'A hired workman, *orig* one hired by the day; a worker whose apprenticeship is completed; someone who is competent at his trade.' (*The Chambers Dictionary*. Completely revised and updated, 1993.)

The term is evidently of such generality that it encompasses even musicians such as 'fiddlers and singers', as well as 'orchestral performers'.

Praeger's German version *qv* below has: 'Arbeiter, das ist Handwerker', 'workers, that is artisans' *ie* have a trade. The comparative status of musicians in the Germany of that time and the London of Julius Klesmer seem to be equivalent.

In *Mein Leben* (1963 edition, p 506), Wagner does not refer to this particular circumstance, but in his list of more than ten cities that sent musicians, he does not mention Lachner or Munich.

An Wagner's vierzigstem Geburtstage, am 22. Mai 1853, wurde ein grosses Fest in Zürich veranstaltet, und alle Musiker aus den naheliegenden Städten wurden dazu eingeladen. München allein schlug die Mitwirkung ab, indem der dortige Hofkapellmeister Lachner als Entschuldigung angab, dass das Gesetz Arbeitern, das ist Handwerkern, nicht gestatte, ohne Pass zu reisen; — das Orchester konnte desshalb trotz des besten Willens nicht ohne des Kapellmeisters Erlaubnis zum Wagnerfeste nach Zürich gehen. [Short account of how Wagner got his own back on Lachner omitted.] (p 215)

English translation

For Wagner's fortieth birthday, on 22 May 1853, a grand festival was organized in Zürich, and all the musicians from the neighbouring cities were invited. Munich alone declined to cooperate, its Court Kappellmeister Lachner proffering the excuse that the Law did not permit mere workers (that is, hired hands) to travel without passports. So the orchestra, contrary to its fervent wishes, could not travel to Zürich without the permission of its conductor. [JNG]

It would appear therefore that the reason why the musicians did not have the requisite passports is that Lachner would not give them to them, a circumstance not stated in the English text of Praeger.

Collating the two versions, it is clear that the English text is not the original, contrary to what is printed on the title-page of the German edition, but more an adaptation of the original German with some running compression of the more wordy passages, leading sometimes to loss of information, or even to substantive changes in statements of fact. For instance, the German version gives Praeger the credit for calming the atmosphere after Wagner's outburst, whereas the English text gives the credit to Wagner.

Conclusions

I did not originally intend to show any parallelisms between the real-life persons, episodes, or incidents and their novelistic cognates. But the method of juxtaposing them yields very good results. The thing that is lacking in the process is that there is no derivational relationship between the real-life element and the novelistic correspondent. The novelistic

element is the product of the artistic Imagination of the writer, as explained by Coleridge.

The 'Originals' model yields results, but it almost always lacks conviction because of the inevitable discrepancy between the 'Original' and the cognate. The last word on this matter is surely the quotation from GE in footnote 3. The 'Originals' model is a version of the popular aesthetic principle of 'It's just like it.' Even the most ingenious *roman-à-clef* does not contain personages who are 'just like' the 'Original'. A film purporting to show a 'real-life' Margaret Thatcher, Queen Victoria, Queen Elizabeth II, King George VI, or whoever, can never make them 'just like' the 'Original'.

There is nothing obviously in common between Wagner's tirade against his arch enemy Lachner and Klesmer's explosive reaction to being called 'a mere musician'; only the insult can be seen to suggest the other.

The chain of incidents that make up the episode of Gwendolen Harleth's appearance as a singer have each their parallel in Mephistopheles's appearance as a singer in the scene in Auerbachs Keller in *Faust*, including Klesmer's reproof, a mirror image of Siebel's insistence on 'ein nagelneues Stück!' What Gwendolen sings is, Klesmer says, 'beneath her'.

There is nothing in common between Klesmer's ironic referral to himself as 'Elijah, the Wandering Jew', and the entry on this theme in *GE's Daniel Deronda notebooks*, except the reference itself.

The passages can be shown to be structurally identical or parallel by the method used to display the parallelism between the Liszt episode in Weimar and the appearance of Klesmer the consummate musician playing his 'fantasia on Freudvoll, Leidvoll, Gedankenvoll'. To say 'that it has often been suggested that Liszt may have been the real-life model for Klesmer' does not show anything until the model and the copy are shown to share sufficient and distinctive attributes to make some likeness plausible.

Annotated list of references

Acton, [Lord]. [Sir John Emerich Edward Dalberg Acton, first Baron Acton of Aldenham and eighth baronet (1834-1902).] 1885. 'George Eliot's Life.' *Nineteenth Century*, Volume XVII, March 1885, pp 464-485. Acton's review of Cross (1840-1924) 1885, asserts (p 483) positively that Franz Liszt 'became Klesmer' (Haight 1986a p 489). The full passage reads:

The Italian journey reveals that weakness of the historic faculty which is a pervading element in her life. Her psychology was extracted from fortuitous experience, from observations made on common people in private life, under the sway of thoughtless habit and inherited stupidity, not from the heroic subjects, the large questions and proportions of history. Italy was little more to her than a vast museum, and Rome, with all the monuments and institutions which link the old world with the new, interested her less than the galleries of Florence. She surveys the grand array of tombs in St. Peter's, and remarks nothing but some peasants feeling the teeth of Canova's lion.

Travel supplied the later books with the materials which came at first from home. *The Spanish Gypsy* (1868) was derived from a Venetian picture. The celestial frescoes in Savonarola's home at San Marco suggested the argument of *Romola* (1863). A Dresden Titian haunted her for years. It became the portrait of her latest hero, whose supposed resemblance to our Lord gives intensity to the contrast between a Jew who sacrificed his people for religion, and a Christian who goes back to Judaism, renouncing his religion in obedience to the hereditary claim of race. When she was writing *Adam Bede* (1859) at Munich, a Moldavian Jew came with introductions to her friends, intent on the same vague errand of national redemption upon which Deronda disappears from sight. Liszt, whom they had known at Weimar, became Klesmer, and a lady over whom George Eliot wept in the gambling rooms at Homberg, and who remembers the meeting, served as the model of Gwendolen. (pp 482-483)

To Lord Acton, the well-read, learned historian, George Eliot's artistic imagination is nothing more than the mere mechanical recording and compilation of recycled snippets of personal experience, a kind of personal history, almost like a travelogue.

For Gordon Sherman Haight's account of the 'Originals' of *Daniel Deronda*, see Appendix IV.

Baker, William (b 1944). 1981. *The Libraries of George Eliot and George Henry Lewes*. 1981. Victoria: The University of Victoria. English Literary Studies 24.

