

Loya, S. (2016). Recomposing National Identity: Four Transcultural Readings of Liszt's Marche hongroise d'après Schubert. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 69(2), pp. 409-476.

doi: 10.1525/jams.2016.69.2.409



**CITY UNIVERSITY
LONDON**

[City Research Online](#)

Original citation: Loya, S. (2016). Recomposing National Identity: Four Transcultural Readings of Liszt's Marche hongroise d'après Schubert. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 69(2), pp. 409-476. doi: 10.1525/jams.2016.69.2.409

Permanent City Research Online URL: <http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/15059/>

Copyright & reuse

City University London has developed City Research Online so that its users may access the research outputs of City University London's staff. Copyright © and Moral Rights for this paper are retained by the individual author(s) and/ or other copyright holders. All material in City Research Online is checked for eligibility for copyright before being made available in the live archive. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to from other web pages.

Versions of research

The version in City Research Online may differ from the final published version. Users are advised to check the Permanent City Research Online URL above for the status of the paper.

Enquiries

If you have any enquiries about any aspect of City Research Online, or if you wish to make contact with the author(s) of this paper, please email the team at publications@city.ac.uk.

Recomposing National Identity: Four Transcultural Readings of Liszt's *Marche hongroise d'après Schubert*

SHAY LOYA

A Curious Attachment

Sometime in 1882, past his seventieth year, Liszt decided that an old piece of his deserved another revision. This resulted in the last of many arrangements of the *Marche hongroise d'après Schubert*, a work that originally took form as the second movement of the *Mélodies hongroises d'après Schubert* of 1838–39 (S. 425), Liszt's solo piano arrangement of Schubert's *Diversissement à l'hongroise* for piano four hands (D. 818, 1825, published 1826).¹ Carl Lachmund, an American pupil who kept a diary of his studies with Liszt from 1882 to 1884, gives a vivid account of how this final version of the Schubert-Liszt “Hungarian March” came about. According to Lachmund, it was on the occasion of his debut in a masterclass on May 2, 1882, at which he chose to play the work from an old 1840s publication, that Liszt told his pupils that he intended to republish the march, since he

Special thanks are due to Ralph Locke for his reading of earlier drafts and for help with French-language sources. I am also indebted to Michael Short for his help with primary sources; to Leslie Howard for introducing me to rare music scores; to Irene Auerbach for her help with German-language sources; and to Christopher H. Gibbs, Dana Gooley, Scott Messing, and Margaret Notley for their advice.

1. Liszt's *Mélodies hongroises* were published in 1840 as shown in Table 1. The “S.” (Searle) numbers used in this article are based on the Short-Howard catalog: Short and Howard, *Ferenc Liszt*. For S. 425/2ii I have consulted only the Lucca edition. The presumed date of composition, 1838–39, follows various catalogs of Liszt's works, as well as NLA II/3, xiv. Readers should be aware, however, that NLA II/3 references two letters from Liszt to Marie d'Agoult that indicate only that he had completed his arrangement by December 1839. (The relevant passages are translated in LAC, 137–38, 143.) Zoltán Gárdonyi gives the year 1838 without explanation, possibly as a result of seeing a sketchbook or a letter to or from Diabelli: Gárdonyi, *Liszt Ferenc magyar stílusa*, 74. Scholars after him also reproduce this date without explanation (see, for example, Eckhardt, “Liszts Bearbeitungen,” 135). I have not been able to trace any primary source that confirms that Liszt had started work on the piece by 1838, but do not discount the possibility for that reason. There is also some uncertainty about the year of composition of the original *Diversissement*: see Pethő, “*Style hongrois*,” 253.

“play[ed] it altogether differently now.”² As Lachmund approached “a part that had to be repeated”—most probably measures 91–102 of the old version—Liszt asked if he could play the repetition himself. This is what happened next:

Gently crowding me from the chair, and slipping his fingers over mine, he took up the repetition without interrupting the time. Thunderingly he stormed over the keyboard in grand variations, his face radiating youthful fire and vigor—in memory of former triumphs with the same *Marsch*, a piece after his own heart, in the noblest Hungarian spirit.

For a few moments there was silence; we did not dare applaud; Liszt stood deep in thought; and it seemed to me I had never seen a more expressive face. All the eyes turned on der liebe Meister; we realized he had been deeply moved by the recollections the piece brought back to him. Arousing himself he said: “Really, I must re-write this; and I will do so at an early opportunity.”³

The most reliable of witnesses can sometimes slightly misremember, misinterpret, or embellish what they have actually observed, but the basic facts bear this testimony out. We know that Liszt published the *Marche hongroise* in early 1883; that he was very fond of it and chose to play it several times in his old age on rare public appearances;⁴ and that the 1883 version is indeed

2. Lachmund, *Living with Liszt*, 9–10, 31–32. Lachmund prepared the diary for publication in 1922–23, but it remained unpublished in the original English until 1995, as detailed in Walker’s informative introduction.

3. *Ibid.*, 32. When Liszt took over he probably improvised a more florid passage similar to the *ossia* part at measures 135–46 of the 1883 version (S. 425/2vi; see Example 10), which is a reworking of measures 91–102 of S. 425 (the first version of 1838–39). I deduce this from Lachmund’s description of the music and from the music example provided in his book (*ibid.*, 31). Lachmund’s example reads like an editorial mistake, since it reproduces old variants of the march theme already encountered in the 1840s. It is indicative of the author’s meaning nonetheless, since the new (1882–83) variants of the same phrase (seen in Example 10) appear in the *ossia* staves immediately preceding Lachmund’s example.

4. Two examples of such special occasions may be cited. Liszt played one or more movements of the *Mélodies hongroises d’après Schubert* on March 20, 1876, in Budapest, in response to a general charity appeal after a disastrous flood. It seems he associated the piece with charity concerts he had given for Hungarian flood victims in 1838, the very flood that had caused him to ponder his Hungarian identity, only in 1876 he was actually present in Budapest during the (new) disaster; see Legány, *Ferenc Liszt . . . 1874–1886*, 47–50. Not long after the Budapest concert he played the *Marche hongroise* as an encore to a concert of his works given by his former pupil Theodor Ratzenberger as part of the Lower Rhine Festival in Düsseldorf. The motivation this time was to support Ratzenberger, who was apparently having financial difficulties; see Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Final Years*, 362. Lachmund, who was then a student in Cologne, had traveled to Düsseldorf and witnessed Liszt playing this piece (Lachmund, *Living with Liszt*, xvii), and it is possible that this prompted him to introduce himself to Liszt with the same piece six years later.

significantly different from the much earlier version played by Lachmund. The idea that Liszt became invigorated by memories of former triumphs with the same *Marsch*⁵ is persuasive in the context of this anecdote, and fits with the fact that he had originally transcribed Schubert's entire *Divertissement* during 1838–39, right at the beginning of the most spectacular phase of his virtuoso career, the so-called *Glanzzeit* or *Glanzperiode* (glorious period) of 1838–47.

But there is much more that Lachmund does not tell us, and that may point to other factors in Liszt's curious attachment to the work. First, Liszt's transcription of Schubert's *Divertissement* stands at the very beginning of his career as a "national composer." In that light, it is of some significance that he transformed the march movement into heroic, virtuosic music, driven toward an apotheosis à la Beethoven, and that this compositional act coincided with his decision to represent himself as a Hungarian. Secondly, this new kind of national art music allowed Liszt to express a Hungarian identity with links to French republicanism and Viennese music, one that mirrored his own diverse and interrelated cultural affiliations. Thus the transcultural relationships reflected in this work—between centers and peripheries, and between personal patriotism and public nationalism—complicate simpler nationalistic narratives. An overview of the work's history and the extent of Liszt's revisions will provide a useful introduction to these complexities.

Liszt completed the *Mélodies hongroises* sometime in 1839 and as far as we can tell from surviving concert programs first performed it in Vienna, on December 14 of that year. A few days later, on December 19, he gave his first concert in Pressburg (then part of Hungary, now Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia), and with it he launched his much-celebrated "homecoming" tour, sixteen years after he had left Hungary as a boy. We know from a letter to Marie d'Agoult dated December 25 that, shortly after playing the *Rákóczi March* for the first time and being struck by the strong enthusiasm it elicited, he had spent an entire morning in his hotel "transcribing the 2nd part [i.e., the march movement] of the *Divertissement hongroise* of Schubert."⁵ Since this occurred after he had already completed the transcription of the *Marche hongroise* and performed it in Vienna, Liszt's letter indicates that something about his performance of the *Rákóczi* may have induced him to revisit Schubert's march. Did he intend to play it to audiences in Hungary, to elicit similar patriotic enthusiasm? Liszt does not tell us, and other primary sources unfortunately help little with this question. The original manuscript has not survived, and many reviews and concert programs from the Hungarian tour simply state "Hungarian March." This generic title could refer to any number of works (most obviously the *Rákóczi March*), so we cannot be sure

5. LAC, 143.

when or how often Liszt played the *Marche hongroise* in Hungary,⁶ or, for that matter, in other countries.⁷

Stronger evidence of the march's popularity can thankfully be gleaned from the numerous editions of it that were published in Vienna, Hamburg, Paris, London, and Milan between 1840 and 1846 (see Table 1).⁸ A flurry of publications followed the 1839–40 Hungarian tour, and another single publication of the complete *Mélodies hongroises* (including a new version of the march) appeared in 1846, the year in which Liszt toured Austria and Hungary (including Transylvania) even more extensively. We then see a sudden resumption of publications in the 1870s and 1880s (see Table 2), decades after Liszt's retirement from active concertizing in September 1847. The two orchestral versions and a four-hand version were certainly not about a "memory of former triumphs" in the narrow sense of recalling Liszt the virtuoso. Likewise, the two late piano versions (1879 and 1883, the former written for a pupil's use) were not intended as collectable souvenirs of Liszt's playing.

Why this particular work should have mattered so much to Liszt, rather than any of the many other warhorses that had bedazzled audiences during the *Glanzzeit*, is moot. And if it is the march's putative noble Hungarian

6. The music played during the Hungarian tour is not as well documented as that of the Viennese one. The *Rákóczi March* seems to have been quite frequent, as were the *Grand galop chromatique*, *Hexaméron* (to be discussed later in this article), and *Erlkönig*, but only one program dating from the first Hungarian tour (Pest, January 9, 1840) mentions "Hungarian Melody and March," which probably alludes to (the first?) two movements of the *Mélodies hongroises d'après Schubert*. Although later programs increasingly mention Liszt's playing of "Mélodies hongroises," this vague title could also refer to his *Magyar dallok* (S. 242), or to some other work, or to an improvisation. The same problem applies to reviews that mention unspecified Hungarian works. But when the dates of these titles in programs from France, England, and Germany are compared with contemporaneous publications of the *Marche hongroise* in Paris, London, and Hamburg (shown in Table 1), the correlation strongly suggests that Liszt frequently performed the work in the early 1840s. His recitals during his Viennese and Hungarian tours are summarized in Legány, "Liszt in Hungary," 7–16. My thanks to Michael Short for sharing with me his research in this area.

7. To give a typical example, an anonymous correspondent for the *Music Journal* (May 12, 1840) gives the most impressionistic account of Liszt's playing, predictably compares him to Thalberg, and then writes, "So great and continued was the burst of applause which followed his 'Marche Hongroise,' that he was induced to re-seat himself at the piano, when he again let loose the wild rushes of his exuberant and impetuous fancy." Which "Marche hongroise" is never mentioned. The *Anthemum* review of the same event (July 4) strongly suggests that it was S. 231 rather than S. 425 (i.e., not the Schubert-Liszt march), but again there can be no complete certainty. See Williams, *Portrait of Liszt*, 136. What is beyond doubt is that Liszt often programmed Hungarian marches around the time that the first versions of S. 425 were printed and disseminated (i.e., 1840–41; see *ibid.*, 132, 135–36, 138, 144, 186, 191).

8. As James Deaville has shown, such editions of popular recital works were collected as souvenirs of Liszt's electrifying performances: Deaville, "Publishing Paraphrases." We can further note that the publication of S. 425 in 1840 coincided with the republication of the original Schubert *Divertissement*, thus also serving the business interests of Diabelli.

Table 1 Publications of Liszt's *Mélodies hongroises d'après Schubert* and of various versions of the march (second) movement in the 1840s

S. no.	Title	Composed	Historical publication	Modern publication	Comments
425	<i>Mélodies hongroises d'après Schubert</i> : 1) Andante 2) Marcia (first version) 3) Allegretto	1838–39	Vienna: Diabelli, 1840 (pl. nos. 6958–60); Hamburg: Cranz, 1840 (pl. nos. as for Diabelli, 1840)	NLA II/3 (1999)	Based on Schubert's <i>Divertissement à la hongroise</i> (D. 818, 1825).
425/2iii	<i>Mélodie hongroise de François Schubert</i> (march movement only) <i>Marche hongroise</i>		Paris: Richault, 1840 (pl. no. R. 4413) London: Lavenu, 1840 (pl. no. L. 175)		Dedicated to Count Gustave Neipperg; slight revision of the original (different repeats). Same variant without the dedication to Neipperg.
425/2ii	<i>Marche hongroise d'après Schubert</i>		Paris: Latte, 1841 (pl. no. B.L. 2308); Milan: Lucca, 1841 (pl. no. C 3493 C)		Dedicated to Prince Felix Lichnowsky. Contains added <i>ossia</i> passages and a different ending.
425a	<i>Schuberts ungarischen Melodien—aus dem ungarischen Divertissement—auf eine neue leichtere Spielart gesetzt</i>	1846	Vienna: Diabelli, 1846 (pl. nos. 8353–8355); Hamburg: Cranz, 1846 (pl. nos. as for Diabelli, 1846)	NLA II/3 (1999)	A shortened and simplified version of S. 425.

Table 2 Late versions of the Schubert-Liszt *Marche hongroise*

S. no.	Title	Composed	Historical publication	Modern publication	Comments
363/4	<i>Franz Schuberts Märsche:</i> 1) <i>Vivace</i> 2) <i>Trauermarsch</i> 3) <i>Reitermarsch</i> 4) <i>Ungarischer Marsch</i>	1859–60 (US-Wc, ^a ML31. H43a no. 61); revised 1870 (H-Bn, ^b Ms. mus. 4.869)	Berlin: Fürstner, 1870–71 (pl. nos. 191–95)		Two orchestral versions.
632/4	<i>Franz Schuberts Märsche</i>	1872–79	Berlin: Fürstner, 1880 (pl. nos. F.2100–2103)		Arrangement of the orchestral version. ^c
425/2iv	<i>Marche hongroise</i>	1879 (US-Wc, Rosenthal Collection)	Unpublished ^d	<i>Liszt Society Journal</i> 31, Music Section (2006): 21–30	Prepared for Liszt's pupil Sophie Menter.
425/2v and 2vi	<i>Marche hongroise: Troisième édition revue et augmentée</i>	1882? (US-Wc, ML96.L58)	Hamburg: Cranz, 1883 (pl. no. 35681)	NLA II/15 (2003)	The <i>ossia</i> to the Cranz edition is catalogued as 425/2vi.

^a Washington, DC, Library of Congress, Music Division.

^b Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár.

^c According to Dezső Legány, the (likely) first performance of S. 632 was given on March 26, 1872, played by Liszt and M. Reitter Pázmándy: Legány, *Ferenc Liszt... 1869–1873*, 283.

^d The work was first recorded by Leslie Howard in *Franz Liszt: The Complete Music for Solo Piano*, vol. 31, Hyperion, 1995.

character that made it such a favorite of Liszt's, this still leaves us none the wiser as to why he preferred it to other nationalistic works, and why he felt compelled to revise it so many times. Nostalgia and national identity alone cannot explain a sustained project consisting of as many as nine different notated versions between the 1830s and the 1880s—something of a record, even for an inveterate reviser such as Liszt.⁹

Liszt's iconic status as a national composer and founder of a new Hungarian school prompts the more pointed question of how “a piece after his own heart, in the noblest Hungarian spirit” could have had its origin in a work by a Viennese composer. Why would a national composer return to music of questionable cultural origins so many times? It is indeed a curious fact that no other Liszt arrangement of music by another composer, whether nationalistic or not, comes close to this number of revisions; and that the only other “national” work with a similar history of revisions is the aforementioned *Rákóczi March*.¹⁰

The latter fact is particularly noteworthy, because in terms of representation the two works are very different. The *Rákóczi* was a popular nineteenth-century military march that evoked a historical rebellion against the Habsburgs, and was recognized both in Hungary and abroad as a political symbol of Hungarian identity. The Schubert-Liszt march could never attain such national status, even if its particular style may have influenced the work of Liszt's Budapest circle to a limited extent.¹¹ Whereas the *Rákóczi* represented self-determination and frankly anti-Habsburg sentiments, the Schubert-Liszt march originated in the world of the Viennese *style hongrois*, the manner in which the subjugated Hungary was portrayed in the music of the imperial capital.¹² As a self-appointed

9. Precisely what constitutes a separate version is arguable. Leslie Howard, who first brought the numerous versions of this work to attention in his *Franz Liszt: The Complete Music for Solo Piano* recordings (vols. 31–33), counts all the different S. 425 numbers as seven different solo piano versions (to this count one can then add the other versions). By my count, there are two or three early solo versions (S. 425 and S. 425a; other 1840–41 editions are close to S. 425, with the arguable exception of the Lucca edition, S. 425/2ii, which contains some notable *ossia* passages and additions); two orchestral versions (1860 and 1871); one piano duet; and three late solo versions (1879 and the 1883 edition, which Short and Howard rightly catalog as two different versions within the same edition—S. 425/2v and its extensive *ossia* part S. 425/2vi); therefore nine or ten in total.

10. Liszt's *Die Zelle in Nonnenwerth* is also comparable in terms of the high number of versions written during 1841–83, but it is an original work in an altogether different genre—an elegy that came to assume an increasingly tragic meaning in Liszt's life. See Leslie Howard's booklet notes on *The Canticle of the Sun*, in *Franz Liszt: The Complete Music for Solo Piano*, vol. 25, 4.

11. Loya, “Liszt's *verbunkos* Legacy,” 28–29.

12. The term “style hongrois,” as used in present-day musicology, was coined by Jonathan Bellman in *The “style hongrois” in the Music of Western Europe* (1993). Although “style hongrois” is simply the French for “Hungarian style” (the way the term was used by Zoltán Gárdonyi in the 1936 French translation of his *Die ungarischen Stileigentümlichkeiten in den musikalischen*

representative of the country, it makes sense that Liszt wanted to assert his authorship of the *Rákóczi* at crucial points in his career through a number of versions,¹³ but the same logic does not apply to a far less canonical piano arrangement associated with Schubert. Liszt was aware of the importance of the *Rákóczi March* in Hungary (as revealed in his correspondence);¹⁴ the Schubert-Liszt march simply happened to be the other Hungarian march he transcribed in a heroic manner at the time. Both marches had been foundational in their own way, as will be discussed presently; yet one of them remains obscure, and the historical importance of Liszt's Hungarian marches in general is also forgotten.