Blind [German pronunciation 'blīnt', with 'short ɪ'], Mathilde *née* Cohen, later Blind, after her mother's second husband Karl Blind (1826-1907). (1841-1896). 1883 *George Eliot*. London: W. H. Allen & Co.

Eminent Women Series [by women writers]. Edited by John Henry Ingram (1849-1916). New edition 1888. See article on Mathilde Blind by Richard Garnett (1835-1906) in *DNB* (1901). Karl, a prominent revolutionary, involved in the revolutions of 1848 and their aftermath, was forced to flee with his family to Highgate, London, in 1852; see the article on Karl by S E Fryer in *DNB* (1912).

Regarding the well-commented duality of the structure of the novel, the following is of interest:

... Curiously enough, this novel consists of two perfectly distinct narratives; the only point of junction being Daniel Deronda himself, who, as a Jew by birth and an English gentleman by education, stands related to both sets of circumstances. The influence he exerts on the spiritual development of Gwendolen seems indeed the true *motif* of the story. Otherwise there is no intrinsic connection between the group of people clustering round Mordecai, and that of which Gwendolen is the centre: unless it be that the author wished to show the greater intensity of aim and higher moral worth of the Jews as contrasted with these purposeless, worldly, unideal Christians of the nineteenth century. (p 197)

Bowen, Catherine Shober Drinker (1897-1973). 1939 “*Free Artist.*” *The Story of Anton and Nicholas Rubinstein*. Boston & Toronto: Little, Brown and Company. (Nicholas Gregor’evich Rubinstein (1835-1881), Anton’s brother, also a musician and pianist.)

Cave, Terence (b 1938). 1995. George Eliot. *Daniel Deronda*. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by. London [etc]: Penguin Books Ltd. Penguin Classics. Reprinted 2001 with new Further Reading and Chronology.

Foster, Myles Birket (1851-1922), 1912. *History of the Philharmonic Society of London: 1813-1912. A Record of a Hundred Years’ Work in the Cause of Music*. Compiled by Myles Birket Foster, F.R.A.M., &c. With 16 Illustrations. London: John Lane, The Bodley Head. New York: John Lane Company Toronto: Bell & Cockburn. See Scholes 1947 for complementary information.

Individual entries for each year contain a short history of the Philharmonic’s year, an account of any other notable circumstances or events, and a complete list of concerts with complete list and details of works played and individual soloists, and the name of the conductor.

There is a six-page Appendix, ‘Analysis of Beethoven’s 9th Symphony, by Richard Wagner, written at Dresden in 1846’. An 84-page Index of composers gives titles of works played, dates of first and last performance, and total number of concerts in which the work appeared.

Below is the beginning of the entry for the concert season 1855 conducted by Richard Wagner.

Costa having resigned his position as conductor, the question as to who should succeed this great disciplinarian [!] became an urgent one; in the end, Richard Wagner was asked and accepted the post for this season. The appointment was made at the suggestion of Prosper Sainton and Ferdinand Praeger, and met with bitter opposition from the London musical critics, principally because Wagner upset all their preconceived ideas, preferring (as he said) to *make* tradition rather than to *follow* it! (pp 239-240)

Haight, Gordon Sherman (1901-1985). 1968a. *George Eliot. A Biography*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. Reprinted (with corrections) 1969.

For Haight’s synoptic account of the visit to Weimar and their friendship with Liszt see Chapter VI, ‘Someone to lean upon’, Weimar and Berlin.

———. 1968b. ‘George Eliot’s *Klesmer*.’ In: Maynard Mack (1909-2001) and Ian Gregor (eds.), *Imagined Worlds. Essays in Some English Novels and Novelists in Honour of John Butt (1906-1965)*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd. pp 205-214. Reprinted in Haight 1992, Chapter 5, pp 68-77.

———. 1992. *George Eliot’s Originals and Contemporaries: Essays in Victorian Literary History and Biography*. Edited by Hugh Witemeyer. Ann Arbor, Michigan; University of Michigan Press.

Hallé, Sir Charles (1819-1895). 1896. *Life and Letters of Sir Charles Hallé*. Being an Autobiography (1819-1860) with Correspondence and Diaries. Edited by his son Charles Edward Hallé (1846-1919), and his daughter, Marie Hallé. With two portraits. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

Handley, Graham (b 1926) (ed.). 1988. George Eliot. *Daniel Deronda*. Oxford World’s Classics. Edited with a new Introduction, Notes on the Text, Select Bibliography, Explanatory Notes, and Chronology of *Daniel Deronda*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Originally published 1984. Oxford: Clarendon Press. The Clarendon Edition of the Novels of George Eliot. Graham Handley (ed.)

Hardy, Barbara (b 1924) (ed.). 1967. George Eliot. *Daniel Deronda*. Edited with an Introduction. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Limited. The Penguin English Library.

Harris, Margaret (b 1942); Johnston, Judith (b 1947). 1998. *The Journals of George Eliot*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The very full and comprehensive 'Explanatory Index' contains biographical and bibliographical information on the more important entries.

Hueffer, Francis [*né* Franz Hüffer (1845-1889).] 1888. Unsigned synoptic narrative review of the following biographical works on Richard Wagner and Franz Liszt (all who refer to it seem to know the author's identity). In: *The Quarterly Review*, Volume 167. July & October, 1888. No. 333. July, 1888. Article III. pp 65-87.

1. *Correspondence of Wagner and Liszt*. Translated into English, with a Preface. By Francis Hueffer. Two Volumes. London, 1888.

2. *Franz Liszt*. Von Lina Ramann (1833-1912). Two Volumes. Leipzig, 1887.

3. *Franz Liszt. Souvenirs d'une Compatriote*. Par Janka Wohl (1846-1901). Paris, 1887.

4. *Wagner, sa vie et ses œuvres*. Par Adolphe Jullien (1845-1932). Paris, 1886.

———. 1889. *Half a Century of Music in England. 1837-1887. Essays Towards a History*. London: Chapman and Hall, Limited. Published posthumously ed. H. A. Rudall; see his note below. Front cover has pair of rectangular cartouches top and bottom, enclosing the dates '1837' and '1887', respectively.

Dedication [p v]: To Her Majesty the Queen [on the occasion of her Diamond Jubilee], the Friend of Mendelssohn, and the First Englishwoman to recognise the Genius of Wagner, This Book is by Permission respectfully Dedicated by The Author.

Contents: 3½-page Preface; half-page editorial Note on the author by the editor H. A. Rudall, dated 'London, *March*, 1889.' by H. A. Rudall; Chapter I. Introduction — General Music during the Queen's Reign in England; Chapter II. Wagner in England; Chapter III. Liszt in England; Chapter IV. Berlioz in England; Chapter V. Conclusion. No index. Published posthumously.