Liszt's Hungarian Marches: A Forgotten History

As early as 1931 Zoltán Gárdonyi observed that these first two heroic Hungarian marches of the late 1830s established two different subtypes of the Hungarian march in Liszt's oeuvre. Most immediately, the moderate tempo and dignified character of the Schubert-Liszt *Marche hongroise* was the model for Liszt's *Heroischer Marsch im ungarischen Styl* (S. 231, 1840; old German spelling), whereas the fiery character and quick pace of the *Rákóczi* inspired the *Ungarischer Sturmmarsch* (S. 232, 1844; second version S. 524, 1875–76).¹⁵ Gárdonyi also noted the more obvious fact that Liszt's symphonic poem *Hungaria* (1856), a landmark in the creation of a

Werken Franz Liszts), it was not until the late 1990s that it became a fixed musicological concept, always in French, denoting the evocation of Hungarian or Gypsy identity in art music. Bellman's book, which is clearly influenced by Ratner's topics theory, concentrated on the use and reception of the *style hongrois* as representative of ethnic and cultural otherness. My preferred (more generic and historically specific) term is the *verbunkos* idiom, as explained in Loya, *Liszt's Transcultural Modernism*, 1–10. I do, however, find Bellman's term useful for the exploration of particular exoticist discourses, and this is the stricter sense in which I use it when referring to a tradition of "the Viennese *style hongrois*."

13. Since his 1839–40 tour of the country Liszt had clearly associated this work with his representational status in Hungary. He often concluded recitals with this march, including the historic concert of January 4, 1840, after which he was awarded the "saber of honor" that ceremonially proclaimed him a national hero; see Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years*, 323–32, and Gooley, *Virtuoso Liszt*, 117–200. Liszt's attempts to publish the work were thwarted by the Austrian censor, however (LAC, 155). In 1847 he finally managed to publish a revised version dedicated to the six Hungarian magnates who had presented him with the ceremonial sword back in 1840. He then published it both separately (1851) and as part of the definitive *Fifteen Hungarian Rhapsodies* (1853), placing it meaningfully at the end of the collection. Also notable is the fact that the orchestral version (with accompanying piano reductions) was published in 1871, not long after Liszt assumed a significant public role in Hungarian musical life. For the *Rákóczi March* versions, see NLA I/18, xv–xviii, and Eckhardt, *Franz Liszt's Music Manuscripts*, 112–28.

14. LAC, 143.

15. Gárdonyi, *Liszt Ferenc magyar stílusa*, 82–84. This is the 1936 Hungarian-French edition of the original German book of 1931.

canon of national works, was closely related to the *Héroischer Marsch im ungarischen Styl*, from which several of its main themes are derived.¹⁶ These observations, rich in possibilities, do not lead to further speculation about the foundational role of the Schubert-Liszt piece.¹⁷ I am not aware that any commentator since Gárdonyi has considered the work's importance in this specific context. In fact, the work is often omitted from discussions of Liszt's early Hungarian repertory, or else its (too complicated?) relationship with nineteenth-century Hungarian nationalism is glossed over.¹⁸

One reason for the omission is a wider historiographic tendency to concentrate almost exclusively on the *Magyar dallók* (Hungarian Melodies, 1840–51) and Hungarian Rhapsodies (1851, 1853) in such discussions, resulting in a limited understanding of how Liszt set out to build a national canon of works.¹⁹ As we have seen, two subgenres of the heroic Hungarian march, the stately and quick types that led to other original marches, were already established before the *Magyar dallók*. But to understand more fully the foundational role of the Hungarian march genre in the 1840s one needs only to take stock of the many march-like sections within other types of works. In fact, a third subgenre of the Hungarian march, the Hungarian funeral march, is explored in a few of the early *Magyar dallók*, coming into its own in 1846 with no. 12 of the series, entitled “Héroïde élégiaque.”²⁰ Soon the heroic Hungarian march had a further use for Liszt as a recurring topic in his works (whether or not self-declared as “Hungarian”),²¹ and especially as the means toward the greatest goal of all, a national symphony, as revealed in symphonic sketches dating back to 1840 and leading up to *Hungaria*.²² All three subgenres (quick, stately, funerary) became even

16. *Ibid.*, 92.

17. This is because Gárdonyi's overriding concern is the sense in which the *Mélodies hongroises* can be considered to be “a Hungarian work by Liszt,” a concern about personal and national ownership rather than the specific role of one movement in kick-starting a national canon. In the context of this discussion the *Mélodies hongroises* are presented as something of a false start: *ibid.*, 74–75. Gárdonyi may not have known at the time of later versions of the Schubert-Liszt *Marche hongroise*.

18. To give three representative examples: Klára Hamburger dispatches the work in one sentence in her Liszt biography; Humphrey Searle gives one passage from the work as an example of Liszt's “formidable demands of the pianist”; and in his three-volume biography of Liszt Alan Walker mentions the work twice, and in the context of pianism rather than nationalism. See Hamburger, *Liszt*, 46; Searle, *Music of Liszt*, 46; and Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years*, 312–13, and *Franz Liszt: The Final Years*, 362.

19. The following description is based on Loya, *Liszt's Transcultural Modernism*, 98–101.

20. It was later recycled as Hungarian Rhapsody no. 5, also no. 5 of the 1874 orchestral version. The symphonic poem *Héroïde funèbre* (1849–56) is also related to this genre.

21. See, for example, the “Marcia funebre” section of the symphonic poem *Héroïde funèbre* (S. 102, 1849–50, rev. 1854–56), the opening of the Credo of Liszt's *Missa solennis*, S. 9 (1855–58), and Variation 1 of *Totentanz*, S. 126 (1865).

22. These conclusions are largely based on Kaczmarczyk, “Genesis of the *Funérailles*” and “Franz Liszt's First Hungarian Symphonic Attempt.”

more prominent in Liszt's late instrumental and vocal oeuvre, from the stately march "Die heiligen drei Könige" (*Christus*, S. 3, 1866–72), through laments such as "Sunt lacrymae rerum" (*Années de pèlerinage: Troisième année*, S. 163, 1872–82) and the fast-paced *Ungarischer Marsch zur Krönungsfeier* (S. 523, 1870), to the various march movements of the *Historische ungarische Bildnisse* (S. 205, 1885).

The historiographic neglect of Liszt's Hungarian marches, in contrast to the attention given to the Hungarian Rhapsodies, is partly due to the Rhapsodies' much clearer emphasis on stylistic difference from mainstream European music. As early as the 1780s the idea of a distinct "national" Hungarian music was invariably related to the genre of the *verbunkos* (recruiting dance), or magyar (Hungarian dance) as it was then called, and to the manner of its performance by Gypsy bands.²³ From the early nineteenth century onward there was a growing interest in attempting to capture performance practices in notation,²⁴ and in that sense Liszt's Hungarian Rhapsodies were not so much a departure from previous *verbunkos* literature as a radical realization of that particular trend. Liszt's book *Des Bohémiens et de leur musique en Hongrie* (1859) then also linked such performance practices to "Gypsy" cultural and racial alterity, which in turn conditioned readers of the book to listen to the Hungarian Rhapsodies in this way. By contrast, the Hungarian march was still a kind of march, which did not conform very well to the premise by which nationality is equated with stylistic, cultural, or ethnic distinctiveness. At best its style could be identified as "Hungarian" if it included strong *verbunkos* elements such as the *bokázó* figure (representing the clicking of the heels, actually absent from the second movement of the *Divertissement* though used abundantly from the very first phrase of the first movement), other typical melodic turns, ornaments, and

23. "Verbunkos" (Hung., pl. "verbunkosok") refers to the Hungarian recruitment dance of the eighteenth century, comprising Hungarian village dances for men and elements of Western march music. Etymologically it relates to the music and dances played during "Werbung" (recruiting) campaigns in Hungarian villages, which lasted until 1848. The musical genre outlasted its recruiting function, however. The *verbunkos* genre can therefore also be understood as comprising many subgenres that dominated nineteenth-century national music, including the slow and ornamental *hallgató*, the *giusto*-tempo *verbunk*, and the fast-paced *fris* and *csárdás*. Elements of *verbunkos* also permeate the genre of composed Hungarian songs known as *magyar nóta*, which started in the 1840s. Although the familiar term for this genre in the nineteenth century was simply "Hungarian," "magyar," or "Gypsy music," Bence Szabolcsi and other twentieth-century Hungarian musicologists began to use the term "verbunkos" to denote a super-genre that had historical specificity, in contrast to the timeless term "magyar": Szabolcsi, *Concise History*, 56. Current musicologists opt either for the generic "verbunkos" (as do I in *Liszt's Transcultural Modernism*, 1–10), or for the hyphenated ethnic label "Hungarian-Gypsy music" (Locke, *Musical Exoticism*, 136–37; Hooker, *Redefining Hungarian Music*, 43–45).

24. That shift occurred partly as a result of the rise of star performers, the most prominent of whom was Janos Bihári (1764–1827). This type of "authorial *verbunkos*," as I term it, eclipsed the simpler, "authorless," and deliberately naive late eighteenth-century type of *verbunkos*, see Loya, *Liszt's Transcultural Modernism*, 76–81.

augmented seconds. In terms of rhythm, one can find a propensity for spondee (two accented long notes at the beginning or end of a phrase, as in the Schubert-Liszt march), short-long-short syncopations (as in the accompaniment of the Schubert-Liszt march), and dotted rhythms, none of which in isolation marks out certain marches as “Hungarian.”

From a basic stylistic point of view, then, the march is a problematic national genre. But we can turn the problem on its head by noting that the militaristic march has also been the genre of nationalism par excellence since the French Revolution, used everywhere to glorify different nationalities. In that sense it is an instance of a “National Style-Only Paradigm” (to adapt a concept from Ralph P. Locke) that restricts the analysis of musical nationalism to a limited number of stylistic markers, not unlike the limits it places on the perception of musical exoticism (Locke’s original argument).²⁵ The “style-only” paradigm misses other expressive and compositional aspects of the work that apply to nationalism. Just as in national opera an “All the Music in Full (Nationalistic) Context” paradigm (to apply Locke’s theory again to nationalism) is necessary to explain how different musical features of a piece interact with the background story, plot, staging, and so on, one should also consider broader formal aspects of instrumental music beyond idiomatic gestures: for example, the choice of genre itself, tonal-thematic processes that imply a narrative of heroism or redemption, and non-idiomatic gestures that relate to an explicit or implicit nationalist “program.” This broader view is indispensable if we are to consider how Liszt intensified the “national” aspect of Schubert’s work without adding particular idiomatic markers.

Similarly, in this article we shall consider more fully the sense in which Liszt’s arrangement was not merely a pianistic elaboration but a creative response to Schubert and the Viennese tradition of the *style hongrois*. The historiographical invisibility of the *Marche hongroise* can in part be attributed to the twentieth-century bias against arrangements for (supposedly) lacking in originality.²⁶ (The perceived derivativeness of arrangements such as the *Marche hongroise* seemed to gain historical vindication from the fact that they were survived by the original works they feigned to promote: whereas the *Mélodies hongroises* sank into obscurity, the original *Divertissement* had long been a staple of the piano-duet repertory.)²⁷

25. Locke, *Musical Exoticism*, 48–64.

26. On the twentieth-century marginalization of transcriptions, particularly those of Liszt, see Deaville, “Wanting the Real Thing?”

27. To this day there are very few recordings of Liszt’s transcription(s) of Schubert’s march. (Almost all existing recordings are listed in the short “Recordings” section of the “Works Cited” list, below.) The important role of arrangements in the nineteenth century in disseminating music that was otherwise inaccessible (which only emphasized their irrelevance in the following century) was never the *raison d’être* for most of Liszt’s Schubert arrangements in any case, since the originals were much better suited to amateur music making in the home. The point was rather to promote Liszt as a pianist, and also to increase the publisher Diabelli’s income by

Against this bias some scholars have highlighted Liszt's creativity beyond technical pianistic innovation, especially in cases where his arrangements seem to intervene in, and thereby inject new meaning into, the content of other composers' works.²⁸ Jonathan Kregor's recent study of Liszt's arrangements expanded this mainly aesthetic stance critically, inquiring how different transcription strategies reflect Liszt's respective investment in each of his multiple cultural identities—most importantly the French, German, Hungarian, and Catholic.²⁹ This is also our point of departure. A work by a dead Viennese composer transformed into a substantially different composition during the politically charged years of 1839–40 cries out for a critical interpretation; as does the work's continued relevance throughout Liszt's life.

Transculturation and Identity

A work that crossed so many mediums and genres, and was performed in different historical contexts for different audiences, naturally lends itself to multivalent interpretations.³⁰ Even a single version of the work in one particular historical context can give rise to several perspectives. The very first transcription exemplifies a generic crossover from a Biedermeier-era piano duet for gifted amateurs (Schubert's *Divertissement à l'hongroise*) to virtuoso concert music, a change of cultural location, from a fairly local Viennese piece in the *style hongrois* to one with a more international resonance (associated, for example, with French-republican marches, as discussed below), and a change of representation, from a portrayal of otherness (Schubert being entirely Viennese) to the expression of national selfhood. All of these cultural shifts suggest that, at this point in history (1838–39), Liszt “transcribed” and “recomposed” a new identity, one that selectively accepted and rejected certain cultural, aesthetic, and musical elements of Schubert's Viennese *style hongrois*. Later versions of the work show further negotiations of national and cultural identity.

The process of such a selective, evolving formation of cultural identity through prolonged cultural contact can be described as “transculturation.” As originally conceived by Fernando Ortiz in *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar* (first published 1940), transculturation is a three-way process that involves the acquisition of culture (acculturation), the loss of the original culture (deculturation), and the formation of a new culture (neoculturation).

reintroducing Schubert's music through Liszt's charismatic playing, so that enthusiastic audiences would be tempted to purchase either the original works, their arrangements (as unplayable souvenirs), or both. See also Deaville, “Publishing Paraphrases.”

28. Wilde, “Transcriptions for Piano”; Suttoni, “Opera Paraphrases.”

29. Kregor, *Liszt as Transcriber*.

30. For an example of how such a multivalent approach may work in opera, see Locke, “*Aida* and Nine Readings of Empire.”

The most detailed case study of transculturation in *Cuban Counterpoint* relates to the changing meaning of tobacco after Native American, black African, and Iberian white communities came into contact with each other in sixteenth-century Cuba. Thus transculturation is not only about individuals and communities, but also about cultural values attached to specific ideas and artifacts.³¹ Transculturation was further popularized as a postcolonial concept in *Writing across Cultures: Narrative Transculturation in Latin America* (first published 1982) by the Uruguayan critic Ángel Rama, who shifted the focus to literary texts and modes of reinventing and resisting dominant Western literary models. Following Mary Louis Pratt's *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (first published 1992) the concept became better known to Anglophones, especially in relation to the study of South American texts and visual arts, and the way in which subaltern populations responded inventively to the pressures of modernity and imperial hegemony in what Pratt described as the "contact zone."

"Transculturation" has since been applied to different cultural phenomena and art forms, and beyond postcolonial and South American studies.³² I have queried elsewhere the extent to which Liszt's much-discussed modernist aesthetics and techniques interfaced with the Hungarian-Gypsy tradition he inherited, and how these processes of musical transculturation related to his complex identity.³³ Liszt is known for his cosmopolitanism, but it is worth remembering that he was rooted in particular cultures, and that his relationship with these cultures evolved in a particular way. A brief outline of his cultural transformations will suffice to make the point. He was born and raised in West Hungary (today Burgenland in Austria) as part of an ethnic German minority (1811–21), acquired some education and culture in Vienna (1821–23), and thereafter became an acculturated Parisian, with French replacing German as his first language. In 1838 he declared himself Hungarian, and held fast to this identity for the rest of his life.³⁴ During his concertizing years in the 1840s his connection to Paris weakened, and in

31. Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint*, pt. 2, chs. 1–7.

32. Examples include Julie F. Codell's *Transculturation in British Art* (2012), which also provides a good theoretical introduction, and Felipe Hernández's "Transcultural Architecture in Latin America" (2005), which takes the term beyond postcolonial politics. The concept has permeated music studies (especially ethnomusicology) since the 1990s (Geoffrey Colson's "A Fresh Approach to Transculturation in Contemporary Music in Tahiti," 2014, offers further theoretical development as well as applications), and since 1998 there has even been a journal dedicated to the concept, *TRANS-Revista transcultural de música*. There is still considerable scope, however, for applying transcultural perspectives to European art music.

33. Loya, *Liszt's Transcultural Modernism*. For the theoretical application of the term, see pages 1–57; the *verbunkos* idiom's role in "non-Hungarian" and late works is discussed on pages 191–251; and the relationship between this compositional transculturation and Liszt's background and life events is examined in Chapter 3, "Identity, Nationalism, and Modernism," 86–117.

34. As stated in his famous letter to Lambert Massart, published in *La revue et gazette musicale de Paris* (September 2, 1838); see Liszt, *Artist's Journey*, 138–40.

1848 he settled in Weimar and became deeply involved in north German music and culture. At this point he also replaced his native Austrian dialect with *Hochdeutsch*, without shedding his Hungarian identity or his use of French as a first language.³⁵ In 1861 he settled in Rome and concentrated on Catholic music, and in the final years of his life assumed several titles and public roles in Hungary, which increased his commitment to the country and his output of compositions representing a Hungarian identity. He nevertheless continued to divide his time mainly between Rome, Weimar, and Budapest (the so-called “vie trifurquée,” 1869–86).

In this article I focus on a single piece and situate it, over a period of forty-five years, in particular moments both in history and in Liszt’s life. In this case the act of transcription itself constitutes an interesting subject for transcultural investigation, given the origins of the music in both *verbunkos* and Schubert, the interplay between Hungarian, Austro-German, and French identities, and the way in which we can understand the transfer of music from one medium to another in terms of “transcribing” and “retranscribing” identity. Such richness invites multiple readings of the work, and I shall offer four extensive interpretations, in a chronological order that will allow us to follow the work’s evolution.

My first reading considers Liszt’s original reaction to Schubert’s *à Phongroise* (Hungarian manner) in generic terms, and examines how the alteration of genre expressed a kind of nationalist repatriation or reclamation. It queries how and why Liszt treated the march movement differently from the two outer movements of Schubert’s *Divertissement*, and demonstrates the foundational role of the resulting *Marche hongroise* by comparing it with a related work that followed soon afterward, the aforementioned *Heroischer Marsch im ungarischen Styl* (1840). Reading 1 also provides a transcultural critique of this nationalist aspect of the march, by pointing both to this work’s constant dialogue with Schubert’s original movement and to its relationship with Beethoven’s heroic style, and by distinguishing between generic reconfiguration and the work’s actual reception.

The second reading locates this work as part of a French-republican march tradition, linking it to other marches by Liszt from the same era that communicate either explicit or implicit revolutionary messages. Two of these works, the *Étude no. 4* (“Mazeppa”) and the *Hexaméron*, even show a forceful aesthetic (and possibly political) reaction to Viennese post-Classicism, casting an interesting shadow on the *Marche hongroise d’après Schubert* that was to follow them. Like Reading 1, Reading 2 provides an intertextual analysis of genre that, problematically, cannot be corroborated by a reception study for lack of sufficient evidence.

By contrast, the late 1850s present us with some interesting anecdotes concerning the way Liszt used both the original *Divertissement* and the new

35. For a detailed examination of Liszt’s complex identity through his use of languages, see Cormac, “Liszt, Language, and Identity.”

orchestral transcription of the *Marche hongroise* to represent a benevolent Hungarian identity in Vienna, during the difficult years that followed the suppression of the 1849 Hungarian uprising. Reading 3 shows that the political and cultural was also personal. Paying homage to Schubert in Vienna, while appropriating his “Hungarian” music, was part of Liszt’s effort to promote his new Weimar works, subdue conservative critics (chief among them Hanslick), and simultaneously assert his own vision of a plural, world-facing Hungarian identity, in opposition to chauvinistic trends in Hungary.

The fourth and final reading considers how a modernist (and ostensibly “New German”) symphonic and harmonic style increasingly permeated the work from 1859 onward, creating both moments of stylistic rupture and unlikely cultural blending. In these late versions one can still hear the older meanings of the heroic march from the *Vormärz* years, even if these are at times attenuated or even subverted. Conversely, one could apply Reading 3 (conciliation) and Reading 4 (modernism) to earlier versions of the march. These late versions in particular force us to again ask how this work expressed “the noblest Hungarian spirit” and on what terms, questions that will take us back to where we started—Liszt playing to his awe-struck pupils on a May morning in 1882.

Reading 1: Nationalist Reclamation

In the 1830s a Hungarian art-music school was a distant dream, despite the cultural awakening and political optimism of the so-called “reform era” (1825–48). The proud cultivation of popular magyars (*verbunkosok*) by patriotic societies such as the Veszprém Vármegyei Zenetársaság (Veszprém County Music Society) had more to do with national heritage than artistic ambition. The uncomfortable truth about Hungarian music in the 1830s was that one of the litmus tests for a country’s low cultural standing in Europe was the combination of being renowned for rich folklore and poor high art.³⁶ This cultural situation was reflected aesthetically in the lower-grade genres of *verbunkos* adaptations: the folkloristic tradition of individual numbers or suites consisting of short phrases, written by local and sometimes anonymous composers;³⁷ more polished and stylized versions of the same, by highly accomplished composers such as Hummel (*Balli ongaresi*, 1807);

36. Gustav Schilling’s *Encyclopädie der gesammten musikalischen Wissenschaften* of 1840, for example, consistently made that point, with Hungary as a prime example by comparison with neighboring Austria; see Mayes, “Eastern European National Music,” 75, and Gramit, *Cultivating Music*, 56.

37. For two seminal publications of such *verbunkos* collections, see Papp, *Hungarian Dances, 1784–1810*, and Ruzitska, *Magyar nóták Veszprém Vármegyéből* (Hungarian Melodies from Veszprém County). The latter collection was sponsored from 1823 to 1832 by the abovementioned Veszprém County Music Society; see Ruzitska, *Magyar nóták Veszprém Vármegyéből*, 3, 42.

and the Viennese tradition of adapting folkloristic material such as *verbunkosok* into charming, lighthearted rondo-finales (such as Haydn's "Rondo all'ongarese" from the Trio in G Major Hob. XV:25). More ambitiously, at the turn of the nineteenth century we find in Hungary programmatic music for strings based on the *verbunkos*; yet even these pieces barely exceeded the dimensions of a *verbunkos* suite, and were at any rate unknown outside the country.³⁸ Likewise, Hungarian musical plays and Singspiele from the 1820s and 1830s feature *verbunkosok* only intermittently, in short scenes, and were meant solely for domestic consumption.³⁹

It is clear why Liszt would be attracted to Schubert's *Divertissement à l'hongroise*. Its alluring mixture of folklorism and Romantic sensibility, and the impressive and effortless way its large dimensions and sophisticated form sustained a *verbunkos* idiom throughout, dwarfed all previous attempts to create a *verbunkos*-based artwork, including Liszt's own youthful *Zwei ungarische Werbungstänze* (Two Hungarian Recruiting Dances, S. 241, 1828). This was particularly true of the innovative two outer movements in rondo form. Each of these movements contained two expansive episodes that functioned more like independent movements in their own right, with internal repetitions.⁴⁰ Schubert tried to fit this intricate, expansive form to the material by developing the most characteristic *verbunkos* elements motivically, and by creating associations between the Classical rondo and form-building principles of a *verbunkos* dance suite. The recursive section-within-a-section effect created a dreamlike sequence of material, with a loose sense of harmonic teleology. The ternary structure of each episode balanced the primitivist effect of copious melodic repetition with the imperative of thematic development. As Csilla Pethő writes, "we do not perceive [the outer movements'] intricate rondo form so much as the diversity of various thematic materials whose enumeration seems spontaneous, throwing the rhapsodic character of the work into deep relief."⁴¹ Moreover, the two outer movements were full of modal peculiarities and imitations of Gypsy-band

38. Notable examples of this genre include János Lavotta's *Nobilium hungariae insurgentium nota insurrectionalis hungarica* (Uprising of the Hungarian Nobles: Hungarian Revolutionary Music, 1797) and Antal Csermák's *Az intézett veszedelem vagy Hazya szeretete* (The Threatening Danger, or Love of the Homeland, 1809).

39. Szabolcsi, *Concise History*, 60–61. The same tradition continued to limit the use of *verbunkosok* in Ferenc Erkel's first "grand" Hungarian operas from the 1840s, and also in subsequent operas. The infrequent, or rather discriminating, use of a *verbunkos* idiom in Erkel's operas has more recently been defended on dramaturgical grounds in Schneider, *Bartók, Hungary*, 69–78.

40. The form, a succession of refrains and palindrome-shaped episodes, may be summarized as R–E1 [aba']–R'–E2 [cdc']–R, with a final coda for the third movement. There are quasi-improvisatory cadenzas leading back to the refrain, but in this respect the movements are not strictly alike: the first movement has two identical cadenzas, one after each episode, while the third has only one, after the second episode.

41. Pethő, "Style hongrois," 256.

instruments and performance practices such as percussive cimbalom tremolos, open fifths, and quasi-violinistic solos in cadenzas. In other words, these two movements of Schubert's *Divertissement* foreshadowed the compositional ideas that led to Liszt's Rhapsodies. Just as usefully, they provided an anti-model for him to work against. Liszt rejected a glorified version of the same old *style hongrois* tradition of representing Hungary in *Hausmusik* genres and folkloristic rondos. He hit on an alternative way of constructing a larger-scale work in the *Magyar dallok* no. 7, the first "Hungarian Rhapsody" in all but name, by applying the improvisatory techniques and form-building principles of operatic paraphrase to this material, and also by blending such techniques with Gypsy-band improvisatory traditions.⁴²

Almost two decades later, Liszt's book *Des Bohémiens et de leur musique en Hongrie* (1859), coauthored by his life-partner Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein, addressed the problematic connection between the *Divertissement* and Liszt's Rhapsodies in a roundabout way. The book's purpose was to promote the Hungarian Rhapsodies and consolidate Liszt's status as a national composer, a cause much harmed—as far as public opinion in Hungary was concerned—by its claiming that the "hongrois" (*verbunkos*) genre was of Romani rather than Hungarian origin.⁴³ Liszt's identification with virtuoso Gypsy-band players, however, was part and parcel of distancing himself as far as possible from traditional *verbunkos* literature, and of disowning both minor and major predecessors. By emphasizing the most virtuosic, complex, and exotic aspects of the style Liszt could easily claim that transcribing such things faithfully was beyond the musical understanding and technical capabilities of a multitude of amateur transcribers and minor composers.⁴⁴ The argument reaches its apex in Chapter 135, where it is directed at none other than Beethoven and Schubert, revered "geniuses" whose music was much promoted by Liszt throughout his career. Here the issue was never musical ability, but rather cultural distance. Thus Schubert's *Divertissement* is praised as "one of his most ravishing works"⁴⁵ only as a preliminary to charging both Schubert and Beethoven with the same sin of domesticating the most exotic features of

42. Instead of a circular form with symmetrical sectional repeats governed by more or less the same tempo, the *Magyar dallok* no. 7 reproduced the *verbunkos* tradition of *lassù-friss* (slow-fast) tempo pairing, which later became the model for most of the Hungarian Rhapsodies. Instead of literal repeats or occasional variants, the ever-developing figuration throughout phrase repeats simulates the improvisations of Gypsy-band players.

43. After the 1881 reissuing of an expanded version of the book by Sayn-Wittgenstein, Liszt was also attacked for antisemitic passages that were probably not his. For excellent discussions of this issue, see Hamburger, "Understanding the Hungarian Reception," and Hooker, *Redefining Hungarian Music*, 78–93.

44. At one point these are referred to as "les incorrigibles correcteurs": Liszt, *Des Bohémiens* (1859), 334. The context of this quotation is a discussion of the "correction" of modal intervals, but the book attacks amateur collectors for other infringements: see *ibid.*, chs. 98, 104, 105, 108, 130, 136–38.

45. *Ibid.*, 331: "une de ces plus ravissantes œuvres."

“Gypsy art”—modality, ornamental style, and repetition principles in particular—a critique that seems to be aimed at the two rondo movements of Schubert’s work.⁴⁶ (The intentionally less exotic march movement was less relevant to such a critique and, tellingly, no work by Beethoven is cited.) Beethoven and Schubert are accused of subjecting the music’s exotic complexities to art-music norms (“nos règles et nos méthodes”) on the well-intentioned but misguided assumption that this will somehow dignify and elevate such wild and alien music.⁴⁷ In the final chapter of the book, Liszt, by contrast, is presented as a patriotic insider, with native knowledge of the music and the skill to present it in a new artistic form that does it justice.⁴⁸

The idiomatic richness of the *Divertissement*, especially in its historical context, makes Liszt’s criticism seem unfair or possibly even the result of unfortunate editorializing.⁴⁹ Another way of looking at this criticism is that it reflects an “anxiety of influence” that is only to be expected in a strong artist who wishes to distance himself from his predecessors, indicating also which musical aspects Liszt took great care over in a particular genre he had created—the Hungarian Rhapsody.⁵⁰ We can see a similar strong critique and “creative misreading” of Schubert’s march, Liszt’s transcription of which, it will be recalled, immediately predates the 1840 *Magyar dallok*. His retitling of the work already points to two crucial shifts of aesthetic emphasis, from light,

46. See, for example, the following passage: “[Beethoven and Schubert] did not take the trouble to sufficiently penetrate the spirit and intimate sense [of the music] to avoid treating the abrupt modulations as barbarisms, the intentional repetitions as pleonasm, the strange chords as mistakes, the unusual augmentations and diminutions [of intervals] that are constitutive of the style as *lapsus linguae*. They paid attention only to the overall shape or fine bones of the melody, neglecting to familiarize themselves with the very special role played by the rhythm in its diverse combinations, and failing to consider the importance of the system of ornamentation”: *ibid.*, 332 (“Ils ne se donnèrent pas la peine d’en pénétrer assez l’esprit et le sens intime pour n’en pas traiter les modulations abruptes de barbarismes, les répétitions intentionnelles de pléonasmes, les accords étranges d’incorrections, les augmentations et diminutions inusitées qui en constituent le style de *lapsus linguae*. Ils ne s’arrêtèrent qu’au dessin large ou aux fines arêtes de la mélodie, négligeant de se familiariser avec le rôle tout particulier qu’y joue le rythme dans ses divers mélanges, et ne s’enquérant pas de l’importance qu’y prend le système ornementatif,” my translation).

47. *Ibid.*, 331–33. There is a certain discrepancy between the two French editions of *Des Bohémiens*. The 1881 version of the same chapter directs all the negativity at Schubert and his *Divertissement*, whereas Beethoven is mentioned but not directly criticized; see Liszt, *Des Bohémiens* (1881), 507–10. Since Liszt was not responsible for the 1881 edition we must treat it as Sayn-Wittgenstein’s later interpretation of his original meaning. It is also clear from the way Beethoven is lauded in the 1881 edition that he is deemed too sacred a figure for such criticism.

48. Liszt, *Des Bohémiens* (1859), 343–48. This is also where the Hungarian Rhapsodies are finally introduced, as a teleological solution to a historical problem.

49. Bellman, “*Style hongrois*,” 175–77, 192–94.

50. The “Clinamen” form of Harold’s Bloom’s theory of the “anxiety of influence” seems particularly apt here—that is, the idea that predecessors have failed to make the necessary changes that the artist has made, in this case changing the received rules of composition to suit the particularities of “Gypsy music”: Bloom, *Anxiety of Influence*, 19–48.

post-Classical associations (“*Divertissement*”) to more serious Romantic ones (“*Mélodies hongroises*”), and from the notion of music that assumes a Hungarian costume for the evening’s entertainment (“à l’hongroise,” as in “*alla turca*”) to an implication that the music was originally Hungarian, Schubert having merely collected and presented it in his own manner (“d’après Schubert”). Liszt’s most proactive intervention in the musical content was precisely at those moments in which Schubert had tried to create idiomatic effects, especially in the cadenzas. On the one hand, by 1838 Liszt’s audience, and the Viennese in particular, had come to expect Schubert’s “salon” works to be transformed into dazzling, virtuoso concert pieces that were beyond the technical capacity of ordinary professionals, let alone amateurs.⁵¹ On the other, by subjecting the *Divertissement* to the same treatment Liszt had also unleashed a new kind of *style hongrois*, one in which the ideal of a transcendental execution à l’hongroise swept away—with a great deal of conviction—the entrenched aesthetics of artless playing associated with rondos and *divertissements*.⁵²

Liszt wasted no time in asserting his authorial voice in the very first page of his transcription, interjecting a florid cadenza where Schubert originally wrote a concluding cimbalom-like tremolo chord (see Example 1). Although there are similarities here to other examples of passagework found in many of the operatic paraphrases, there are also added idiomatic features whose purpose is to declare Liszt’s greater expertise in matters of Hungarian music. The insertion of augmented seconds into the scalar runs of measure 19 is an intentional stylistic marker, but even more notable is the way Liszt takes care to amplify Schubert’s idiomatic effects. Schubert wrote a tremolo at the end of this opening phrase to imitate the improvisatory embellishments of the cimbalom; Liszt ran further with this idea in measure 20, following the tremolo with “percussive” arpeggios that are clearly intended to continue the same idiomatic effect. The final undulating figure of the arpeggio passage is equally idiomatic, with variant “Kuruc fourth” figures imaginatively resonating with the melancholy song that opened the work.⁵³

51. Schumann, who testified to the popularity of Liszt’s transcriptions of Schubert’s *Lieder*, judged them to be among the most technically demanding in the piano repertory, constituting the beginning of a new piano school. Schumann expressed these opinions in a review that happened to appear on the very day on which Liszt premiered his *Mélodies hongroises d’après Schubert* in Vienna. See Schumann, “Franz Schubert, *Lieder*.”

52. Koch’s influential *Lexikon* of 1802, for example, states, “it goes without saying that the rondo has to be performed in an artless way, as befits the naive”: Koch, *Musikalisches Lexikon*, 1274 (“Aus dem Vorhergehenden versteht sich übrigens von selbst, daß das Rondo mit einem ungekünstelten und dem Naiven eigenem Vortrage ausgeführt werden muß,” my translation). See also Koch’s definitions of “divertimento” and “divertissement,” *ibid.*, 440–41. Matthew Head discusses these eighteenth-century “artless” genres in Head, “Like Beauty Spots.”

53. The term “Kuruc fourth” denotes the melodic fourth (dominant to upper tonic) figure that opens the *Rákóczi Lament* (not to be confused with the *Rákóczi March*). It assumed a nationalist symbolism in the nineteenth century by evoking the so-called Kuruc rebellions against

Example 1 S. 425/1, mm. 18–20 (NLA II/3, 111). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the *Journal*.

The fact that this transcription predates Liszt's more in-depth study of Hungarian-Gypsy music and the *Magyar dallók* helps to explain why the style of such passages appears familiar yet not quite formed.

Liszt's editorial interventions went further in the second, simplified edition of 1846 (S. 425a/1 and 3), when he cut the second half (episode and final refrain) of the first movement, and reduced the third to a quarter of its original length.⁵⁴ More than a mere adjustment to the modest stamina of non-virtuoso pianists, these cuts treated the text as structurally violable, further asserting Liszt's authority as a coarranger of "Hungarian melodies." And replacing the rondo with a more teleological form and tonal process suggests a further critique of the Viennese *style hongrois* and its rondo-finale tradition.

By contrast, and irrespective of some textural simplifications, the inner march movement of S. 425a retained the same expanded proportions of the

Habsburg rule, one of which was led by Francis Rákóczi II at the turn of the eighteenth century. For music examples, see Szabolcsi, *Concise History*, 168–70.

54. Without its second extended episode, the remaining palindromic R–aba'–R form of the first movement constitutes a single, overarching (if somewhat wayward) progression away from and back to a brief "curtain theme" in G minor (twenty measures at the beginning and only thirteen at the end). The final movement, with its lengthy and harmonically rich ninety-two-measure refrain, necessitated an even more radical solution. Liszt simply eliminated *all* of the episodes, joining a repeated "refrain" to a slightly extended coda, once again creating an overarching progression that substitutes the original, circular tonality.

1839 version, as well as the basic idea of intensification and triumphant coda. Liszt's willingness to cut the outer movements while preserving "his" Schubert march (which had already been published separately throughout 1840–41, as Table 1 shows) completely overturned the original proportions of the *Divertissement* and indicates that he valued the movement he had effectively recomposed above those he had merely "arranged." (Although he enjoyed performing the rondo movements throughout his life he did not publish another version of them after 1846.)⁵⁵ Above all there was an important difference in the way the two movement types related historically to their generic successors. Whereas the rondo movements of the *Mélodies hongroises* remained at some remove from the form, style, and aesthetics of the Hungarian Rhapsodies, the *Marche hongroise* constituted a direct and successful prototype for future heroic Hungarian marches.

When seeking "the national" in Liszt's recomposition of the march we should note not so much the usual *verbunkos* markers as the militaristic effects and narrative of struggle and redemption that Liszt added to Schubert's original music. These become meaningful when set against the political climate of the winter of 1839–40, when a radicalized Hungarian Diet gathered in Pressburg to make fresh demands for further autonomy. The fact that Liszt himself met political leaders and activists during his stay in Hungary at this time may also be seen as significant. We should, however, bear in mind that Liszt did not make politically unequivocal statements about Hungarian nationalism to match his music (and no wonder, when he had to tread a cautious path between the different political factions in Hungary as well as maintaining his good standing in Vienna).⁵⁶ For this reason, the following interpretation of the music as a nationalist "reclamation" should be understood primarily in aesthetic terms, and as one that does not foreclose complementary or even contradictory readings.