In his Preface Hueffer says:

... A chronological arrangement of the vast material at hand, ... would to a certainty have produced a very dull work, ... I have therefore preferred to group dates and facts round certain men of light and leading,...

For purposes of reference I have here thought it sufficient to introduce the separate chapters by a general synopsis of the period [Chapter I], which had previously appeared in *The Fortnightly Review*. Portions of the chapter on Liszt are republished from the same periodical, while some of the materials of the Wagner chapter were previously used for an article in *The Quarterly Review* of July, 1888 [*qv* above].

Irwin, Jane (b 1941) (ed.). 1996. *George Eliot's Daniel Deronda notebooks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Longyear, The Rev. Morgan (b 1930). 1988. Klesmer, not Liszt: George Eliot's Musical Portrait. *Journal of the American Liszt Society*, Volume 23 / January — June 1988, pp 30-43; plus Appendix, pp 44-52: 'Klesmer Criticizes Gwendolen's Singing.' Text from *Daniel Deronda*, Chapter XXIII.

Klesmer does more than criticize her singing and there is more in the text preceding and following this excerpt that gives valuable insights into Gwendolen's character. Without these, the impact of Klesmer's authority and judgements on her is not fully portrayed or accounted for.

Covers most of the clues to Klesmer's personality and *persona* scattered throughout the first half of the novel, and the candidates that have been proposed for his supposed 'Original'.

The first of the following conclusions has been arrived at by other disinterested commentators:

Klesmer, in all likelihood, is a composite figure, built up of many musicians (especially German) that Eliot encountered. (p 37)

Klesmer projects the image of competence, expressed both through the piano and through winning Catherine Arrowpoint. Later he becomes an instrument in the furtherance of Eliot's narrative, whether through discouraging Gwendolen or encouraging Mirah. Finally he becomes an offstage figure. Yet during his presence in the novel he is one of Eliot's most

memorable characters, a composite of many German or German-trained composers, a cosmopolitan among the more provincial English: in short, a person who has won his position through merit, talent, and diligence, and expects the same of others. (Final paragraph, p 43)

Newman, Ernest (1868-1959). *The Life of Richard Wagner*. Four Volumes. Volume I (1933), 1813-1848; Volume II (1937), 1848-1859; Volume III (1945), 1859-1866; Volume IV (1946), 1866-1883. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1933-1946; London [etc]: Cassell and Company Limited, 1933-1947.

Praeger, Ferdinand [Christian Wilhelm (1815-1891)]. 1892a. *Wagner as I Knew Him*. London (etc): Longmans, Green, and Co. Has 12¼-page chapter-by-chapter synoptic table of Contents *in lieu* of index. Has 6-page dedication (*ie* introduction, dated ‘London, 15th June, 1885.’) to [William John Manners Tollemache (1859-1935)], ‘The Right Honourable The [9th] Earl of Dysart, President of the London Branch of the United Richard Wagner Society’ (1884-1895).

Cover has gold gilt piano score of the first four bars of the ‘Pilgrims’ Chorus’ (*Chor der älteren* [!] *Pilger*) from *Tannhäuser*, marked, ‘Andante maestoso.’ (‘Beglückt darf nun dich, o Heimat, ich schauen, /...’ — ‘Happy now I may O Homeland behold Thee, /...’)

Based on both primary and secondary sources, and his own personal acquaintance with Wagner. Praeger has been criticized by the Wagnerites for inaccuracies and misrepresentations, but no one could have contrived this engaging narrative without some first-hand experience. None of this critical literature is referred to here.

Some idea of Präger’s own musical compositions and other matters can be gained by perusing the entry for him in COPAC.

———. 1892b. *Wagner, wie ich ihn kannte*. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt vom Verfasser. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von Breitkopf & Härtel. This German edition was suppressed and the printed volumes destroyed. Only a few survive.

I wish to thank my successor Professor Kurt Kohn of the Seminar für Englische Philologie der Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen for making the expert services of his student research assistant Friederike Fingerle available to procure a copy of the book from a German university library for my use.

After this note was written, a present-day paperback reproduction said to have been published on 19 April 2012 appeared on the Internet on Amazon.co.uk and at the same time on AbeBooks.co.uk.

Reid, Charles (1900-1987). 1984. *The Musical Monster. A Biography of James William Davison (1813-1885), Music Critic of The Times of London, 1846-1878. With Excerpts from His Critical Writings.* London [etc]: Quartet Books Limited.

... He first wrote in the 'Musical Magazine and Dramatic and Musical Review;' in 1843 he was connected with the 'Musical Examiner,' which was merged in the 'Musical World,' of which periodical he shortly afterwards became the editor, a post he retained until the end of his life. ...

As a critic he will be remembered by his unswerving attachment to Sir William Sterndale Bennett (1816-1875) and Mendelssohn; indeed the position which the latter holds in popular taste in this country may be largely attributed to Davison's advocacy. He was also, somewhat strangely, one of the first to recognise the merits of Berlioz, but on the other hand he attacked Schumann's music with persistent bitterness, and possessed so little insight as to class him with Wagner as a would-be innovator. [Further critique of Schumann omitted.] It is small wonder that latterly Davison fell out of touch with the age. Personally he was popular among his friends, and a genial and amusing companion. As one who knew him well has said of him, 'he committed faults of judgment, none of feeling.'

(Article on Davison by William Barclay Squire (1855-1927) in *DNB* (1888))

Rubinstein, Anton Grigor'evich (1829-1889). 1890. *Autobiography of Anton Rubinstein 1829-1889.* Translated from the Russian by Aline P. Kuzmishcheva Delano (1845-1890). With Supplement: Rubinstein as a Composer. Rubinstein as a Pianist. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. London: Sampson, Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington Limited. Reprinted 1892. Reprinted New York: Haskell House Publishers, 1969.

———. 1891. *Die Musik und ihre Meister. Eine Unterredung.* ('Music and its Masters. A Conversation') Leipzig: Verlag von Barthols Senff.

———. 1892, *Music and its Masters. A Conversation*. Translated for the Author by Mrs. John P. Morgan [*née* Jane Norton Grew (1868-1925), wife of John Pierpont Morgan (1837-1913)]. London: Augener & Co. Chicago: Charles H. Sergel & Co., 1892.