To understand first what Liszt reacted to it should be noted that Schubert's march referenced the most restrained and dignified type of "recruiting dance," which Pethő aptly terms the "tight" or "*giusto*" type of *verbunkos*: a military march infused with *verbunkos*-type melodic turns and cadences.⁵⁷ Such music accompanied dances for village men as well as

55. As late as July 1879 Liszt toyed with the idea of orchestrating the rondo movements as he had the march, but this was not to be; see his letter to August Manns in Liszt, *Selected Letters*, 844.

56. See Barany, "Hungarian Diet." The extent of Liszt's knowledge of the politics described in this article is open to speculation, but a telling sentence in a letter to Marie d'Agout of December 29, 1839, suggests that he was well aware of the febrile political atmosphere. This concerns the magnates' initiative to confer on Liszt a nobility title by sending a signed petition to the emperor, whose consent was necessary. As Liszt tells Marie, this was abandoned in favor of sending a diplomatic delegation to Vienna. "It was feared," Liszt writes, "that such a formidable demonstration [i.e., an official petition from the Hungarian magnates] would have seemed hostile under present circumstances": LAC, 145–46. For an account of Liszt's careful dealings with the different political factions in Hungary, see Gooley, *Virtuoso Liszt*, 117–55.

57. Pethő, "*Stylé hongrois*," 215–16.

soldiers, projecting an image of manly duty, valor, and honor. In earlier descriptive music “about” Hungary, such as Antal Csermák’s *Az intézett veszedelem vagy Hazzy szeretete* (The Threatening Danger, or Love of the Homeland, 1809), this genre of the march-like Hungarian dance had not evoked the exotic image of “the Gypsy” as much as that of the nation of fierce Magyar warriors, the historical protectors of the Holy Roman Empire and all Christianity against the Ottomans. The image of the Hungarian hussars may still have been exotic, but—judging by the different way Schubert (and indeed Liszt) set this movement by comparison with the other two—it was an exoticism that called for fewer orientalist markers such as augmented seconds and ornate melodic lines. Rather than suggesting an uncivilized Hungary this type of military march was a genre that represented Hungary as a European, if culturally unique, country.

In the original *Divertissement* the *pianissimo* beginning of the march is a stylized impression of a procession approaching from afar (see Example 2). The sudden *forte* outburst just before a *piano* closure is typical of Schubert’s style, but here, as elsewhere in this piece, it is extreme. (Note how it suddenly

Example 2 Schubert, *Divertissement à l’hongroise* (D. 818), second movement, mm. 1–12 (Franz Schubert’s *Werke*, vol. 9, no. 19, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1888, 14–15). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the **Journal**.

The image displays a musical score for Schubert's *Divertissement à l'hongroise*, second movement, measures 1 through 12. The score is written for piano and is in 2/4 time with a key signature of two flats (B-flat major). It is divided into three systems. The first system (measures 1-4) begins with a *pp* dynamic marking. The piano accompaniment in the bass clef consists of a steady eighth-note pattern. The right hand (treble clef) plays chords and melodic fragments. The second system (measures 5-8) continues this pattern. The third system (measures 9-12) shows a dynamic shift from *pp* to *f* in measure 11, followed by a *p* marking in measure 12. The score concludes with a double bar line and repeat dots.

inverts the pattern of hypermetric accent in the even-numbered measures.) In the context of Hungarian associations it may portray something of the formidable character of those legendary hussars. Other than that, what makes this march a type of *verbunkos* are the spondee (two quarter note) rhythms every second measure, the sharpened intervals (especially, in the context of the A-flat chord in measures 7–8, D \sharp and B \sharp), and the syncopated short–long–short pattern in the accompaniment.

Liszt clearly understood the patriotic meaning of the genre, as well as Schubert's particular and very individual realization of it. The music has a tragic quality, with gestures of defiance in the form of outbursts in *forte* and *fortissimo*, supposedly depicting the proud and possibly tragic Hungarian character. The ABA form itself provides a tragic narrative, as the more optimistic trio section in A-flat major must return to the brooding music of the march in C minor. As part of a heroic transformation Liszt sought to release the relentless, pent-up tension. In the process he had found a new way of creating national art music that transcended its folkloristic origins, sublimating the dignified dance into a Beethovenian struggle for redemption.

The simple phrases and ABA form provided perfect grist to the Liszt mill of intensifying variations. The moderately louder internal repeats and occasional loud outbursts at cadences were transformed into a massive crescendo arc, intensified by an increasingly animated texture. This happens almost imperceptibly at first, but in the second half of the “trio” (the original sectional designation that Liszt pointedly avoids in his transcription: I use it here for convenience) the intensification begins more clearly. As the piano range is expanded orchestrally, imitating the sound of high woodwinds and percussion instruments on top of the string and brass in the middle and low registers (realized decades later in the orchestral version, S. 363/4), we hear the first glimmers of triumph in the submediant key of A-flat major (see Example 3a).

At this point Liszt's instinct for forward motion and buildup begins to unravel the original ABA form. He leaves out a repeat of the second trio phrase and cuts straight back to the march theme, adding an orchestral texture of brooding, tempestuous chromatic triplets in the “strings” against the upper melody in the “wind instruments” (see Example 3b). This means we never get to hear that first intimation of triumph in A-flat major again. Instead, the return of the C minor music, and the quiet but nervous energy that begins this section, marked “Un poco più animato” and “sotto voce tempestoso” in measure 91 (note also the dynamic signs in Example 3b), create a repressed desire for the return of the triumphant music. We are at the beginning of the stormy part of the work that Lachmund had described so engagingly in his diary.

The final idiomatic crescendo in the march's second phrase (mm. 103–18) carries a series of increasingly stormy variations. On the repeat of this section one would have expected at least a few more cadences to bring all this momentum to a halt and end the piece with dramatic C minor chords. But for Liszt this is the moment of release: the suspenseful rest in measure 119, where

Example 3a S. 425/2, conclusion of the A-flat major (formerly “trio”) section, mm. 83–90 (NLA II/3, 127). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the *Journal*.

The musical score for Example 3a consists of three systems of music, each with two staves (treble and bass clef). The key signature is two flats (B-flat and E-flat), and the time signature is 2/4. The tempo marking is *marcato assai* and the dynamic is *(f)*. The score includes a glissando in the right hand, indicated by a dashed line labeled "8va" above the notes. The bass line features a series of chords and single notes, with asterisks marking specific measures. The first system covers measures 83-84, the second system covers measures 85-87, and the third system covers measures 88-90.

the tonic resolution should have been (the only rest on a strong beat in the piece), is followed by a massive glissando in octaves, taking us into a transfigured trio theme in the blazing parallel key of C major “con tutta forza,” in *forte fortissimo* (see Example 3c).

In expressive terms the choice of the trio theme as triumphant coda was logical given its major mode and fanfare character. Earlier, at the beginning of the original trio section, Liszt had already imagined the orchestration and military character when he wrote “quasi tromba.” This marked the theme with a heroic potential that could be augmented to the point of transcending the original dance or march genre. Chopin came up with a similar idea in the trio of his *Military Polonaise*, op. 40, no. 1, published in 1838 (whether Liszt knew it at the time of transcribing Schubert’s march is moot). But in contrast to Chopin’s recourse to a traditional circular form, Liszt exploits the

Example 3b S. 425/2, reprise of the march theme, mm. 91–94 (NLA II/3, 127). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the *Journal*.

The musical score for Example 3b is presented in two systems. The first system, measures 91-92, is marked *Un poco più animato* and *sotto voce, tempestuoso*. The second system, measures 93-94, is marked *cresc.*. The score is in 2/4 time, C minor, and features a driving eighth-note pattern in the bass and a more complex, accented melody in the treble.

fanfare quality of the trio to transfigure it completely in a closing apotheosis. Even the rhythmic accompaniment in triplets assumes motivic proportions, especially in the rare Lucca edition (S. 425/2ii, 1841), where this figure takes over at the point of tonic closure, extending the tonic through soaring plagal cadences that further enhance the coda's gesture of apotheosis (see Example 3d). Through such dramatic gestures, as well as the transformation of the previously "suppressed" trio theme (mi-mi-so-mi motif) and insistent rhythms, Liszt creates a teleological, redemptive journey from C minor to C major that strangely alludes to Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, despite its very different formal process.

The heroic tone and techniques of "monumentalizing" the dance with orchestral pianistic effects, overarching buildup, and an overpowering conclusion in the parallel major all constituted a first important step toward a new kind of affirmative, patriotic, national music.⁵⁸ Once Liszt's new concept had arrived in the form of a pioneering arrangement, it was rapidly followed by an original work in the same new genre. In the *Heroischer Marsch*

58. Monumentalization of this kind had had a long history, its meaning shifting from liberal to more chauvinist types of nationalism as the century wore on. In his "Liszt's Musical Monuments" Alexander Rehding gives a good account of the "overwhelming" power of persuasion of the Lisztian apotheosis, which unwittingly contained "seeds of certain totalitarian features" (57) that later appealed to the Nazi regime, notwithstanding Liszt's liberal politics.

Example 3c S. 425/2, beginning of the coda, mm. 119–21 (NLA II/3, 129). The *ossia* attached to measure 119 is from S. 425/2ii (Milan: Lucca, 1841, 6).

The image displays two systems of musical notation. The first system, labeled '119', shows a piano introduction in 2/4 time with a key signature of two flats. It includes an 'Ossia' section. The second system, labeled '120', is marked 'con tutta forza' and 'fff'. It features a sixteenth-note pattern in both hands, with a '6' indicating a sixteenth-note group. The notation includes various dynamics and articulation marks, such as accents and slurs.

im ungarischen Styl (S. 231, 1840) Liszt was free to try an even broader conception that would elevate the genre by infusing it with elements of sonata form, more specifically by inserting quasi-developmental passages, in the manner of Beethoven's "heroic style," into the same basic A(i)–B(VI)–A(i)–B(I) form and tonal progression. Like Schubert's march, this piece starts with a *giusto-tempo verbunkos* theme in a minor key (see Example 4a) and has a fanfare-like trio section in the (major-mode) submediant key (see Example 4b).

The first theme concludes in the tonic key, as befits a closed march section. Likewise, the fanfare theme commences in the new key of B-flat major without any preparatory modulation, in the manner of a trio. Liszt incorporates within the trio, however, a passage based on the first theme that behaves like a development section, both harmonically and in its "Beethovenian" process of motivic fragmentation (mm. 57–76). This leads to a triumphant

Example 3d S. 425/2ii, conclusion (Milan: Lucca, 1841, 8). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the **Journal**.

141

6

6

6

8va

144

146

8va

sempre *fff*

148

(8va)

Example 4a *Heroischer Marsch im ungarischen Styl* (S. 231), mm. 1–4 (NLA I/13, 17). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the **Journal**.

Andante eroico
sotto voce marcato

Example 4b S. 231, second (“trio”) theme, mm. 40–43 (NLA I/13, 18). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the **Journal**.

quasi trombe
ff

reemergence of the fanfare trio theme, this time accompanied by richly textured arpeggios. At this point the sense of a quasi-sonata scheme gives way to a more episodic, fantasy-like structure. And yet something of this sonata quality is regained when the fanfare disintegrates texturally, leading to a tonally indeterminate area (empty tritones followed by silence, mm. 100–104) that prepares for the reprise of the first theme and original key, as at the end of a development section.

The A' section returns with a textural variation in the manner of the *Marche hongroise* (see Example 4c; cf. Example 3b), but with the previous development-like disintegration it now also alludes to a recapitulation, its threatening rumble distantly recalling the recapitulation moment in the first movement of Beethoven's *Appassionata*, op. 57. Through this quasi-Beethovenian sonata-form rhetoric the trio-section-cum-second-subject suggests a recapitulation-apotheosis in the parallel major key. Further momentum is created by replacing the caesura between the first and second themes (march and trio) with a continuous, connecting passage, in which motivic

Example 4c S. 231, first theme/march section reprised, mm. 105–8 (NLA I/13, 21). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the **Journal**.

105 **Tempo I (poco più animato)**

sotto voce

con f

107

fragments of the incomplete cadence are developed in a foreign key area, fantasy-like (“stringendo,” mm. 139–55).⁵⁹ This passage leads directly to the triumphant return of the second theme in the parallel D major key, and from there, without a break, Liszt takes us to the concluding apotheosis: a second utterance of this fanfare in *forte fortissimo*, accompanied by lush, celebratory arpeggios (see Example 4d).⁶⁰

The legacy of Beethoven’s “heroic style” and its association with sonata form is palpable here, even if Liszt does not really set out to create a Classical sonata. Whereas for Beethoven the form was secure enough to support a new kind of narrative drama, as Scott Burnham has argued,⁶¹ for Liszt this kind of dramatic-formal demarcation was already a way of referring to an elevated genre, even without a fully functional sonata form. These form-defining moments are dramatically signposted: the trumpet fanfare, marked “quasi trombe,” at the beginning of the second theme (Example 4b), the rumbling chromatic scales in the bass that accompany the return of the first theme (Example 4c), and the thick arpeggio figurations at the two

59. Perhaps Liszt had at the back of his mind the F-sharp minor moment just before the recapitulation in the first movement of Beethoven’s *Tempest* Sonata, op. 31, no. 2 (mm. 159–70). The progression back to D minor through the G minor subdominant is also a little similar, although Liszt starts from F-sharp major rather than minor.

60. It is interesting to note that the final measures of this theme settle on the “apotheosis” key of C major (as can be seen in Example 4d), before the codetta that takes us back to a closure in D major. This ending of the theme is analogous to its previous appearance (mm. 85–97), where a B-flat opening leads to an A-flat conclusion; the relationship A-flat/C major, in turn, may relate to the *Marche hongroise*.

61. Burnham, *Beethoven Hero*, esp. 142–46.

Example 4d S. 231, second theme, mm. 171–74 (NLA I/13, 25). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the *Journal*.

climactic moments (the second of them shown in Example 4d). Equally remarkable is the fact that all of these dramatic gestures occur at the same structural points in the Schubert-Liszt march.⁶²

It is worth bearing in mind that Liszt completed both S. 425/2 and S. 231 not long after his first transcriptions of Beethoven symphonies (S. 464, 1837), namely of the slow (“*Marche funèbre*”) movement of the *Eroica* and Symphonies nos. 5–7. This music would also have made him painfully aware of how far he would have to travel to become an original symphonist, let alone compose a “Hungarian symphony.” He nevertheless made a few drafts for a “*National-ungarische Symphonie*” throughout the 1840s, which he belatedly made use of in the 1860s orchestration of a few Hungarian Rhapsodies, and for some ideas for the symphonic poem *Hungaria* (1856).⁶³ *Hungaria* is more prominently based on the two themes from the 1840 *Heroischer Marsch*.

Furthermore, Liszt had already orchestrated the *Heroischer Marsch* in 1840 (though for reasons unknown kept it unpublished),⁶⁴ and would first

62. The *Rákóczi March* also combines such features. The combination of a drum-like roll and a “storm” topos in particular appears to have been something of a Liszt specialty, as evidenced in a commemorative transcription of his playing published in 1840 by his contemporary and compatriot Ferenc Erkel; see Szabolcsi, *Concise History*, 171–75.

63. Kaczmarczyk, “Franz Liszt’s First Hungarian Symphonic Attempt.”

64. In a personal communication of November 18, 2014, Michael Short confirmed that the still unpublished orchestral score of the *Heroischer Marsch* is held at the Österreichische

orchestrate his *Marche hongroise* in 1859–60. The orchestral potential of these early heroic Hungarian marches, and indeed the eventual realization of that potential, indicates that Liszt had long-term plans for using them to build up a national canon. When we then consider the genealogical lines leading to the symphonic poem *Hungaria*, and then on to patriotic tone poems from Smetana (notably “Vyšehrad” and “Blaník” from *Má vlast*) to Sibelius (*Finlandia*, and the concluding march movement from the *Karelia Suite*), the historical import of the national march genre cannot be doubted.

This concludes the case for understanding Liszt's recomposition of Schubert's march in 1838–39 as a reclamation of music assumed to be Hungarian. Liszt may not have thought of the work in strong ideological terms when composing it, but *in retrospect* it is possible to argue that by “translating” for the first time the world of the convivial Viennese *style hongrois* into the world of post-July Revolution heroic marches he was staking out some kind of cultural if not political autonomy; that as a prototype for subsequent Romantic Hungarian marches this work effectively constitutes one of the foundation stones of the new Hungarian national school—and, to a lesser degree, of nationalism *per musica*, broadly speaking.

That said, Liszt's cultural elevation of the Hungarian march genre did not express any anti-Viennese sentiment *per se*. On the contrary, Liszt wrote his *Mélodies hongroises d'après Schubert* in the first place for Vienna's music lovers, for whom he had the highest admiration.⁶⁵ The Viennese had come to expect unique solo piano renditions of Schubert's music from him, and given the general fondness for Hungarian music in Vienna, and the warmth with which Liszt's first modest *Magyar dallok* were received in February 1840,⁶⁶ it is likely that the Schubert-Liszt march—together with the other movements of the *Mélodies hongroises*—was similarly received as a charming rather than subversive representation of Hungary. In fact we could go further: evidence points to the *Marche hongroise* being suitable for the entertainment of political reactionaries. Liszt himself testifies that he “usually played it at Court,”⁶⁷ and that he played such Hungarian marches for autocratic monarchs such as the Russian tsar and Prussian king, to humor their

Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Mus.Hs.5661. It consists of twelve pages in the hand of Liszt's then manager and confidant Gaetano Belloni.

65. Liszt praised the Viennese for their musical intelligence and friendliness, and for allowing him to program serious music, in his published letter to Lambert Massart of September 2, 1838; see Liszt, *Artist's Journey*, 141–42. He did not describe any other audience in such glowing terms, and it should be recalled that it was in Vienna that he invented the recital and from Vienna that his *Glanzzeit* was launched. See also Gibbs, “‘Just Two Words.’”

66. As he wrote to Marie d'Agoult on February 2, “Odd thing! My new Hungarian pieces had the most prodigious effect this morning. . . . Towards the middle, a gale of applause interrupted me. I hardly expected that for these airs, which you will like, I hope”: LAC, 159.

67. Lachmund, *Living with Liszt*, 31. The comment was made to his pupils decades later, during the May 1882 masterclass described at the beginning of this article: we shall return to the quotation later.

militaristic bent. We have the following testimony in a letter from Liszt to Marie d'Agoult about his meeting with the tsar on April 16, 1842:

The Emperor approached me thus: "We are almost compatriots, M. Liszt?"—"Sire . . ."—"You are Hungarian, are you not?"—"Yes, Majesty."—"I have a regiment in Hungary." During the evening I naturally asked H. M. for permission to play for him a *Marche hongroise* (which, by the way, I played remarkably well), telling Wielhorsky, *who is marvellous* towards me, that until His Majesty came to experience the rhythm of Hungarian sabres, it would perhaps amuse him to listen to their musical rhythm.⁶⁸

Whichever *Marche hongroise* Liszt played on that occasion, it seems he did not hesitate to make use of it to "amuse" a despot whose regiments were ready to assist in enforcing the post-Napoleonic status quo (although Liszt was not to know in 1842 that this reality would turn into nightmare when Nicholas I's army crushed the Hungarian rebellion in 1849).