Scholes, Percy Alfred (1877-1958). 1947. *The Mirror of Music, 1844-1944. A Century of Musical Life in Britain as reflected in the pages of the Musical Times*. Two [continuously paginated] Volumes. London: Novello & Company Limited jointly with the Oxford University Press. Reprinted Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970. Has comprehensive synoptic table of contents to each volume and detailed Index. See Foster 1912 for complementary information.

Solie, Ruth A. (b 1940). 2004. *Music in Other Words: Victorian Conversations*. Berkeley, California. University of California Press, 223 pp. California Studies in 19th Century Music 12.

Wagner, Richard (1813-1883). *Mein Leben*. [First published privately in successive volumes from 1870 to 1880.] Vollständige, kommentierte Ausgabe. Herausgegeben von Martin Gregor-Dellin (1926-1988). München: Paul List Verlag KG. 1963. Modern critical edition based on the original documents. Has index of names. Supersedes all previous editions.

———. *My Life*. Translated by Andrew Gray (1931-2001). Edited by Mary Whittall. Cambridge [etc]: Cambridge University Press. 1983. 28 pp of Notes. No Index. The translation is based on the critical German edition of 1963 above.

Appendix I

Freudvoll und Leidvoll, Gedankenvoll

The title of Klesmer's 'fantasia', *Freudvoll, Leidvoll, Gedankenvoll*, is a version of the opening words of one of Clärchen's two songs in the tragedy, *Egmont* (1788), by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832). At least eleven composers have set this song to music.²⁷

²⁷ Aside from an edition of the "Complete Works", and the 'verse-epic' *Reinecke Fuchs* (1794), *Egmont* (1866 edition) is the only individual volume of any of Goethe's works recorded in William Baker's catalogue of *The Libraries of George Eliot and George Henry Lewes* (1981), items 340 & 346, p 73.

Clärchen, *ca* 18 yrs old, sings two songs. The first, *Die Trommel gerühret* ('Beat the Drum'), Act One, Scene 3, is a spirited martial cry to be made a man clothed in battle dress in order to accompany her lover Egmont into battle and help him to rout the enemy.

The second song is sung while Clärchen and her mother are in their parlour (Act Three, Scene 2) busying themselves with their 'work' (knitting and sewing), eagerly awaiting the arrival of Egmont, Clärchen's betrothed, the protagonist of the drama.

This song is also an anguished, impassioned cry, this time of the joys, sorrows, and pangs of love, at the end of which her mother remarks tartly: 'Laß das Heiopopeio.' ('Stop the childish nonsense.' — German *eiapopeia*: nonsense lullaby sung to babies while rocking them to sleep.)

Especially *Freudvoll und leidvoll* would have been instantly recognized by at least some of GE's well educated audience. (See Appendix II.) She herself had read Egmont while in Weimar. She twice records in her *Journal* that she was reading this play while at Weimar, 14 & 20 October 1854. (Harris & Johnston 1998, pp 27 & 28)

14 [Saturday, October 1854]. Began to read Egmont after dinner,
... (p 27)

20 Friday [October 1854]. ... I read *Egmont* in the evening. (p
28)

A. Clärchens 1. Lied

Die Trommel gerühret! Beat the Drum!

Die Trommel gerühret!	Beat the drum!
Das Pfeifchen gespielt!	Play the fife!
Mein Liebster gewaffnet	My loved-one armed
Dem Haufen befiehlt,	Commands the host,
Die Lanze hoch führet,	Carries high the lance,

Franz Liszt in particular composed two settings of this song (Searle No 280), of three settings in all.

1st setting. (i) c1844; (ii) revision c1860.

2nd setting. c1848.

There is also an album-leaf from the Album of Marie Princessin zu Sayn-Wittgenstein (1837-1920) (1847): *Albumblatt* for Piano, Searle No 166n. *Freudvoll und leidvoll*. Duration: c0:51.

Die Leute regieret.	Directs the men.
Wie klopft mir das Herze!	How beats my heart!
Wie wallt mir das Blut!	How surges my blood!
O hätt' ich ein Wämslein,	O had I a doublet,
Und Hosen und Hut!	And breeches and hat!
Ich folgt' ihm zum Tor naus	I'd follow him out the gate
Mit mutigem Schritt,	With courageous step,
Ging' durch die Provinzen,	Would go through the provinces,
Ging' überall mit.	Would go with him everywhere.
Die Feinde schon weichen,	The enemy soon give way,
Wir schießen darein.	We shoot in their midst.
Welch Glück sondergleichen,	What happiness without equal,
Ein Mannsbild zu sein!	To be the image of a man! [DAR]

B. Clärchens 2. Lied
Freudvoll und Leidvoll Joyful and Sorrowful

Freudvoll	Joyful
Und leidvoll,	And sorrowful,
Gedankenvoll sein,	Thoughtful to be, [German word-order]
Langen	Grasping [at something]
Und bangen	And yearning
In schwebender Pein,	In hovering torment,
Himmelhoch jauchzend,	Exulting to heaven,
Zum Tode betrübt —	Depressed unto death —
Glücklich allein	Happy alone
Ist die Seele, die liebt.	Is the soul that loves. [DAR]

Appendix II
The German Connection

Knowledge of German formed part of the best education for both sexes in 19thC England. Germany was the fount of modern science, philosophy, mathematics, humanistic studies, of the arts, and the originator of modern philology. This means that a knowledge of German is just as important today for the scholarly study of 19thC English literature as is a knowledge of Latin for the study of 18thC English literature and culture. Those, usually older, English scholars who had no German were at a distinct disadvantage, as Will Ladislav tells Dorothea in Chapter XXI of *Middlemarch*, which takes place c1830's.

They are engaged in a highly charged exchange in which Dorothea defends Casaubon as a scholar, and Will Ladislaw disputes it.

... It was too intolerable [to Will] that Dorothea should be worshipping this husband: such weakness in a woman is pleasant to no man but the husband in question. ...

“No, indeed,” he answered, promptly. “And therefore it is a pity that it [Casaubon’s labours] should be thrown away, as so much English scholarship is, for want of knowing what is being done by the rest of the world. If Mr. Casaubon read German he would save himself a great deal of trouble.” ...

Later, when the teaching of German has become a commonplace, it also becomes a fit subject for satire. When Cecily Cardew has her German lesson with Miss Prism, she remarks in subdued exasperation:

But I don’t like German. It isn’t at all a becoming language. I know perfectly well that I look quite plain after my German lesson.

(Oscar Wilde (1854-1900), *The Importance of Being Ernest* (1895), Second Act, Scene [1])

The currency of knowledge of German, especially among younger persons, is used to create the following exchange between Mrs. Arrowpoint and Gwendolen Harleth.