Reading 1, however, is not contingent on the music's reception in the early 1840s, of which there is very scant evidence in any case; rather, it describes a transcultural process with historical hindsight. It shows how Liszt effectively challenged a *Hausmusik* tradition of knowing "peripheral" nations musically from an imperial, "positionally superior" perspective (to adapt a term by Edward Said),⁶⁹ even if no offence was meant to, or taken by, the Viennese, and irrespective of any Hungarian patriot's preference for *Hausmusik verbunkos* renditions. The fault line was not between Viennese and Hungarian audiences, in fact, but between a tradition that marginalized Hungarian music by confining it to light genres and the ideal of elevated and "progressive" Hungarian art music. The aesthetic difference was also political, and it is therefore meaningful to understand how the *Marche hongroise* was generically related to Liszt's French-republican marches. This part of the work's transcultural identity was its most cosmopolitan, arguably encoding the work with *Vormärz* sentiments shared by liberals across national divides.⁷⁰

Reading 2: Republican Critique

Liszt was in his late teens when he took part in the July (1830) Revolution in Paris. Shortly thereafter he became part of an elite circle of left-leaning aristocrats, artists, and intellectuals who were critical of the politically conservative reign of Louis-Philippe.⁷¹ The influence of the Saint-Simonians and the

68. LAC, 312, with slight modifications to Short's translation.

69. Said, *Orientalism*, esp. 7.

70. There is much historical evidence to suggest that when events came to a head in March 1848 there was a "tendency towards a certain 'Austro-Hungarian' solidarity against the detested autocratic regime": Evans, *Austria, Hungary and the Habsburgs*, 252.

71. Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years*, 143–48; Gooley, *Virtuoso Liszt*, 62–69.

Abbé Lamennais on his social Christian ideals is equally well known and need not be rehearsed here.⁷² We should note instead the international reach of French republicanism, in both political and aesthetic terms, as this formed an important background to Liszt's musical response to Schubert's march.

Art music was enlisted to the cause of the first revolution of 1789 by assimilating heroic, popular, march-like songs into overpowering sonic (and in opera also visual) representations of violent struggle leading to redemptive liberty, an aesthetic that Sarah Hibberd has aptly termed the "revolutionary sublime."⁷³ Like the politics it represented, this sound and the corresponding aesthetic were also eminently exportable, as the emergence of Beethoven's heroic style at the turn of the century demonstrates. The July Revolution gave both style and aesthetics a new lease on life. The grand spectacles returned to the streets. In the opera houses the new genre of *grand opéra* absorbed and adapted the liberal ideology and sublime revolutionary aesthetics (cataclysmic finales in particular) of earlier rescue operas modeled after Cherubini's 1791 *Lodoïska*.⁷⁴ The gargantuan ensembles representing the masses of the first revolution (such as the 1,200 singers and 300 wind instruments marshaled for Gossec's *Te Deum* in 1790) returned in works commemorating the July Revolution, notably Berlioz's *Requiem* (1837) and *Symphonie funèbre et triomphale* (1840). New piano styles and techniques from the 1830s spearheaded by Chopin, Alkan, and above all Liszt projected this massive sound and the aesthetic of the revolutionary sublime through the piano.

The heroic march was the republican genre par excellence, and Liszt had mastered it in the 1830s. Since not all heroic marches are republican,⁷⁵ we can ask rather what gives any heroic march "republican" associations, apart from a clear title or the quotation of a famous republican tune (as in Liszt's plan from 1830 to include the "Marseillaise" in his abortive "Revolutionary Symphony"). Any reading of music from this angle will invariably mix aesthetics with politics, and yet there is a fine line between republicanism as committed ideology and republicanism as image and cultural fashion.

72. Locke, "Liszt's Saint-Simonian Adventure"; Merrick, *Revolution and Religion*, 3–25.

73. Hibberd, "Cherubini and the Revolutionary Sublime."

74. In an example of art anticipating politics, Daniel Auber (1782–1871) had created the first five-act grand opera, *La muette de Portici*, in 1828. As in Cherubini's *Lodoïska*, which founded the genre of rescue opera (and is central to Hibberd's discussion of the revolutionary sublime), there is a cataclysmic staging of a war for liberation in the final act, reinforced by the "sublime" eruption of Mount Vesuvius. Unique in the history of music, a performance of this opera is sometimes said to have sparked the Belgian Revolution on August 25, 1830, after the incendiary duet "Amour sacré de la patrie," distantly echoing the "Marseillaise," had inflamed audiences. For an insightful discussion of the opera's (controversial) revolutionary content, see Fulcher, *Nation's Image*, 11–46.

75. Schubert, for example, wrote the *Grande marche héroïque* (D. 885, 1826) for the coronation of Nicholas I of Russia, the tsar to whom Liszt played a Hungarian march.

Dana Gooley's in-depth exploration of Liszt's militaristic and specifically "Napoleonic" image in relation to his sensational rendition of Weber's *Konzertstück* in F minor gives us an excellent example of "cultural republicanism." Since the post-Classical style of Weber's original piece, and the medievalist-romantic tale associated with it, had nothing at all to do with revolutionary ideals (quite the contrary, one might argue), it was rather Liszt's stage persona and aesthetically "violent" manner of playing that attracted comparisons with generals and conquerors commanding battlefields.⁷⁶ Some aspects of Gooley's analysis, which focuses on the third-movement march in C major, apply equally to the Schubert-based *Marche hongroise*, especially to its coda in the same key. In both cases Liszt's unique, heroic manner of performing these movements elicited a particularly rapturous response from the audience, which in turn prompted Liszt to perform them as freestanding pieces.⁷⁷ In the *Marche hongroise* the massive celebratory chords and skips in the coda (especially on the second beat of most measures) emphasize the imperious, violent sonic and visual gestures of domination that Gooley discusses in relation to Weber's march. Moreover, the dramatic pause on the dominant followed by a thick glissando (with octave doubling in the right hand) that launches the triumphant coda in measure 119 of Example 3c may well have been intended as an allusion to the analogous moment of the hero's return in Weber's movement. It exhibits, at any rate, the same key, harmonic function, and pianistic range. In fact, this analogy is strengthened by Liszt's *ossia*, in which the ascending glissando is transformed into a chromatic scale of alternating octaves (the so-called "Liszt octaves"). According to Gooley, this is precisely how Liszt recast the glissando moment in Weber's *Konzertstück*, thereby enhancing his militaristic stage persona through the combined effect of percussive violence and rapid vertical motion of the hands.⁷⁸

It was not only Liszt's pianism that revitalized the genre of the heroic march but also his compositional ideas, most significantly in 1837–38, the two years leading to the composition of the *Marche hongroise*. Three examples will suffice to locate the *Marche hongroise* within this genre. "Lyon," the first piece in the *Album d'un voyageur* (S. 156, completed January 1838), glorifies the crushed insurrection of the weavers of that city in April 1834. The slogan from the earlier 1831 uprising in Lyon, "Vivre en travaillant ou mourir en combattant!" (Live working or die fighting!), is boldly printed at the top of the first page. Scholars widely agree that its syllables find a close rhythmic

76. Gooley, "Warhorses." Liszt played this concerto throughout 1831–47 and notably at important moments in his career, including the historic first concert in Vienna for the Hungarian flood victims on April 18, 1838.

77. *Ibid.*, 74. In the case of the *Marche hongroise* Liszt went further by publishing the march in separate editions, as we have seen.

78. For a point of comparison, see *ibid.*, 79–81 and Example 3. Gooley concludes his analysis with Peter Gay's theory of "cultivated aggression": *ibid.*, 82; see also Gay, *Cultivation of Hatred*, 3–8.

parallel—hence a kind of unsung “performance”—in the opening march theme of the work, and that the second, more melodic theme from measure 34 alludes clearly enough to the “Marseillaise.”⁷⁹ The daring harmony and sophisticated thematic development create a much more complex and dramatic narrative of despair and defiant triumph than is found within the simpler scheme of the Schubert-Liszt march. “Lyon” nevertheless gives us the most tangible connection within Liszt’s oeuvre between this genre and overt, anti-establishment politics.

Alexander Main has persuasively associated this composition with an open letter that Liszt published in the *Revue et gazette musicale de Paris* on February 11, 1838, a few lines of which react to the awful scenes of worker deprivation that Liszt had witnessed firsthand during his visit to the city the previous summer.⁸⁰ Clearly influenced by Lamennais, it reads as if taken straight out of a Christian social manifesto. It contains not only lamentation and remonstrance but also the following stark warning to the powers that be, which leads to a vision of a heroic, socially committed art:

Those who hold the fate of nations in their hands too often forget that resignation cannot be the masses’ attitude for long, and that, when the people have groaned a long while, suddenly they are heard to roar. What will art, what will artists do in these evil times? . . . The time has come for them to restore the courage of the weak and ease the sufferings of the oppressed. Art must recall to the people the fine dedication, heroic resolution, fortitude, and humanity of their fellows.⁸¹

Such populist and even subversive sentiments should warn us not to read heroic marches as necessarily expressing jingoistic bombast. When they allude to the “Marseillaise,” especially in the context of the *Vormärz* period and the cult of Napoleon, they could just as well be advocating liberal democracy and the ideals of liberty, fraternity, and equality anywhere in Europe, in defiance of the post-1815 political settlement.

79. The close fit of words and melody was pointed out nearly a century ago by one of Liszt’s last pupils, José Vianna da Motta, in his preface to the Breitkopf & Härtel publication of the work. It is reasonable to assume that this is also how the march theme was perceived in its day. See *Franz Liszt’s musikalische Werke*, 2/IV, vi; “Lyon” is republished in NLA I/5–Supplement (2007).

80. Main, “Liszt’s ‘Lyon.’” The open letter is addressed to Liszt’s friend the Swiss linguist and philosopher Adolphe Pictet (1799–1875).

81. The translation presented here slightly modifies the one given in Main, “Liszt’s ‘Lyon,’” 232. The original text reads, “Ceux qui tiennent en leurs mains le sort des nations oublient trop que la résignation ne saurait être longtemps la vertu des masses, et que quand le peuple a gémi longtemps, on l’entend rugir tout à coup. Que fera l’art, que feront les artistes en ces jours mauvais? . . . L’heure est venue pour eux de relever le courage du faible et de calmer les souffrances de l’opprimé. Il faut que l’art rappelle au peuple les beaux dévouements, les héroïques résolutions, le fortitude, l’humanité de ses pareils”: Liszt, “Lettre d’un bachelier ès-musique,” February 11, 1838, 61. For an English translation of the entire article, see Liszt, *Artist’s Journey*, 40–52.

We should consider the possibility that in this period Liszt associated such marches with ideals of social and political progress, even when there is no overt title to guide us. The Étude no. 4 in D minor from the *Douze grandes études* (S. 137) makes a good case for this argument. The heroic theme and stormy accompaniment—as well as the devilishly difficult piano technique of constant skips between melody and accompaniment—all suggest an epic struggle or a warlike charge. The ending in the parallel major suggests a triumph of some sort. Two years later Liszt revised the work a little and gave it the title “Mazeppa.”⁸² The retrospective title alludes to Victor Hugo’s translation (1829) of Lord Byron’s eponymous poem (1819) about the historical figure of the hetman (military leader) of the Cossacks Ivan Mazeppa (1639–1709). According to a legend that circulated throughout the eighteenth century, Mazeppa was cruelly punished for cuckolding an old Ukrainian aristocrat by being stripped naked and strapped to a steed that began a frenzied gallop across the steppes. As part of Hugo’s collection *Les orientales* (1829) the suffering and survival of Mazeppa represented the republican aspirations of small nations bullied and oppressed by big empires.⁸³ The symbolic naked and suffering body of Mazeppa, tied to the boundless energy of the steed, created a visceral masculine association with the struggle for liberty. The corresponding sound, gallop gestures, heroic march theme, and sheer physical effort of Liszt’s piano work create similar associations.

Even before Liszt gave us such a helpful title and later (in the symphonic poem) program, the way he transformed the original, post-Classical exercise in thirds from 1826 (op. 6, no. 4, in D minor, S. 136) into a “Grande étude” lends itself to an interpretation in which the political and the aesthetic are intertwined. The exercises were composed in Vienna under the guidance of Carl Czerny. Although highly original they still belonged to the pre-Romantic world of exercises with a prosaic, pedagogical purpose. Liszt set out to transform almost all of them into works that featured his new poetic ideas as well as novel technique. He may initially have been prompted by pragmatic considerations (recycling old material), and many of the études retained their original formal, harmonic, and contrapuntal framework. In most of them, however, and not least in no. 4, the resulting transformation of the old music is so profound that it is impossible not to see in it, in the first instance, a critique of post-Classical pianism.⁸⁴ In that sense the dedication to his teacher

82. He retained this suggestive title in the two later, more widely performed versions: no. 4 of the *Études d'exécution transcendante* (S. 138) and the symphonic poem *Mazeppa* (S. 100), to which he added a more explicit program; see Samson, *Virtuosity and the Musical Work*, 198–226.

83. Thomas McLean has argued that the original poem by Byron already contained this political meaning, more specifically in connection with the late eighteenth-century Polish struggle against Russia and its Mazeppa-like leader Tadeusz Kościuszko (1746–1817): McLean, *Other East*, 88–113.

84. This topic has been extensively explored in Samson, *Virtuosity and the Musical Work*.

Czerny is certainly a generous acknowledgment, but one that also boastfully underlines how far Liszt had come. In the fourth étude the prosaic thirds become the turbulent background to a heroic march that is “characteristic” enough and—given Liszt’s background—implicitly political, without the need for titles. From this point of view the étude is to the op. 6 exercises what Liszt’s 1830s “republican” Paris was to Metternich’s 1820s Vienna; the personal, artistic, and political transformations are fused. It is even possible to argue that, as in the *Marche hongroise*, Liszt emancipates violent forces that were “suppressed” in the original Viennese work—an aesthetic act with political overtones.

This republican subtext to Liszt’s new pianism in relation to Czerny and Vienna becomes more explicit in the *Hexaméron* (S. 392), a work that Liszt often played in Vienna in 1838 and 1839. The work consisted of a set of six variations on a theme from Bellini’s *I puritani* (1836), each composed by a different prominent pianist, but it is Liszt who, *primus inter pares*, acted as editor as well as collaborator.⁸⁵ In addition to the single variation he contributed, he determined the order of the variations, added a lengthy introduction, transcribed the main theme, and added a conclusion as well as several connecting passages. Thus displaying a world of 1830s pianism and placing Liszt as its hegemon, this project also tacitly involved Liszt in a republican cause. The theme of the *Hexaméron* was based on the most patriotic number of *I puritani*, the bass duet “Suoni la tromba” (Sound the trumpet), calling for a war of liberation to “Marseillaise”-like march music, and it is no coincidence that the work was commissioned for a charity concert for Italian refugees by Princess Cristina Trivulzio di Belgiojoso (1808–71), a notable Italian dissident.⁸⁶

Liszt predictably augmented the march’s heroic tone in his composed introduction and rendition of the theme, but here we are concerned with his curious reaction to Czerny’s (the fifth) variation. Czerny knew his former pupil well, and he composed a variation that truly rose to the challenge of the new pianism, with orchestral fireworks and Paganini-like textures (as in the wide registral leaps and broken tenths).⁸⁷ As this sprightly music draws to a close, Czerny interrupts the cadence with a playful German sixth chord, a gesture beloved of Viennese composers (see Example 5). But for Liszt,

85. The six pianists, in order of variation, were Sigismond Thalberg, Liszt, Johann Peter Pixis, Henri Herz, Carl Czerny, and Frédéric Chopin. For a study of Liszt’s dominant position within the *Hexaméron*, see Lutchmayer, “*Hexameron*.”

86. The work was not completed in time for the concert, however; see *ibid.*, 4–8.

87. It contrasts with the more old-fashioned filigree passages of the Herz variation that precedes it—perhaps a deliberate editorial decision by Liszt. Lutchmayer notes that Czerny’s variation is the “most physically taxing” of the six, and reminds us of Czerny’s *Piano Forte School*, op. 500 (1839), which demonstrates an awareness of the historical development of piano technique: *ibid.*, 18–19.

Example 5 *Hexaméron* (S. 392), end of Variation 5, mm. 248–54 (NLA II/3, 18–19).
 A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the **Journal**.

Tempo I (Vivo e brillante)

Carl Czerny [closing phrase of Variation 5]

248

ff

249

fz
[Ger.6]

250

ff 8va

Red. * Red. *

6 5
4 3

Fuoco molto energico

Franz Liszt

(8va)-----

251

ff marcato

252

ff marcato trem. 6

Example 5 continued

The image shows two systems of musical notation for piano. The first system, starting at measure 253, features a treble clef staff with a melodic line and a bass clef staff with a bass line. A '8va' marking with a dashed line indicates an octave shift in the treble staff. A 'Fuoco' marking is present in the bass staff. The second system, starting at measure 254, continues the piece with a '6' marking above a note in the bass staff and an asterisk (*) at the end of the system.

evidently, such an ending is still quite far from reflecting the words “sia voce di terror: patria, vittoria, onor” (let [the trumpet call] be the voice of terror: fatherland, victory, honor) sung in the final phrase of the duet. Seizing on the previously heard augmented sixth chord, he tears to shreds the safe syntactical and stylistic world of old Vienna. Instead of the anticipated perfect authentic cadence at measure 251, a bass chord and treble arpeggios similar to the German sixth sonority in measure 249 (now respelled enharmonically as E major) launch a truly terrifying passage in the *Lisztian* orchestral style, taking us into the harmonic unknown. This irrational, violent, and “lawless” interruption is suitably marked “Fuoco molto energico.” It is a perfect “voce di terror,” the old world of genteel wit and mannered bravura overrun by the revolutionary sublime.⁸⁸

Such examples encourage us to apply a republican reading to the *Marche hongroise* as well, and one that is not necessarily specific to the struggle of the Hungarian nation against Habsburg domination. Like the *Étude* no. 4 and

88. Liszt’s “sublime” continuation and the impression that he follows a higher law rather than simply misunderstanding the rules of harmony and form does have its foundation in a higher compositional rationale. He repeats and develops his coda from the third variation, and the elision at the end is subliminally prepared for by the one at the beginning. Such examples also remind us that in Liszt the political and the personal are often inextricable. Both “Mazepa” and the *Hexaméron* offer considerable scope for a critical study of professional rivalries, possibly even a psychoanalytical investigation in the case of Czerny, a father figure to Liszt. See also Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years*, 72, 240n19.

the Czerny variation in the *Hexaméron*, the *Marche hongroise* exemplifies post-Classical Viennese music overtaken by the sounds of the republican, Lisztian heroic march. One could easily read in the small outbursts of defiance in Schubert's original an unconsummated rage that finds dangerous release in Liszt's version, as already suggested in Reading 1. But translating aesthetics to politics in such a simple way is also problematic. In the first instance, it is just as easy to point out that music identified with political revolution was appropriated by regimes that were not particularly revolutionary or even liberal: the French government's patronage of some of Berlioz's works of the 1840s is a case in point.⁸⁹ Secondly, in line with James Deaville's "dialectics of virtuosity," one could argue that the flipside of hearing the "revolutionary sublime" executed with extreme technical prowess was the sheer pleasure such a performance gave, which served the status quo by facilitating the harmless letting off of steam and by numbing critical thinking.⁹⁰ This would accord with Alan Sked's hypothesis that Metternich's encouragement of cultural nationalism was a calculated measure intended to stave off the more dangerous political variety.⁹¹ Let us not forget that the chief of both the police and the Bureau of Censorship Josef von Sedlnitzky, who had bigger fish to fry, reassured the emperor that Liszt was "vain and superficial, affecting the fantastic manners of today's young French, but apart from his artistic value, he appears much more to be a good-natured, insignificant young man."⁹²

And yet any reservations we might have about reading republican sentiments too literally into the *Marche hongroise* should not invalidate the centrality of the "revolutionary sublime" to the way Liszt had transformed Schubert's march, as described in detail in Reading 1. Moreover, although Liszt's more

89. The abovementioned Requiem (1837) and *Symphonie funèbre et triomphale* (1840) were commissioned by government ministers and played an important part in official public events. Whatever Berlioz intended privately, his music helped Louis-Philippe's regime to manage the public memory of the July Revolution. See Berlioz, *Mémoires*, 305–16, 344–48.

90. Deaville argues convincingly that these "dialectics of virtuosity" would have been evident during Liszt's second Hungarian tour, in the way his playing could either abate or sublimate political discontent: Deaville, "Politics of Liszt's Virtuosity," 132–36.

91. Sked, *Metternich and Austria*, 178–243.

92. Quoted in Gooley, *Virtuoso Liszt*, 126. The most severe measure taken against Liszt was the censoring of the publication of the *Rákóczi March*, which, unlike the *Marche hongroise*, sparked nationalistic fervor when Liszt played it in Hungary; see his letter to d'Agoult of January 23, 1840, in LAC, 155. In truth, the imperial Bureau of Censorship was overwhelmed with material, mainly in the form of books, plays, and librettos: instrumental music was the least of its concerns, unless it had clear subversive associations (as in the case of the *Rákóczi March*). Liszt seems not to have had any difficulty in programming the *Hexaméron*, for example, irrespective of its association with a known dissident, Princess Belgiojoso, and the melody's original text. The Austrian censors had more pressing material to pore over than a piano work showcasing six virtuosos, and if ever the work passed through their hands it is extremely unlikely that they would have concerned themselves with the fine detail of the musical text. See Hanson, *Musical Life in Biedermeier Vienna*, 39–60, and Sked, *Metternich and Austria*, 139–70.

radical republican politics had steadily cooled throughout the 1840s,⁹³ his aesthetic of the “revolutionary sublime” had not, and there were always those who were willing to read such aesthetics in literal political terms.⁹⁴ It is also important to understand that cultivating friendly relations in Vienna on a personal level did not prevent his music from entering into an aggressive dialogue with an older Viennese style, overrunning it (as in the *Hexaméron*) or literally overwriting it (as in “Mazeppa” and the *Marche hongroise*). Paradoxical though it may seem, the “revolutionary sublime,” as realized through Liszt’s particular piano style, made an identifiably Parisian cultural heritage an essential part of a new Hungarian musical identity. It is this transculturation of genre—more than the scant *verbunkos* markers found in the work—that makes the *Marche hongroise d’après Schubert* so nationalistic.

Reading 3: Bridge Building and Conciliation

Thus far my text-based reading of generic references has revealed a dialogic relationship with the work’s different cultural backgrounds, emphasizing confrontational nationalism and republicanism through generic associations. Another way of reading the changing ideological and cultural values attached to the work, however, is by looking more closely at the way Liszt used it to promote himself at different points in his career. I have already suggested that his Hungarian works were generally well received in Vienna during the *Glanzperiode*; but it is in the late 1850s that Liszt’s diplomatic uses of the original *Divertissement* and the *Marche hongroise* come to the fore in the context of his battle for recognition as a composer. My third reading, therefore, provides the immediate background to the late versions of the march, and the more “Austro-Hungarian” aspects of its identity, in light of Liszt’s continued and evolving special relationship with Vienna.

The capital of the Austrian Empire had played an important part in Liszt’s career since his childhood: he received his formative professional instruction there; it was home to many of his old allies from the virtuoso years and new allies from the Weimar period (as we shall see); it was a city with a glorious musical history, serious musical tastes, enthusiastic musical societies, and a

93. Hamburger, *Liszt*, 86–89.

94. When Liszt played the *Rákóczi March* in Hungary there were those who readily interpreted it as a call to arms and political independence, not only because of the symbolic meaning of the original melody, but also because of Liszt’s manner of executing the “revolutionary sublime.” As one correspondent of the *Pesti Divatlap* (Fashion Journal) put it in 1846, it was “as if his brilliant instrument and otherworldly voice spoke to us thus: I salute you, my Nation. How I rejoice, that you have come awake! Set out and advance further forward towards the great goal you have set on your road to freedom. Go! Go! Impress! Move! Act—fight! Struggle for the good cause until death! . . . If need be I shall sacrifice my blood, and even my life for you!” Hamburger, *Liszt*, 55.

developed infrastructure for concerts; it was where in 1846 he sought to succeed Donizetti as court Kapellmeister before settling on Weimar,⁹⁵ a number of important music publishers with whom he had frequent dealings were based there; and his “uncle-cousin” and close friend Eduard Liszt, a musically gifted lawyer who took care of his business affairs, resided there.⁹⁶

In the 1850s Vienna also became important because of the influential role played by Eduard Hanslick in opposing the “New German School” (as it was known by 1859) in general and Liszt’s music in particular. Liszt could neither ignore this opposition nor simply rest on his past glory as a virtuoso—quite the opposite, since Hanslick pointedly referred to Liszt’s virtuoso past in order to discredit him as a composer.⁹⁷ To reintroduce himself to the Viennese as a worthy Kapellmeister and composer was therefore no mean feat, and Liszt deployed a careful strategy. First, his success as a conductor in the Viennese Mozart Festival of late January 1856 allowed him to present himself as a “musician of the future” firmly rooted in the classics—an important victory over those who questioned his suitability.⁹⁸ Secondly, he avoided programming the symphonic poems in Vienna, choosing instead less controversial works, in the hope that they would pave the way for a fuller acceptance. The stakes were therefore high when he conducted his “Gran” Mass (*Missa solennis*, S. 9) in Vienna on March 22 and 23, 1858, a little over a year after Hanslick published his fierce attack on the symphonic poems.⁹⁹ But Liszt must have calculated that a sacred work with a comparatively

95. Liszt, *Briefwechsel mit seiner Mutter*, 197; Hamilton, “Wagner and Liszt,” 28–29.

96. Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years*, 34–35.

97. The best example of this can be found in the very first paragraph of Hanslick’s notorious “*Les préludes*.” See also Hanslick, *Music Criticisms*, 53.

98. Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Weimar Years*, 283, 397–98. The opposition to his appointment only played into Liszt’s hands. His successful concerts turned almost into state occasions through the attendance of the imperial family. Even Hanslick had to concede that the more aggressive opposition to Liszt was in bad taste, prompting Liszt to write to him immediately on January 31, thanking him for being a “perfect gentleman”; see LFL, vol. 2, letter 396. One cannot overestimate the importance of the January 1856 Mozart Festival for Liszt’s Viennese “campaign,” for shortly after leaving Vienna he also met the most powerful politician in the realm, Baron Alexander von Bach (1813–93), as recorded in his letter to Agnes Street-Klindworth on February 3, 1856; see Liszt, *Franz Liszt and Agnes Street-Klindworth*, 83–84. The same letter reveals Liszt’s strategy of carving out a role for himself in Vienna as a “serious” and more consensual composer, carefully containing his reputation as a fearsome “musician of the future”: “I shall send you from Weimar . . . a few press reviews, together with the article I published about this festival when I arrived in Vienna, which served me as preparation for the solemn ceremony in Gran, and more generally as a transition to my present position. Although I am a very strong advocate of what they like to call Zukunfts-Musik, I do not intend to be held off for a month of Sundays!” (my italics). He followed this up on February 9 with a letter to Eduard Liszt, in which he proposed a plan of action for setting in motion a critical edition of Mozart’s complete works; see LFL, vol. 1, letter 148.

99. See note 97 above.

“moderate” *Zukunftsmusik* style would be less controversial, and that its status as a “national” occasional piece that marked improved relations between Hungary and Austria would be most welcome in the Habsburg capital.¹⁰⁰ The well-rehearsed concert was a success and Liszt was even satisfied with the critical response, which he thought was the main reason for the public demand to repeat the performance in Pest, as he told Zellner, one of his supporters in Vienna.¹⁰¹

But of course at least one critic would not be moved. Hanslick published a typically negative review (though not the harshest by his standards) that contrasted Liszt's church music most unfavorably with that of the “old masters.”¹⁰² Liszt for his part advised patience: “We must not give *certain gentlemen* any occasion to imagine that I concern myself about them more than is really the case. *Faust* and *Dante* can quietly wait for the due understanding of them.”¹⁰³ When he got back to Vienna from Budapest he organized a dinner party for the virtuoso violinist Ferdinand Laub on April 18, to which Hanslick was invited. Laub had just concluded a critically acclaimed series of concerts in Vienna, and one can only guess that inviting Hanslick gave Liszt an opportunity to demonstrate magnanimity and keep an enemy close while reminding him and others present that the dreaded “New Weimar” was actually a new center for world-class talents. (Laub's career took off, with Liszt's help, after two fruitful years as concertmaster in Weimar, under Liszt's direction.) Liszt was always in his element in such social situations and he knew exactly what music would suit this one. As Hanslick himself tells us in his memoirs, at one point during this cozy event Liszt asked for a volunteer to join him in playing a little from Schubert's *Divertissement*. This would have been a completely normal suggestion for an entertaining social occasion, except that there was nothing normal about being partnered with Franz Liszt. When everyone hesitated, Hanslick—who was both an

100. Liszt had originally conducted the work in Esztergom (Gran) on August 31, 1856, a historic state occasion attended by the emperor and the Hungarian ruling elite that promised regeneration and reconciliation following the events of 1849. For the subsequent concerts in Vienna on March 22 and 23, 1858, he brought with him musicians from the Hungarian Theater in Pest who had already performed it under his direction; see Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Weimar Years*, 489–90. This was a diplomatic coup as well as a pragmatic solution: it allowed him to present the work in the best possible light, and himself as an amiable musical ambassador rather than a confrontational *Zukunftsmusiker*. He did not wish to spoil this advantage by testing the Viennese too much and wisely avoided programming symphonic poems on this occasion, rejecting the advice of well-meaning supporters; see LFL, vol. 1, letter 202.

101. He wrote to Zellner from Pest on April 6, “The articles in the Austrian p[aper], and your *brochure*, have done the most towards stirring up the general wish [for a repeat performance in Pest]. The public is like this—that they only know what they ought to think of a work when they see it printed in black and white!—You have therefore to answer for it if the Mass is performed here a second time”: *ibid.*, letter 201.

102. *Die Presse*, March 25, 1858, 1–2.

103. LFL, vol. 1, letter 201 (Liszt's emphasis). Liszt is referring here to his new compositions, the *Faust* (S. 108) and *Dante* (S. 109) Symphonies.

excellent pianist and a lover of four-hand music—rose to the challenge.¹⁰⁴ Liszt reportedly cried, “Bravo . . . but criticism plays second fiddle, does it not, to production? So you play *secondo*!” He then made things a little difficult for the poor *secondo* player:

Whether it was artistic exuberance or just an imp of mischief, which took hold of him, he not only played with rhythmic abandon but also improvised, in the gypsy manner and quite wonderfully, long embellishments, passages, chains of trills, cadenzas, as and where the fancy took him. Luckily I knew the piece so well that I needed to give my attention to his playing only, and not the score. And so there came my way an experience never to be forgotten, plus a friendly word from Liszt for not letting myself be “thrown from the saddle.”¹⁰⁵

Liszt gives us a slightly different account, and had the advantage of writing it only two days after the event, in a letter of April 20, 1858, to Marie Sayn-Wittgenstein.¹⁰⁶ He reports that he had actually played the first two movements with Joseph Dachs, a professor at the Vienna Conservatory, after which

Hanslick asked me if I wouldn’t do him the honor of playing the 3rd [movement] with him. I acceded very gracefully, and he played his part wonderfully. If only this little incident could later become a *symbol* and *omen* for the happy alliance of Art and Criticism—We could ask nothing better than to have these gentlemen play the bass—as long as it weren’t faulty and we kept good time.¹⁰⁷

The two accounts are reconcilable. It is possible that Liszt stopped after the second movement and asked who would play the third with him. It is likely that Hanslick’s eagerness to take his place next to him provoked in Liszt “an imp of mischief.” Liszt does mention that “these gentlemen” ought to play the bass, in a clear assignation of hierarchy. The terms of the truce he imagines between fair criticism and good art are couched in metaphors of four-hand playing; but “as long as . . . we kept good time” could also be a sly reference to the improvisational freedoms he had taken that evening, flouting the norm of making sure the more ornate *primo* part does not fall outside the beat provided by the bass. Though we can never be sure what Hanslick meant by “rhythmic abandon” and wonderful improvisations “in the gypsy manner,” Liszt’s transcription of the third movement and his Hungarian Rhapsodies provide enough clues for one’s musical imagination.

104. According to Max Kalbeck, a close associate, Hanslick was “a passionate *à quatre mains* player”: Kalbeck, *Johannes Brahms*, 190 (“ein passionierter *à quatre mains* Spieler”).

105. Eduard Hanslick, *Aus meinem Leben* (1894), translated in Williams, *Portrait of Liszt*, 557–58.

106. Hanslick’s account was published in 1894 (see note 105), and there he reports that it was Liszt who reminded him of this encounter when the two met again in Paris in 1878. Princess Marie was the daughter of Liszt’s partner, Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein.

107. Liszt, *Letters of Franz Liszt to Marie zu Sayn-Wittgenstein*, 98–99.

At any rate, Liszt must have enjoyed making Hanslick sweat a little, manipulating the situation to his full advantage while honoring the Viennese by playing Schubert's *Divertissement* in his inimitable way, first with a noted conservatory professor, and then with the famous Hanslick, his nemesis. What made the situation perfect for Liszt was the irresistible charm of the *Divertissement*, his position as the gracious host, and his undisputed mastery of music that was in no way controversial. This most social of mediums was traditionally used to instruct children at the piano, and as a pianist and creative artist Liszt could literally put Hanslick in his place (criticism, *secondo*) and "teach him a lesson" in the most effective yet nonbelligerent way. Hanslick for his part understood the tongue-in-cheek nature of the situation all too well, and was intelligent and resilient enough to show how much he too enjoyed it.

Liszt most probably did not believe that this "little incident" could really become "a *symbol* and *omen* for the happy alliance of Art and Criticism,"¹⁰⁸ but he understood well enough the conciliatory and diplomatic uses of Schubert's *Divertissement*. The work's popularity had only increased since Liszt had transcribed and performed it. It had even evolved into a public concert piece thanks to patriotic choral societies such as the Wiener Männergesangverein that promoted it alongside other works by Schubert.¹⁰⁹ It was to Liszt's advantage to remind the Viennese of his long-standing association with Schubert, and even to find a way to use the beloved *Divertissement* to disarm his opponents. He would do it on his own terms, as we have seen, in a way that asserted his ownership of it and even his Hungarian identity. Thus the first reading of "reclamation," in this sense, does not really clash with this one. On the contrary, by appropriating such convivial Viennese music in his own manner, Liszt also made the point that he would not cede any ground to the likes of Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, who had posited *Zukunftsmusik* as the aesthetic opposite of a putatively more wholesome and ethical *Hausmusik*.¹¹⁰

108. In reality Liszt did have critic-allies, and they were equally responsible for the escalated polemics on both sides during 1859–60; see Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Weimar Years*, 348–51, and Grimes, "Critical Inferno?"

109. For example, in a concert dedicated to the composer's works that took place on November 22, 1853, as reported in *Die Presse* on November 25. The performers on that occasion were Joseph Dachs and (probably Adolph) Lorenz. Interestingly, Dachs played the work with Liszt five years later at Laub's party, as we have seen, before Hanslick stepped in.

110. Riehl (1823–97) was a Munich-based folklorist scholar and a staunch "anti-1848" conservative who rejected what he saw as the destruction of diverse regional German cultures through urbanization and French cosmopolitanism. His musical aesthetic formed one part of this philosophy. In 1855 he published *Hausmusik: Fünfzig Lieder deutscher Dichter*, prefaced by a naturalist and decidedly anti-*Zukunftsmusik* manifesto. See Garratt, *Music, Culture and Social Reform*, 172–74, 201, and Applegate, *Nation of Provincials*, ch. 2, esp. 34–38. Liszt's sarcastic response to Riehl's "manifesto" can be found in a letter of December 4, 1856, in which Liszt warns his former pupil Alexander Ritter against his plan to perform the symphonic poems in Stettin; see LFL, vol. 1, letter 168.

There were other ways in which the Viennese love for social music could benefit Liszt, and in which he could create a useful continuum rather than an opposition between *Haus-* and *Konzertmusik*, and between the traditional and the avant-garde. It was during the 1856 Mozart Festival that he had won the support of Johann von Herbeck (1831–77), the choirmaster of the Viennese Männergesangverein, who would soon rise to greater prominence as conductor of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde (1859–70 and 1875–77; he was appointed imperial Kapellmeister from 1866) and prove to be an indispensable ally.¹¹¹ Through Herbeck Liszt initially introduced his *Studentenlied aus Goethe's Faust*, a work from the Rhine concerts period of 1841–42 and precisely the kind of *Männergesang* music whose intention was to win over cultured, middle-class male patriots.¹¹² Liszt did take some risks with Herbeck, notably acquiescing, against his better judgment, to the latter's wish to perform in Vienna the more challenging *Chöre zu Herders Entfesseltem Prometheus* (S. 69, 1849, rev. 1855–59).¹¹³

He was on safer ground when he orchestrated four Schubert marches in late 1859 and early 1860 at Herbeck's request, a commission that marks the beginning of Liszt's interest in orchestrating his earlier Schubert arrangements for piano.¹¹⁴ The orchestration was not based directly on Schubert's music as much as on Liszt's own previous arrangements and recompositions of Schubert for piano, namely the three *Schuberts Märsche für das Pianoforte solo* (S. 426, 1846) and that spectacular hit from the 1840s, the *Marche hongroise*.¹¹⁵ By including the *Ungarischer Marsch*, as I shall henceforth refer to it in German (in accordance with the title of the German editions of 1871 and 1880), Liszt could once again remind the Viennese of his once famous rendering of this work. The gradual climax and triumphant ending—Liszt's rather than Schubert's—was suited to a quasi-programmatic narrative of lament and triumph. Liszt may have had this familiar narrative in mind when suggesting to Herbeck that the *Ungarischer Marsch* could be preceded by the *Trauermarsch* in E-flat minor.¹¹⁶ He later published the *Ungarischer Marsch* as the final movement of four, thereby reinterpreting rather than completely overthrowing the Viennese tradition of the vernacular finale.