“Catherine has certainly had every advantage. We have a first-rate musician in the house now — Herr Klesmer; perhaps you know all his compositions. You must allow me to introduce him to you. You sing, I believe. Catherine plays three instruments, but she does not sing. I hope you will let us hear you. I understand you are an accomplished singer.”

“Oh no! ” ‘die Kraft ist schwach, allein die Lust ist gross,’ as Mephistopheles says.”

“Ah, you are a student of Goethe. Young ladies are so advanced now. I suppose you have read everything.”

“No, really. I shall be so glad if you will tell me what to read. ...”

Gwendolen’s German citation is from *Faust. Eine Tragödie*. Erster Theil (1808), by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1750-1832): Scene in

Auerbach's Keller in Leipzig. Zeche lustiger Gesellen ('Drinking Party of Jolly Lads').

The scene has reached a point where Mephistopheles has extolled the beauty of the singing of the chorus, resounding in the vaulted cellar. Frosch then asks him ironically, 'Seyd Ihr wohl gar ein Virtuos?' Literally, 'Are you indeed an accomplished virtuoso?'. Sense for sense: Frosch means: 'Are you indeed well-versed in musical matters?' Mephistopheles answers, 'O nein! die Kraft ist schwach, allein die Lust ist groß.' 'O no! My strength is weak, my desire alone is great.' (Possessive 'my' added for idiomatic reasons. 'Kraft' strength', not, as one Gutenberg English etext has it, 'skill'! German 'Lust' 'desire', not English 'lust'.)²⁸

Mephistopheles then agrees to sing, and after a few more lines of banter (Siebel: Nur auch ein nagelneues Stück! 'Only some brand-new piece!') offers 'The Song of the Flea'.

Likewise, Gwendolen sings: 'Her song, determined on beforehand, was a favourite aria of Bellini's, in which she felt quite sure of herself.' (Vincenzo Bellini (1801-1835); song not further identified. Klesmer later tells her: '... that music which you sing is beneath you.')

Faust has found a new use for the warning in *eg* Matthew 26:41: 'Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.' The standard German Biblical translation by Martin Luther is: 'Wachet und betet, daß ihr nicht in Anfechtung [here, 'temptation'] fallet. Der Geist ist willig; aber das Fleisch ist schwach.' (Same as Matthew 26:41.)

In fact, these putative sources from Matthew are just special cases of a very wide range of derived or parallel expressions found in the Gospels and other medieval texts, and in later Early Modern German and English texts. It seems to have been a commonplace subject to infinite variety. In popular parlance, the adage sounds like a warning against sexual temptation and misbehaviour. Faust has given us another interpretation; a challenge to portray oneself as a musician is brushed aside. This is the intended sense of Gwendolen's use also.

²⁸ Goethe's old-fashioned usage of 'Virtuos' as a noun is confirmed in the entry in the conservative *Cassell's German & English Dictionary*, 1957; 12th edition, 1968. The up-to-date sense of *virtuos* as an adjective created by back-formation from the noun *Virtuoso* is given in the entry in the more up-to-date *Duden Deutsches Universalwörterbuch*, 2., völlig neu bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage, Duden Verlag, 1989.

It is easy to succumb to the temptation to see in Gwendolen's quotation a portent to the fate that awaits her in the first part of the book. One striking example of this is Barbara Hardy's gloss (1967, Notes, Chapter V, Note 1, p 887):

'die Kraft ist schwach, allein die Lust ist gross'. Mephistopheles in Auerbach's cellar in *Faust*. Dangerous words for Gwendolen to say so lightly, as she is to find out.

GE and GHL read *Faust* together in 1855, and attended a stage performance of *Faust* on a later visit to Germany. They also attended five performances of Gounod's opera *Faust* after their return to England.

Friday 19 [Berlin, Friday 19 March 1855]. ... Tried reading the 2nd Part of *Faust* aloud, but gave it up, as it was too difficult for G. to follow it rapidly enough. ... (*Journals* p 43)

Friday 30 [Munich, Friday 30 April 1858.] ... we went to the theatre to hear Prince Radziwill's [Anton Heinrich Fürst Radzwill (1775-1833) music to the *Faust*. I admired especially the earlier part, the Easter-morning song of the spirits, the Beggar's Song — and other things, until after the scene in Auerbach's cellar, which is set with much humour and fancy. [Further negative judgments omitted.] (*Journal* p 314]

The twenty years that Radziwill devoted to this task were perhaps the consequence of Goethe's demanding punctiliousness in matters of matching words and music.

On Radziwill and the history of this musical setting, begun c1810, finally completed in 1830, and later published in full score and piano reduction by T. Trautwein Verlag in Berlin (1835), see the article on Radziwill by Robert Eitner (1832-1905) in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* Band 27 (1888); searchable text available online. As Eitner says: 'So ward das Lebenswerk des Dichters auch dem Componisten zur Lebensarbeit.' ('Thus the life's work of the poet also became the lifelong task of the composer.')

Eitner concludes: 'Das Werk ist im edlen Stile gehalten, zeigt nichts von dilettantenhafter Halbheit und erhält sich trotz seines großen Umfanges auf gleicher Höhe.' 'The work keeps to a noble style [pre-Romantic?], shows nothing of a dilettantish lightweight work and maintains itself despite its great range always at the same high level.'

Appendix III

Alan Walker and the ‘Originals’ model

This passage, quoted in full from Walker, gives a good portrayal with many telling examples of a version or extrapolation of the ‘Originals’ model dismissed by GE in the passage quoted in footnote 3. It relates historical persons and events to novelistic figures and episodes or one or more of their elements. Where the novelistic feature has no ‘Original’ correspondent, then one may legitimately ascribe the novelistic feature to the putative historical person or event. The derivational link between the ‘Original’ etc and the novelistic cognate is left unexplicated.

Without further analysis, which would take up much space, it is fair to say that the ‘Originals’ model and its derivatives form a distinct alternative to the ‘Parallels’ model used in this article, and should be exhibited for contrastive purposes.

[Liszt] joined her and Lewes for dinner | at the Erbprinz Hotel on August 16 [*sic*; *viz* 17], and the post-prandial conversation sparkled as usual. Eliot confided in her letters that Liszt was “the first really inspired man I ever saw.” [No reference] Many years earlier she had read George Sand’s famous letter to Liszt in the *Lettres d’un voyageur* (1834-1836) [originally published in *Revue des deux mondes*, September 1835], and she confessed that at that time she never thought that she would one day “be seated *tête-à-tête* with him for an hour, as I was yesterday, and telling him my ideas and feelings.”* [GE’s animadversions on Weimar omitted.]

* [footnote 74] *Letters*, vol. 2, p. 171. It has often been suggested that Liszt may have been the real-life model for Klesmer, the concert [*sic*] pianist, in Eliot’s novel *Daniel Deronda*. Eliot formed many first-hand impressions about music and musicians while mingling with Liszt’s circle in Weimar, and they transformed her bourgeois notions of the art. In the novel there is a classic confrontation between a philistine English politician, Mr. Bult (“who had no idea that his insensibility to counterpoint could ever be reckoned against him”), and Klesmer, whom he has unwittingly insulted by telling him that he has too much talent to be “a mere musician.” Klesmer’s response is withering: “No man has too much talent to be a musician. Most men have too little. A creative artist is no more a mere musician than a great statesman is

a mere politician. We are not ingenious puppets, sir, who live in a box and look out on the world only when it is gaping for amusement. We help to rule the nations and make the age as much as any other public men. We count ourselves on level benches with legislators. And a man who speaks effectively through music is compelled to something more difficult than parliamentary eloquence.” [Chapter XXII] Bult, like many of his ilk in England at that time, was stunned by such ideas. And in the famous scene between Gwendolen and Klesmer, when the pianist makes it plain to her that her aspirations to succeed as a performer will come to nought because she lacks real talent, the great British public learned for the first time what sacrifices are involved if one is to succeed in music. The potential musician must submit his mind and his body to rigorous discipline and push them to breaking-point if necessary. Moreover, he must commence the process in childhood. After listening to Gwendolen chatter about her “talent” and her unrealistic hopes for the future, Klesmer is more convinced than ever that he must speak plainly.

“I will tell you the steps, not that I recommend, but that will be forced upon you. You must put yourself under training — musical, dramatic, theatrical; whatever you desire to do you have to learn. ... You have not yet conceived what excellence is. You must unlearn your mistaken admirations. You must know what you have to strive for, and then you must subdue your mind and body to unbroken discipline. ... Your muscles, your whole frame, must go like a watch, true, true, true, to a hair. That is the work of springtime, before habits have been determined.” (EDD, Chapter XXIII, pp 99-101; London, 1896)

Daniel Deronda may well have done more than anything else to convince Britain’s large reading public that the man who took up music as his life’s work had not necessarily sold his soul to the Devil. Incidentally, one of the themes running throughout the novel is anti-Semitism, and the character of Klesmer is, of course, a Jew. This has led some recent authorities to speculate that Klesmer was based not on Liszt but on Anton Rubinstein, to whom Eliot was introduced by Liszt in the summer of 1854. The matter cannot be decided with certainty since Eliot left no conclusive evidence. But simply to read the words that Eliot puts into the mouth of Klesmer is surely enough. His ideas on talent, genius,

musicality, and priest-like devotion to work are basically the ideas of Liszt, and Eliot had opportunity enough to hear them expounded many times by him during her nine-week stay in Weimar.

Klesmer's lofty dismissal of Bult's stupid views on the nature of musical talent could not have been better phrased by Liszt himself; indeed, it is not impossible that George Eliot took them down from Liszt *verbatim*.

(Alan Walker (b 1930), 1989, *Franz Liszt*, Volume II, *The Weimar Years*, 1848-1861. Book Three: The Years of Maturity, 1853-1857, Chapter 1, Growing Achievement, 1853-1855, pp 248, 250.)

Alan Walker believes that Klesmer's words [to Bult and to Gwendolen Harleth] may be ones that Eliot heard from Liszt in 1854. But it is highly improbable that anyone ever 'took [these words] down from Liszt *verbatim*.' Nevertheless, Solie (2004), in a thirty-four page article on musical themes in *Daniel Deronda*, written in the *durchkomponiert* 'history-of-ideas' mode which mixes putatively parallel or complementary sources indiscriminately, in the section ' "Wagnerian" Characters and Assimilation', giving Walker's footnote 74 as the reference, writes:

... and Alan Walker believes that Klesmer's words may be ones that Eliot heard from Liszt in 1854.

Very little hangs on the truth or otherwise of this boundless supposition. In terms of the novel, they remain Klesmer's.

Appendix IV

On the question of 'Originals' in *Daniel Deronda*, see the following passage from Haight 1968, Chapter XIV.

A good deal has been written about the so-called 'originals' of *Daniel Deronda*. A recent writer declared that the youthful Lewes of the 1830s— 'an intense, restless young man in search of a creed—has obviously provided Eliot with the basis for her creation of Deronda'.^[1] Leslie Stephen fancied that she drew some features of her hero from handsome young Edmund Gurney, another of the Trinity men she met in 1873,^[2] Beatrice Webb

thought Octavia Hill's friend Edward Bond the original.[3] Herzl's diary for 1895 recounts a conversation in which Colonel Albert Goldsmid told him, 'I am Deronda.' Goldsmid was born a Christian in India, the son of baptized Jews; but, when a lieutenant in the Bengal Fusiliers, he decided 'to return to my ancestral stock' and went over to Judaism. 'My family was indignant. My wife was also a Christian of Jewish origin. I eloped with her, contracted first a free marriage in Scotland; then she had to turn Jewess, and we were married in synagogue.'[4] His family's indignation might parallel that of Daniel's mother, who hated Judaism; for her no better candidate has been proposed than Mrs. Isaac D'Israeli![5] But with the mild young Daniel there could hardly be a stronger contrast than the second-generation Army man Colonel Goldsmid, of whose conversion George Eliot had never heard. His elder daughter, the Dowager Baroness Swaythling, wrote in 1949 that her father's connection with Deronda 'was just a romance and has no real foundation in fact'.[6] Certainly the Colonel's lady bore no resemblance to the devout Mirah. Deronda was imagined.

Mirah is often said to have been drawn from Mme Bodichon's protégée, Phoebe Sarah Marks. Miss Marks herself, who against the opposition of her family married a Christian, Professor W. E. Ayrton, could see no likeness, and Mme Bodichon declared that Mirah's story was written before George Eliot saw her.[7] The heroine of Byron's *Sardanapalus*, Myrrha, a pious, loyal, patriotic Greek slave exiled in Nineveh, offers a tempting literary source. But George Eliot named her Mirah (pronounced My-ra) after a sister of the fifteenth-century chronicler Rabbi Joseph ben Joshua ha-Cohen ben Meir.[8]

For her conception of Mordecai, Deutsch obviously provided the principal impetus. But the character was immediately connected with Kohn or Cohn, the consumptive watch-maker whom Lewes had known in his youth as a member of the Philosophers Club that met in Red Lion Square, which Lewes had described in his article on Spinoza in the *Fortnightly*. [9] Lewes repeatedly declared that no resemblance existed between the dreamy prophet Mordecai and Cohn, a 'keen dialectician and a highly impressive man, but without any specifically Jewish enthusiasm'. According to George Eliot, Cohn's 'type was rather that of Spinoza, whose metaphysical system attracted his subtle intellect, and in relation to Judaism Spinoza was in contrast to my conception of Mordecai'. [10] Asher Isaac Myers, to whom she

wrote this, considered Mordecai ‘an unconscious photograph’ of Abraham Benisch, whom she never saw. Hunters of originals run easily to the prophetic.