Events leading to the composition of these four orchestral *Franz Schuberts Märsche* may further point to a “bridge building” interpretation. In the autumn of 1859 Liszt's book *Des Bohémiens* had caused a furor in Hungary.

111. See Wessley, “Herbeck, Johann Ritter von,” and LFL, vol. 1, letter 173.

112. See LFL, vol. 1, letter 207.

113. In the letter cited in note 112 Liszt had thanked Herbeck for asking for the score of this work, but had gently warned him that such music would be too much too soon for the Viennese.

114. LFL, vol. 1, letters 224, 228; Rosenblatt, “Orchestral Transcriptions,” 320–26.

115. A good summary of the genealogy of the orchestral versions is given in Eckhardt, “Liszts Bearbeitungen,” 135.

116. See LFL, vol. 1, letter 231.

In a letter to Kálmán von Simonffy (a renowned composer of *magyar nóta*, a type of composed “folksong”) of August 27, Liszt insisted on his patriotism and protested against misleading rumors about his book with some indignation. In sharp contrast, his letter to Hanslick of September 24 dismisses the brouhaha as one of those “little storms” he was already accustomed to, and praised the Viennese critic “for the perfect impartiality and clearness” of his review of the book.¹¹⁷ Hanslick was clearly not the enemy in this case. Then, as the “little storm” stubbornly persisted, Liszt’s son Daniel died tragically from lung illness on December 13, 1859. Liszt was present at his deathbed and at the funeral, and although he had been a distant father throughout Daniel’s life, both his letters and reports by witnesses testify to his deep grief.¹¹⁸ “Uncle-cousin” Eduard, who had been looking after Daniel in a manner of speaking (Daniel had been studying law in Vienna since May 1857), also took charge of the funeral. After thanking Eduard for his support in a letter of December 28, Liszt’s thoughts turned to his “Prometheus” chorus and two Schubert marches he had recently finished orchestrating (S. 363, nos. 1 and 3):

I hope Herbeck will be pleased with the instrumentation of the Schubert Marches. I fancy I have been successful in this little work, and I shall continue it further, as it offers much attraction to me. The four other Marches will follow shortly, which should make the half-dozen complete.¹¹⁹

Liszt finished two more marches, rather than four, within a month—the previously mentioned *Trauermarsch* and *Ungarischer Marsch* (S. 363, nos. 2 and 4), which he thought at the time could be played in succession. In this same period much of his time continued to be occupied by responding to condolence letters, including one to his close Hungarian friend Baron Augusz, written on January 14, 1860. After thanking him for his sympathy, and reminiscing about his son’s character, law studies, and efforts at learning Hungarian, he turned to the subject of his book’s harsh reception in Hungary, attacking the bigotry and cultural chauvinism of his critics:

Patriotism is certainly a great and admirable sentiment; but when, in its exaltation, it reaches the point of disregarding necessary limits, and takes for counsel solely the inspirations of fever, it too will end by “sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind.” For my part, I have no need to get involved in judging these events, as I do not feel called upon to take an active part [in the controversy surrounding the book]. Nevertheless, I firmly hope not to falter in my own task, and shall apply myself ceaselessly to bringing honor to *my country* (as I told H.M. the Emperor) by my work and by my character as artist. Even if this is not [done] precisely in the way understood by certain patriots, for whom the Rákóczy March is more or less what the Koran was

117. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, letter 399.

118. Walker, *Franz Liszt: The Weimar Years*, 474–79.

119. LFL, vol. 1, letter 228.

for [Caliph] Omar and who would gladly destroy—just as the latter destroyed the Library of Alexandria—the whole of Germanic music with this fine argument: “either it can be found in the Rákóczy or it is worthless.” If it is not done entirely in this manner . . . I do not believe myself to be any less deeply attached to Hungary for that reason. Shall I tell you? The fuss made about my volume on the Gypsies has made me feel much more truly Hungarian than my antagonists, the Magyaro-maniacs.¹²⁰

“Sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind” is a reference to the biblical parable in Hosea 8:7 about misguided, vainglorious deeds leading to destruction. It implicitly compares Liszt’s nationalist critics to the zealots who had brought the country to ruin in 1849. We can be quite confident that this is what Liszt means when we read a letter he wrote to Agnes Street-Klindworth later in the year, in which the same parable recurs in connection with a more straightforward political denunciation of Hungarian chauvinism (“patriotisme exclusif”), this time with an explicit reference to the 1849 disaster.¹²¹ Likewise, the orientalist images in the letter to Augustz, a common currency in nineteenth-century discourse, are meant to create a vivid distinction between a progressive, European Hungary and the kind of backward and closed culture that his “antagonists” represented.¹²²

Against this background it is possible that Herbeck’s commission may have prompted Liszt to look at his Schubert *Ungarischer Marsch* in a new way. This work and the 1846 marches had a few things in common, including pianistic style and dramatic narrative, and Liszt had already associated these works by placing them successively in the 1855 thematic catalog. Perhaps the joining of a “Hungarian” march to more “Germanic” ones so effortlessly, in a work for Vienna that celebrated Schubert, can also be regarded as an understated response to the chauvinistic attitudes of the “Magyaro-maniacs.” It may even point to his enthusiasm in 1860 for drawing Hungary into closer political union with Austria, which later evolved

120. Vilmos Csapó, ed., *Franz Liszt’s Briefe an Baron Antal Augustz, 1846–1878* (1911), translation adapted from Williams, *Portrait of Liszt*, 363–64 (with the inclusion of a number of sentences omitted by Williams).

121. On July 25, 1860, following the suicide on April 8 of István Széchenyi (the famous reform leader whom Liszt had met in 1839), Liszt wrote to Agnes Street-Klindworth, “He gave immense service to Hungary, where he rightly enjoyed unparalleled popularity, until the time when Kossuth gained the advantage through his *glib talk* [*parlage*] and led the whole nation down a false path. . . . I do not foresee anything good resulting from this hot fever of tribal patriotism [*patriotisme exclusif*], which will sow the wind only to reap the whirlwind! If Széchenyi’s example and methods had been followed consistently and faithfully, Hungary would certainly be strong and prosperous today. . . . This state of affairs certainly suits *others*—but those among us who sincerely love their country are aggrieved about it to the depths of their souls”: Liszt, *Franz Liszt and Agnes Street-Klindworth*, 172, with minor modifications to the translation; for the original French, see *ibid.*, 347.

122. Loya, *Liszt’s Transcultural Modernism*, 279n80.

into support for the foundation of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.¹²³ At any rate, the inclusion of the *Ungarischer Marsch* in this new orchestral cycle signaled Liszt's determination to continue to bring honor to his country, in his own way—as he had once told the Austrian emperor.

Reading 4: Transcultural Modernism

In early October 1870 Liszt was revising all four of the orchestral Schubert marches (*Franz Schuberts Märsche*, S. 363) for publication in the home of his aforementioned friend Antal Augusz in Szekszárd, south Hungary.¹²⁴ His social calendar was emptier than usual and he had more time for catching up with unfinished or unpublished manuscripts. Liszt had good reason to disappear as much as possible from public view at this time. Paris lay under siege, and the coalition of German states and principalities led by Prussia was set to win the Franco-Prussian War. Liszt avoided Weimar and other German towns in order to remain outwardly neutral, and, as revealed in his letters to Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein, because he privately sympathized with Napoleon III and could not much tolerate the enthusiastic support for German militarism.¹²⁵ While Liszt was denounced as “anti-German” in Weimar merely for having avoided the town during the conflict, around the same time István Bartalus branded him and his circle as “Germanizers” who cared little for Hungarian culture and understood it even less.¹²⁶ It is against this background of intolerance that Liszt revised his orchestrations of the four Schubert marches, after which he also prepared for publication the orchestral *Rákóczi March* (S. 608), *Ungarischer Marsch zur Krönungsfeier* (S. 118), and the six *Ungarische Rhapsodien* (S. 359).

As in these other pieces, the orchestration, motivic work, and harmony of the orchestral *Ungarischer Marsch* all present a progressive, culturally mixed Hungarian identity in the context of 1870–71. The confluence of modernist techniques and the *verbunkos* idiom sounds very close to the usual narratives about national schools, pushing toward international recognition

123. See Liszt's letter to Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein of July 24, 1860, in Liszt, *Franz Liszts Briefe*, 5:34. Almost seven years later the Austrian court commissioned the *Ungarische Krönungsmesse* (S. 11) for the coronation of Francis Joseph as king of Hungary on June 8, 1867, in Matthias Church in Buda, a ceremony that launched the Austro-Hungarian Empire. On this occasion Liszt crossed generic and cultural lines by imbuing sacred Catholic music with strong national markers, thereby legitimating Francis Joseph's new role as king of Hungary in no uncertain terms. See Merrick, *Revolution and Religion*, 127–37.

124. Legány, *Ferenc Liszt . . . 1869–1873*, 263.

125. See Liszt, *Franz Liszts Briefe*, 6:260–63, 289–90, 292–93, 299. The prevailing political mood in Hungary at that time was also largely in favor of the French, as Liszt himself testifies. See also Wank, “Foreign Policy,” 37–56, esp. 42–43.

126. Legány, *Ferenc Liszt . . . 1869–1873*, 78–80; Liszt, *Franz Liszts Briefe*, 6:299.

by employing both a recognizably national idiom and sophisticated compositional means. But a transcultural perspective asks us to look not so much at nationalist semantics (“this material means Hungarian identity”) as at the hybridity beneath the monolithic national identity—how a modernist impulse is negotiated against the imperatives of genre and tradition, and, more generally, how values, aesthetics, and techniques from different cultures interact.

Thus, for example, it is possible to observe, as Mária Eckhardt has, that one of the things Liszt added to the 1870 version was scalar passages with augmented seconds, and that his intention was to reinforce the work’s “Hungarian” identity. Eckhardt further demonstrated that he did this not only (and most prominently) in the *Ungarischer Marsch*, as one would expect, but also in the E-flat minor *Trauermarsch*.¹²⁷ When we also remember that Liszt worked on several other nationalistic works, which might have influenced this interpolation, the case for a nationalist reading seems solid. Without contradiction, however, it is possible to argue that as much as a decade earlier Liszt had created a cultural continuum between Austro-German and Hungarian identities by linking the E-flat minor march and the *Ungarischer Marsch*, and so from a transcultural perspective the 1870 interpolation of *verbunkos* scales in both pieces further smoothed the cultural continuum between the two, by drawing them stylistically closer together. Secondly, the scalar passages in the *Ungarischer Marsch* (occurring just before the reprise of the march theme) further distance the work from its post-Classical origins by creating jolting stylistic contrasts and by loosening the original march-trio-march form to an even greater degree. In other words, it is also part of Liszt’s transcultural modernism, in relation to, but also irrespective of, the nationalist impetus.

A clearer case of transcultural modernism is to be found in a passage that was already present in the 1859–60 orchestral version of the *Ungarischer Marsch*, which extends and reimagines the original piano version’s idea of intensification toward the coda (S. 425, 1838–39) by employing new means, namely motivic fragmentation and chromaticism (see Example 6a). The chromatic harmony and virtuoso orchestral style of this passage are related to Liszt’s Weimar-era symphonic poems and the aesthetics of *Zukunftsmusik*. But this “New German” Lisztian harmony is effortlessly amalgamated with his *verbunkos* idiom.

At measures 129–30, where the submediant degree is expected to resolve tonally, as it has done in all previous versions, the progression drifts instead in a subdominant direction from A-flat major (VI) onward to D-flat major and then F-sharp minor (enharmonic equivalent). The “drifting” subdominant progression, which disrupts the Classical tonic-dominant harmonic polarity heard so far, also happens to be idiomatic to *verbunkos* harmony in

127. Eckhardt, “Liszts Bearbeitungen,” 144–45.

Example 6a Reduction of the *Ungarischer Marsch*, S. 363/4 (1870–71 orchestral version), mm. 129–50 (based on the Fürstner edition, Berlin, 1870–71, 18–21). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the **Journal**.

129 *mf*

Winds

131

133

135

Winds

Brass

Fl. (8va)
Ob.
Cl.
Cl.
Bn. + 8va
Tpt. Hn.

Trb.

Vc.
Cb.

upper strings (*sempre*, mm. 129–36)

(continued)

Example 6a continued

138

cresc. sempre

(Trb.)

cresc. sempre

(8va Cb.)

140

(8va Cb.)

142

(8va Cb.)

Example 6a continued

144

Tbn.
8va: Tbn. + Timp. (G)

più cresc.

146

cresc.

148

Fl. (8va)
Cl., Ob.

ff

brass + percussion

ff

lower strings + timpani

Example 6b Harmonic reduction of Example 6a

L = *Leittonwechsel* (leading-tone exchange)
 N = *Nebenverwandet* (next-related, I–iv)
 S = Slide (also known as a monoterial relationship)

a stylized and abstract way.¹²⁸ At measure 137 the subdominant drifting segues into a more nonfunctional, chromatic progression, whose semitonal voice-leading logic seems to invite a “Neo-Riemannian” theoretical perspective (see Example 6b). On the surface of this chromatic progression we hear augmented seconds that communicate a Hungarian identity.

Although Liszt’s chromatic practice—at least this kind of practice—owes nothing to the Hungarian-Gypsy tradition, the scalar association is interesting not only symbolically but for the particular sonorities it creates. Even familiar diatonic progressions are rendered fresh and strange by enharmonic modal mixtures: for example, in measures 137–38 of Example 6a D major and F-sharp minor are bound together through the use of a symmetrical 3:1 scale (D–E#–F#–A–B–C#, with added E \flat in measure 138). In summary, we hear in this passage “high-art” motivic fragmentation and canonic exchange (enhanced through orchestration); elements signaling *Zukunftsmusik*, such as the nonfunctional chromaticism (mm. 137–44) and augmented-chord sonorities (mm. 141 and 143); and rhythmic and modal elements of *verbunkos* that express a Hungarian identity. All of these musically interacting components project a composite “Hungarian” and “New German” identity, where even the harmonic quality of familiar chromatic progressions becomes strangely new as a result of the voice-leading role of *verbunkos* scales.

In the late arrangements such moments are most often added to the older text in the form of introductions or connecting passages, outside the main thematic body of the work. In all such cases Liszt continued to “comment” on specific points in the piece, and nearly always by associating this sharply differentiated harmonic language with *verbunkos* material. One such daring—and rather playful—moment can be found in the coda of the 1879 version (S. 425/2iv), prepared especially for Liszt’s favorite female pupil, Sophie Menter. In Schubert’s original, the second phrase of the trio is the only moment at which an overall tonic-dominant harmony is relieved by a passage that prolongs the secondary dominant (V^7/V in A-flat major). Liszt reflects on this moment in his coda, in measures 152–59, by creating an extreme and completely unexpected harmonic digression that wittily employs two dislocated V^7/V –V progressions (see Example 7).

128. Loya, *Liszt’s Transcultural Modernism*, 41–44.

Example 7 S. 425/2iv (Sophie Menter version, 1879), mm. 152–61 (*Liszt Society Journal* 31, Music Section (2006): 30). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the *Journal*.

C major disrupted: $\flat\text{III}^7!$
 = D-flat major: V^7/V ----- V -----? C (modal mixture): V^7/V

152

153

154

155

156

157

8va

Return to a stable C major conclusion

Right in the middle of a C major coda we hear a V^7/V - V progression tonicizing the key of D-flat major, as if we are heading back to the trio's flat-key area (further back along the circle of fifths, in fact, since the trio was in A-flat major). Liszt leaves listeners little time to digest what has just happened before pulling them back to the right key at a breathtaking pace. The melodic continuation is unceremoniously transposed a semitone down (a necessary half step away from the D-flat major region), and the V^7/V - V harmonic progression is heard through a modal mixture in C that emphasizes the $\hat{3}\flat\hat{4}\sharp$ augmented second ($\text{Eb}-\text{F}\sharp$). Then, in the next measure, the progression turns just as suddenly to a clear half close in C major. In a final witticism the D-flat major area returns without preparation in measure 156, for a repeat of this wobbly progression.

What does this progression mean in terms of identity? For example, is Liszt's use of rather abstract C-*verbunkos*-minor material (to opt for more generic terminology) representative of a national identity, and if so whose?¹²⁹ To understand the mode Liszt uses in measure 154 in terms of conventional labels such as "Hungarian," "Gypsy," or "Hungarian-Gypsy minor scale" is not wrong per se; it is just too simplistic. True, the distorting, nonfunctional transpositions, in conjunction with the oscillating, "stuck" bass and sudden appearance of augmented seconds, strongly evoke a "Gypsy" caprice topos.¹³⁰ And yet it seems to me that, stylistically isolated and short-lived, this almost subliminal appearance of a "Gypsy" identity is hardly about the representation of Gypsies for the nineteenth-century European imagination, in any normative sense. Rather, these topics are used subtly and comically to deflate some of the earnestness of the original transcription, just as the introduction of a flat-key area constitutes a whimsical disruption of the original, heroic telos of the work. But to what end? We shall never know Liszt's intention, whether it was an in-joke between master and pupil, a satirical homage to Schubert's manner of jumping between keys in the guise of the *style hongrois*, a mischievous baiting of traditionalists, a purposeful deflating of the militant generic aspect of the march for ideological reasons, or all or none of the above. Funny, enigmatic, or just crazy, this passage certainly demonstrates the aesthetics of transcultural modernism.

Nevertheless, despite a few modifications to the old solo piano version (of which Example 7 is decidedly the quirkiest), the Menter version of 1879 evidently did not go far enough in that modernist direction; more specifically, it did not adequately represent some newer ideas found in the orchestral score. The publication of a new solo version had to wait, however, because Liszt had a more urgent need to make the orchestral version known through a four-hand piano reduction (also published as *Franz Schuberts Märsche*, S. 632, 1880), a work begun in 1872.¹³¹ Although disseminating orchestral music through such piano reductions was a normal nineteenth-century practice, it is nevertheless a curious fact that, after five decades, and having passed through several solo and orchestral transcriptions, Schubert's Biedermeier-era four-hand piano music should return to the same medium. Liszt's new

129. By this I mean that the characteristic E \flat -F \sharp is extracted from the *verbunkos* minor (double-harmonic) scale C-D-E \flat -F \sharp -G-A \flat -B \sharp . I generally prefer to use generic terms for musical materials (hence "verbunkos" rather than "Gypsy") to allow more interpretative flexibility, as explained above and in Loya, *Liszt's Transcultural Modernism*, 9-11.