For the formidable musician Julius Klesmer, Franz Liszt has been generally accepted as the model since 1885, when Lord Acton asserted positively that he ‘became Klesmer’.[11] When George Eliot knew Liszt at Weimar in his forty-third year, it was his sweetness, tenderness, benignity that impressed her. None of these qualities can be seen in the irascible Klesmer, nor do his massive square countenance and ‘grand features’ resemble in the slightest Liszt’s long Dantesque face. Klesmer is ‘the German, the Slave, and the Semite’, whose Jewishness forms an important part of the novel’s structure. Liszt, born a Hungarian Catholic, was, after some scandalous decades with the countesses, reconciled to the Church; taking minor orders in 1865, he appeared, tonsured and in clerical garb, as the Abbé Liszt. George Eliot describes Klesmer specifically as ‘not yet a Liszt, understood to be adored by ladies of all European countries with the exception of Lapland’.[12]

But she did meet at Weimar the musician from whom the conception of Klesmer grew. Anton Rubinstein, then twenty-four years old, fits precisely her description of ‘the German, the Slave and the Semite’. His mother was a German Jewess, his father, a Russian, and like Klesmer he grew up knowing ‘penury, ay even to hunger’ in a tiny house ‘on the outskirts of Bohemia; and in the figurative Bohemia too he had had large acquaintance with the variety and romance which belong to small incomes’.[13] Rubinstein had Klesmer’s massive features and the thick mane of hair, which he threw backward when he played in conscious imitation of his hero, ‘the king of musicians, Liszt’. Brusqueness is the trait in which they resemble each other most closely. His writings bristle with tart comments matching in acerbity anything said by ‘the terrible Klesmer’. When Rubinstein came to London early in May 1876, Mrs. Frederick Lehmann invited the Lewes to dine with him. Marian, though ill and struggling with the last book of *Deronda*, broke her rule to go. ‘We shall so like to renew our acquaintance with Klesmer, whom we met at Weimar in ’54!’, Lewes wrote to Mrs Lehmann.[14] When Rubinstein returned to London in 1877, George Eliot was suffering from another attack of kidney stone. Lewes went alone to meet him at the Felix Moscheles’ party,[15] where duets were sung from Rubinstein’s sacred opera *The Macabees*, illustrated by *tableaux-vivants*.

George Eliot was doubtless gratified to think that *Daniel Deronda* had helped create the patriotic interest in Jewish history that prompted the choice of this programme.

Haight's footnotes

1. Hannah Goldberg, *Notes and Queries*, 202 (Aug. 1957), 356-8.
2. Leslie Stephen, *George Eliot* (1902), p. 191.
3. B. Webb, *My Apprenticeship* (1926), pp. 264-5.
4. *The Herzl Diaries*, ed. M. Lowenthal (1956), p. 82.
5. Mudge and Sears, *A George Eliot Dictionary* (1924), pp. 105-6.
6. In a letter to S. Levy, 4 Nov. 1949 (Yale).
7. Evelyn Sharp, *Hertha Ayrton* (1926), p. 38.
8. Notebook, Pforzheimer Library: MS. 711, p.60.
9. *Fortnightly*, 4 (Apr. 1866), 386-7.
10. *Letters*, VII. 96.
11. 'George Eliot's Life', *Nineteenth Century*, 17 (Mar. 1885), 483.
12. DD Ch. 22.
13. DD Ch. 39.
14. GLH to Mrs. F. Lehmann [8 May 1876] (Yale)
15. GHL Diary, 10 May 1877. See also G. S. Haight, 'George Eliot's Klesmer', in *Imagined Worlds*, ed. M. Mack (1968), pp. 205-14.

Appendix V **The 'New Music'** **Nineteenth-century views of the 'New Music'**

Wagner and Liszt, as the most prominent representatives of the 'New Music', were too *avant-garde* for the taste of the 19thC British musical public, until the 1890's or afterwards.

GE here records their first experience of Wagner's operas.

3 Tuesday [October 1854]. ... At ½ past 6 we went to hear Tannhäuser. The overture and the first and second acts thrilled me, but the third I felt rather wearisome. The tragedy in this act is very fine, but either I was too much fatigued to relish the music, or it is intrinsically monotonous and spun out beyond any but German patience. (*Journals* p 26)

22 Sunday [October 1854], G. dined at Liszt's it being Liszt's 43rd birthday. In the evening went to hear Lohengrin but only staid out two acts. (*Journal* p 28)

In her *Recollections of Weimar* 1854, GE gives the following summary of these experiences.

We were so fortunate as to have all three of Wagner's most celebrated operas while we were at Weimar. G. however had not patience to sit out more than two acts of Lohengrin, and indeed I too was weary. The declamation appeared to me monotonous, and situations in themselves trivial or disagreeable were dwelt on fatiguingly. Without feeling competent to pass a judgment on this opera as music, one may venture to say that it fails in one grand requisite of art, based on an unchangeable element in human nature — the need for contrast. [Favourable verdicts on *Der Fliegende Holländer* (1843) and *Tannhäuser* (1845) omitted.] (*Journals*, *Recollections of Weimar* pp 233-234)

As GHL reports much later in 1876, the same year in which they re-encountered Rubinstein, Liszt's music had still not achieved a firm foothold.

We went last Thursday to hear Liszt's Oratorio — mainly out of regard for Liszt; but partly out of curiosity as to this specimen of the music of the future — so in spite of its being an evening concert we went and suffered (physically) in consequence. (p 227)

(GHL, Letter to Alexander Main (1840-1918), London, 1 March 1876. *The George Eliot Letters*. Edited by Gordon S. Haight. Volume VI, 1874-1877, 1956, pp 226-227.)

The oratorio was *The Legend of Saint Elizabeth* (1207-1231), Searle 2 (1857-1862). The three-CD recording on Hungaroton lasts ca 2 hrs 20 mins. This would have been the 'Twelfth Annual Concert' of works by Liszt and many others in the series of London concerts produced (1865-1887) by Walter Bache (1842-1888), pupil of Liszt and his champion. Bache thought this a 'very successful, and a really *first-rate* performance, ...'. (Letter to Mme. Jessie Laussot *née* Taylor (1829-1905).)

Went to concert Liszt's *Elizabeth of Hungary* — wearied by its want of melody and absence of true expression. Home at 11.30.²⁹

(GHL, *Diary*, 24 February 1876, *ibid.*, p 227.)

Haight sums up the general view of the 'New Music' thus:

When not at parties in Berlin, the Leweses went to concerts and four times to the opera. After hearing *Tannhäuser* Lewes wrote to Charles [Lee Lewes (1842-1891), his eldest son]: 'The Mutter and I have come to the conclusion that the Music of the future is not for us — Schubert, Beethoven, Mozart, Gluck or even Verdi — but not Wagner — is what we are made to respond to. [Cf Young Clintock's 'ears' made for].' In his Journal he added: 'Two performances of each of his operas have failed to give us a moment of rapture; and succeeded in giving hours of noise and weariness.' [*The George Eliot Letters*, ed. Haight, Volume V. p 85. GHL Journal, 25 Mar. 1870.] This was a common reaction. Lady Radnor [Helen Matilda Chaplin, Countess of Radnor (1866-1929)], who patronized annual public concerts in London 1881-1896, came out of the concert Wagner conducted at the Albert Hall in 1877 'with the registered resolve that if this was the new music, the old was better'. [Edward Frederic Benson (1867-1940), *As We Were. A Victorian Peep Show*. N.Y., 1931, p. 261.] (Haight 1968a p 424)

²⁹ Not only Liszt but also Wagner was associated with 'want of melody'. In the following instance it is elevated almost to a moral deficit. This is from a review of the concerts of the Philharmonic that he conducted in London in 1855, from the entry for 1855 in Foster 1912 (p 240).

The criticisms of this year, in the light of our present-day experience, are curious. [Hostile critiques also from *Musical World* (Davison) and the *Athenæum* (Henry Fothergill Chorley 1808-1872) omitted.]

The "Sunday Times" said [James William Davison; see Reid 1984]: "Richard Wagner is a desperate charlatan — scarcely the most ordinary ballad-writer but would shame him in the creation of melody, and no English harmonist of more than one year's growth could be found sufficiently without ears and education to pen such vile things."

Davison has spotted the reciprocity between melody and harmony.

What offended the listening public is well-expressed by Lewes's phrase 'want of melody'. There was more, of course. The following report of Bache's first performance of the B Minor Sonata at his twelfth annual Pianoforte Recital on 6 November 1882 contains an extensive analysis and list of offending compositional features. There was a second performance of the Sonata on 22 October 1883.

A leading feature in the pianist's performance was his skilful rendering of the 'Sonata' in B minor, dedicated to Robert Schumann, a 'tone-picture' which to the initiated signifies the successful struggle of 'an heroic spirit in a world full of strife,' whilst to outsiders it would seem to suggest rather the unsuccessful struggle of an ill-regulated ambition after originality of thought and utterance coupled with a complete disregard of those lines of beauty, both as regards form and conception, indelibly marked out with the hand of genius by the great masters. Indeed, with the exception of numberless and equally meaningless phrases, and a few not uninteresting, albeit somewhat affected leading themes [= Wagnerian *Leitmotive*], the elaboration of this rhapsody, misnamed a sonata, is to our thinking positively ugly, calling to mind not unfrequently in its progress the malicious remark attributed to Rossini, in reference to a work of another modern composer of, however, a far different stamp, viz., *Si c'était de la musique, ce serait horrible*.

[*Musical Times*, 1 December 1882, pp 663-664. Scholes 1947 p 427a.]

The musical foundations of the 'New Music'

Professor Nicholas Temperley, formerly Chair of Musicology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, has kindly supplied the following notes on the 'New Music'.

'Why the New Music turned many people off'

I don't believe the *Leitmotive* and programme systems presented much difficulty in themselves. Nor did the new harmonies, though they may have shocked some conservatives. The real problem in appreciating the music was the absence of customary formal guidelines.

The decline of set forms for entire pieces or movements was not new in 1850. It was the second and third levels of form that changed

most with Wagner — the section, tune, theme, or phrase. (There is no consensus on the precise definition of any of these terms.) Listeners expected a cadence (or ending), with harmony typically going from V to I, at the end of each section of music. A ‘section’ lasted from a few seconds to as long as a minute, and in vocal music often corresponded with a line or half-line of verse. The cadence wasn’t necessarily followed by a break, except in very simple pieces. It might coincide with the beginning of a new section, but it had to arrive sooner or later — to satisfy the expectation created earlier in the section or phrase, like the end of a sentence in language. This expectation, mostly generated by a combination of harmony and metrical rhythm rather than melody, was built into the language of classical music much more deeply than the set forms of movements. One view is that all tonal music is based on waiting for the cadence, at several different levels. Well, Wagner toed this line in his earlier works, but in the ‘Music of the Future’ he consciously tried to abandon it. It has been said, with only slight exaggeration, that *Tristan und Isolde* has only three cadences, one at the end of each act.

What made this difficult was that it undermined predictability. Again one thinks of language parallels. I believe that the most satisfying music occupies just the right place (for you) between total predictability (eg hearing a piece you already know by heart) and total unpredictability (which leads to unintelligibility). Partial anticipation of what is to come is produced by familiarity with the style and its conventions, and also, of course, by repetition. The expected continuation can be delayed or modified, and sometimes even denied, but if it is denied too often the listener gives up.

One of the principal formal devices of classical music, originating in the Italian baroque and taken over by Bach and later composers, was the sequence. Repeating a phrase at a different level in the diatonic scale, *ie* without changing key, as in the first movement of Mozart’s G-minor symphony, is called melodic sequence, and necessarily involves changing the harmony. When a phrase is repeated in a new key, but at the same level within that key (and the same harmony), it is called transposition. Liszt and Wagner much preferred transposition to sequence. There was a thrill for many Romantics in exploring abrupt key changes that were unexpected, and went beyond what had been acceptable in the classical period. But Wagner did it so often that he nearly destroyed the anticipation that had made both sequence and transposition such satisfying devices. I think when GHL complained of ‘want of melody’ he was groping for a way to describe a frustration that could have been more accurately termed ‘want of predictable

continuation'. A 'melody' isn't just any succession of notes. It is one that has enough resemblance to what is familiar to give a sense of partial recognition and of knowing where you are going, within a finite group of possibilities.