130. Nonfunctional progressions and unprepared modulations are discussed as a "Gypsy" topos in Bellman, "Style hongrois," 122-27. Bellman also cites passages from Liszt's *Des Bohémiens* in this connection.

131. According to Deszö Legány, one of the four marches had already been performed in a four-hand version on March 26, 1872, played by Liszt himself and Mari Reiter Pázmándy, on which occasion several four-hand piano reductions of Liszt's Hungarian orchestral works were also performed: Legány, *Ferenc Liszt . . . 1869-1873*, 134.

piano-duet transcription was even suited to the level of able amateurs, thus bringing the work back to the sphere of *Hausmusik*. And the relative fidelity of the reduction to the 1870 orchestral score (except for a few minor details) signals, for once, a shift away from the world of paraphrase and improvisation toward that of the work-concept. On the other hand, since Liszt's reduction was faithful to his own orchestral composition rather than to Schubert's original, the commonality of medium (four-hand piano) serves only to emphasize the passage of time, the shift in culture, and the continued reenactment of Liszt's original "critique" of post-Classical folklorism. Harmonic innovation aside, even the very opening measures of the reduction declare a modern soundworld, far removed from the one inhabited by Schubert (see Example 8; cf. Example 2).

Liszt next sought to fill the gap between the old solo versions and his new conception of the *Marche hongroise*. The "Troisième édition revue et augmentée" from 1883 is not only very different from the previous "two" editions published in the 1840s; its many additions, alterations, and lengthy *ossia* passages constitute a summary of the long road traveled, and for this reason it is also the most stylistically fragmented version of all. Liszt begins from the present, as it were: the desiccated, austere, and ponderous introduction announces the world of Liszt's late style in no uncertain terms, and in a way that would have surprised anyone familiar either with Schubert's original or with Liszt's earlier transcriptions of it (see Example 9a). Liszt's transcultural-modernist interpolation of intervals extracted from the *verbunkos* minor scale (C–D–E \flat –F \sharp –G–A \flat –B \natural), so pronounced in the late versions, is present

Example 8 S. 632/4, mm. 1–7 (*primo part tacet*, Berlin: Fürstner, 1880, 52). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the **Journal**.

The image displays a musical score for the first seven measures of Liszt's *Marche hongroise*. The score is written in bass clef with a 2/4 time signature and a key signature of one flat (B-flat major). It begins with the tempo marking "Allegretto" and the dynamic marking "mf marcato". The score is divided into two systems. The first system contains measures 1 through 3, with a dashed line labeled "8vb" below the bass staff. Above the first staff, there are three "ten." markings. Below the bass staff, there are "Red." markings and asterisks. The second system contains measures 4 through 7, with "ten." markings above the first staff and "Red." markings and asterisks below the bass staff. The notation includes various rhythmic values, slurs, and accents.

Example 9a The “third edition” (S. 425/2v and vi, 1883), mm. 1–18 (NLA II/15, 88). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the *Journal*.

Andante con moto ♩ = 112

8vb
* * *

6
trillo
p
(8vb)
trillo
* * *

12
(Beginning of march theme)
p
ten.
ten.
(8vb)
* * *

here in even more abstract form: note especially the F \sharp -A \flat trill that resolves on G, the semitonal essence of the scale.

These new sections in the 1883 edition are also retrospective, and a familiarity with previous versions invites intertextual time traveling. The chords that open the work recall measures 92–95 from the Menter version. Schubert’s original theme enters above a bass that has dropped an octave, a funerary sonority established by the orchestral and more especially the piano four-hand version. A trumpet call in measures 75–78 heralds the coming of the trio, recalling this moment in the orchestral version and its four-hand piano reduction. Likewise, the trio begins with a pared-down

texture that allows the “tromba” part to sound properly as an orchestral solo against minimalist accompaniment.

In measures 127–34, between the end of the trio and the reprised march section, Liszt inserts another austere passage in unison. Measures 131–34 emphasize an affective augmented second, literally repeating measures 9–12 from the introduction. In both cases this happens just before the return of the march theme, demonstrating Liszt’s concern for the coherence of his new compositional conception.¹³² But because we can also hear the music from the 1830s and 1840s in this work, such connecting passages constitute an intrusive stylistic interjection.

The same could be said for the measures that approach and conclude the coda, which suddenly take us back to the austere harmony and texture of the late style. The old glissando that announces the “heroic” arrival of the coda, still present in the Menter edition, is gone. In its place we hear static E minor chords (see Example 9b), distantly recalling the final sonority from the equivalent passage in the orchestral version (Example 6a, mm. 143–48), yet stripped of the latter’s rich chromaticism. Although the E minor fanfare

Example 9b S. 425/2v and vi, mm. 173–81 (NLA II/15, 97). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the **Journal**.

The image shows a musical score for piano, measures 173 to 181. The score is in 2/4 time and E minor. It features a unison passage. The first system (measures 173-181) starts with a dynamic marking of *(ff)*. The second system (measures 177-181) includes a dynamic marking of *ff con tutta forza* and performance instructions like *trem.* and *trem.*. There are also asterisks (*) and a double asterisk (**) marking specific measures.

132. Measures 131–34 of the first edition are reproduced in NLA II/15. In an earlier draft Liszt originally wrote a passage twice as long with more repetitions and scalar figures, undoubtedly in response to the even lengthier equivalent unison passage in the orchestral version. See Library of Congress, Music Division, Washington, DC, ML96.L58, item 44a/1.

coheres formally and thematically with the equivalent moment at measures 75–78, the intrusion here of a different stylistic world, and the sudden, non-functional shift to the mediant degree at the point of tonic resolution, constitute a moment of rupture (textural as well as harmonic if one chooses to play S. 425/2vi, the rich “*ossia* version”).

For the concluding measures Liszt recalls the ascending gestures of the Lucca and Menter editions, synthesized with the rhythmic figures of the 1846 edition (see Example 9c; cf. Example 3d). But the *Vormärz* heroism, still evident in the Menter version, is all but gone. Instead of the massive piano sound, the texture continues to thin out as the chords ascend to the extreme treble. The final chords are a bright and ethereal valedictory utterance: a different kind of apotheosis.

Example 9c S. 425/2v and vi, conclusion (NLA II/15, 98). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the *Journal*.

The image displays three systems of a musical score for piano, measures 208, 212, and 216. The music is in 2/4 time and consists of dense, block-like chords. Measure 208 begins with a dynamic marking of *(ff)* and includes a *ped.* (pedal) marking. Above the staff, a dashed line indicates an *8va* (octave) shift. Measure 212 features a *sempre Ped.* (pedal) marking. Measure 216 shows a continuation of the dense chordal texture, with a *(8va)* marking above the staff. The final measure of the system shows a resolution of the chords.

“A Piece after His Own Heart, in the Noblest Hungarian Spirit”

Just before Lachmund sat down to play the *Marche hongroise* in his first masterclass on May 2, 1882, Liszt took hold of the score and began to reminisce:

“Ah, I must publish a new version of the *Marsch*, for I play it altogether differently now,” he said. “Anything but encouraging,” thought I, “for I can attempt it only as given in this early edition.” “Yes,” he added, “this piece was always a favorite of mine, and I usually played it at Court; the last King of Prussia, Friedrich Wilhelm IV, was fond of it.” With that he sat down and played several of the brilliant parts to illustrate the changes he made in it.¹³³

Liszt made sure he illustrated the changes he had made in the published version. In the reprise of the march theme, the point at which he had originally begun his recomposition in earnest, he has left something of a history of versions in one text (see Example 10). The main text refers to the “simplified” 1846 version. The more virtuosic thirty-eight-measure *ossia* refers to the first version (a division that is already present in certain parts of the trio); more specifically, the chromatic figure in the bass also suggests the equivalent orchestral texture of S. 363/4.

Liszt probably played something like this *ossia* passage when he took over from Lachmund at the point where the reprised march theme was to be repeated, which matches what Lachmund describes next:

Thunderingly he stormed over the keyboard in grand variations, his face radiating youthful fire and vigor—in memory of former triumphs with the same *Marsch*, a piece after his own heart, in the noblest Hungarian spirit.

For a few moments there was silence; we did not dare applaud; Liszt stood deep in thought; and it seemed to me I had never seen a more expressive face. All the eyes turned on der liebe Meister; we realized he had been deeply moved by the recollections the piece brought back to him. Arousing himself he said: “Really, I must re-write this; and I will do so at an early opportunity, so that the publishers may get it out in January.”

I had thus been the cause of Liszt’s decision to put into print the enlarged version of the piece, just as he himself played it in public. The new edition appeared as he had wished, the following January.¹³⁴

I have reproduced this fuller version of the passage quoted at the beginning of the article so that we might have a fresh view of Lachmund’s testimony. In contrast to some of my more speculative readings, which depend on intertextual analysis, here we have direct evidence for the work’s reception. Yet if my analysis involves a number of risks, drawing conclusions from this kind of hard evidence is not without its problems. The simplest of these

133. Lachmund, *Living with Liszt*, 31.

134. *Ibid.*, 31–32.

Example 10 S. 425/2v (main text) and vi (*ossia*), mm. 135–38 (NLA II/15, 93). A sound recording of this example is included in the online version of the **Journal**.

Ossia *un poco più animato*

135

p

8vb.
[*]

un poco più animato

p

137

(8vb.)

is that something may have been left out, so that it is all too easy to misunderstand the meaning of the text. For example, thanks to Alan Walker we know that the following sentence from Lachmund's 1882 diary has been omitted from his book: "The march rhythm greatly pleased the last King of Prussia, Friedrich Wilhelm IV, and he would say to me: 'Why Liszt, you have a splendid interest in the military!'"¹³⁵ This somewhat sardonic comment (as I read it) from the aging and pacifist Abbé throws a different light on the whole testimony.

135. Ibid., 31.

But of course the most serious problem is that this account (and others like it) neither supports nor really contradicts any of the four readings I have offered. It certainly provides no conclusive evidence for “transculturation,” and there is no reason to expect such critical and analytical insights from a personal memoir. Moreover, primary sources that help us with the meaning of the work as understood by Liszt and his contemporaries are truly scarce, as argued at the beginning of the article. It would be wonderful to read about the way the work was received at every performance of it given by Liszt in the year 1840, about Liszt’s own thoughts regarding how and why he set out to remake completely the original conception of the movement, about the first manuscript of the work (manuscripts of later versions have survived, as Table 1 shows)—if only such documents were to be found. Even if more responses to the work were to be discovered, it is safe to assume that they would not provide an in-depth analysis of genre or acknowledge the phenomenon of transculturation. Such arrangements never elicited a lengthy aesthetic discussion in the nineteenth century.

It is rather the retrospective 1883 version of the *Marche hongroise* that contains a rich cache of memories: the reclamation of Hungarian identity from Viennese representations, the foundation of a new Romantic nationalistic genre, the republican sentiment, the attachment to Schubert and Vienna, the rejection of narrow chauvinism, the futuristic comments on the music of the past, and the modernist transformation of *verbunkos* elements. Applying a transcultural perspective to the different texts of S. 425 really does qualify how, and in what sense, this march came to express the “noblest Hungarian spirit.” That is why the story of the *Marche hongroise* is worth telling, even if we shall never know what Liszt was thinking that May morning when he told his pupils, “Really, I must re-write this.”

Works Cited

Primary Sources

- Berlioz, Hector. *Mémoires de Hector Berlioz comprenant ses voyages en Italie, en Allemagne, en Russie et en Angleterre, 1803–1865*. Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1878.
- Hanslick, Eduard. *Music Criticisms*. Edited and translated by Henry Pleasants. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.
- . “*Les préludes*. Symphonische Dichtungen für großes Orchester von Franz Liszt.” *Die Presse*, March 12, 1857.
- Koch, Heinrich Christoph. *Musikalisches Lexikon*. Frankfurt am Main: August Hermann der Jüngere, 1802.
- LAC = *The Liszt-d’Agoult Correspondence: English Translations and Commentaries*. Edited and translated by Michael Short. Franz Liszt Studies Series 14. Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2013.
- Lachmund, Carl. *Living with Liszt: From the Diary of Carl Lachmund, an American Pupil of Liszt, 1882–1884*. Edited by Alan Walker. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 1995.

- LFL = *Letters of Franz Liszt*. Edited by La Mara. Translated by Constant Bache. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1894.
- Liszt, Franz. *An Artist's Journey: Lettres d'un bachelier ès musique, 1835–1841*. Translated by Charles Suttoni. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- . *Briefwechsel mit seiner Mutter*. Edited by Klára Hamburger. Eisenstadt: Amt der Burgenländischen Landesregierung, 2000.
- . *Des Bohémiens et de leur musique en Hongrie*. Paris: A. Bourdilliat, 1859.
- . *Des Bohémiens et de leur musique en Hongrie*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1881.
- . *Franz Liszt and Agnes Street-Klindworth: A Correspondence, 1854–1886*. Edited by Pauline Pocknell. Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2000.
- . *Franz Liszts Briefe: Briefe an die Fürstin Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein*. Edited by La Mara. Vols. 5 and 6. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1900, 1902.
- . *The Letters of Franz Liszt to Marie zu Sayn-Wittgenstein*. Edited and translated by Howard E. Hugo. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1971.
- . "Lettre d'un bachelier ès-musique." *La revue et gazette musicale de Paris* 5, no. 6 (February 11, 1838): 57–62; no. 35 (September 2, 1838): 345–52.
- . *Selected Letters*. Edited and translated by Adrian Williams. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Schumann, Robert. "Franz Schubert, Lieder (in der Bearbeitung von Liszt)." *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 9, no. 48 (December 14, 1838): 192–93.
- Williams, Adrian. *Portrait of Liszt: By Himself and His Contemporaries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Scores

- Liszt, Franz. *Franz Liszts musikalische Werke*. 2/IV. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1916.
- . "Marche hongroise" (Sophie Menter version). *Liszt Society Journal* 31, Music Section (2006): 21–30.
- NLA = *Neue-Liszt Ausgabe*. General editors Imre Sulyok and Imre Mező. Budapest: Editio Musica, 1970–2015. Volumes consulted include I/1 (1970), I/3 (1972), and I/4 (1973), edited by Zoltán Gárdonyi and István Szélényi; I/13 (1985) and I/18 (1985), edited by Imre Sulyok and Imre Mező; II/3 (1999), edited by László Martos and Imre Sulyok; II/15 (2003), edited by István Kassai and Imre Sulyok; I/5–Supplement (2007), edited by Adrienne Kaczmarczyk and Imre Mező; and Supplement 7 (2015), edited by Adrienne Kaczmarczyk and Ágnes Sas.
- Papp, Géza, ed. *Hungarian Dances, 1784–1810*. Musicalia danubiana 7. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Zenetudományi Intézet, 1986.
- Ruzitska, Ignácz. *Magyar nóták Veszprém Vármegyéből: 136 verbunkos tánc 15 füzetben, a Veszprémvármegyei Zenetársaság kiadásában 1823–1832 között*. Edited by Miklós Rakos. Budapest: Nemzeti Kulturális Alap, 1994.

Recordings

- Duo Egri and Pertis. *Rákóczi March*. Hungaroton, 2002.
- Howard, Leslie. *Franz Liszt: The Complete Music for Solo Piano*. Vols. 25 (1993) and 31–33 (1995). Hyperion.
- Kölner Klavier-Duo. *Franz Schubert: Piano Music for Four Hands*. Arte Nova Classics, 1997.

Books and Articles

- Applegate, Celia. *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Barany, George. "The Hungarian Diet of 1839–40 and the Fate of Szechenyi's Middle Course." *Slavic Review* 22 (June 1963): 285–303.
- Bellman, Jonathan. *The "style hongrois" in the Music of Western Europe*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Burnham, Scott. *Beethoven Hero*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Codell, Julie F., ed. *Transculturation in British Art, 1770–1930*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2012.
- Colson, Geoffrey. "A Fresh Approach to Transculturation in Contemporary Music in Tahiti." *Eras* 16, no. 1 (2014): 1–22.
- Cormac, Joanne. "Liszt, Language, and Identity: A Multinational Chameleon." *19th-Century Music* 36 (2013): 231–47.
- Deaville, James. "The Politics of Liszt's Virtuosity: New Light on the Dialectics of a Cultural Phenomenon." In *Liszt and the Birth of Modern Europe*, edited by Michael Saffle and Rossana Dalmonte, 115–42. Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2003.
- . "Publishing Paraphrases and Creating Collectors: Friedrich Hofmeister, Franz Liszt, and the Technology of Popularity." In *Franz Liszt and His World*, edited by Christopher H. Gibbs and Dana Gooley, 255–88. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- . "Wanting the Real Thing? Liszt's Transcriptions and the Issue of Authenticity." In *Liszt's Legacies*, edited by James Deaville and Michael Saffle, 147–70. Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2014.
- Eckhardt, Mária. *Franz Liszt's Music Manuscripts in the National Széchényi Library, Budapest*. Translated by Erszébet Mészáros with revisions by Rena Mueller. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986.
- . "Liszts Bearbeitungen von Schuberts Märschen: Formale Analyse." *Studia musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 26 (1984): 133–46.
- Evans, Robert John Weston. *Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs: Central Europe, c.1683–1867*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Fulcher, Jane F. *The Nation's Image: French Grand Opera as Politics and Politicized Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Gárdonyi, Zoltán. *Liszt Ferenc magyar stílusa / Le style hongrois de François Liszt*. Budapest: Orsz. Széchényi Könyvtár, 1936. Originally published as *Die ungarischen Stileigentümlichkeiten in den musikalischen Werken Franz Liszts*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1931.
- Garratt, James. *Music, Culture and Social Reform in the Age of Wagner*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Gay, Peter. *The Cultivation of Hatred*. New York: Norton, 1993.
- Gibbs, Christopher H. "'Just Two Words. Enormous Success': Liszt's 1838 Vienna Concerts." In *Franz Liszt and His World*, edited by Christopher H. Gibbs and Dana Gooley, 167–230. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Gooley, Dana. *The Virtuoso Liszt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "Warhorses: Liszt, Weber's 'Konzertstück,' and the Cult of Napoléon." *19th-Century Music* 24 (2000): 62–88.

- Gramit, David. *Cultivating Music: The Aspirations, Interests, and Limits of German Musical Culture, 1770–1848*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Grimes, Nicole. "A Critical Inferno? Hoplit, Hanslick and Liszt's *Dante Symphony*." *Journal of the Society for Musicology in Ireland* 7 (2011–12): 3–22.
- Hamburger, Klára. *Liszt*. Translated by Gyula Gulyás. Budapest: Corvina, 1980.
- . "Understanding the Hungarian Reception History of Liszt's *Des Bohémiens et de leur musique en Hongrie* (1859/1881)." *Journal of the American Liszt Society* 54 (2003): 75–84.
- Hamilton, Kenneth. "Wagner and Liszt: Elective Affinities." In *Richard Wagner and His World*, edited by Thomas S. Grey, 27–64. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Hanson, Alice Marie. *Musical Life in Biedermeier Vienna*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Head, Matthew. "'Like Beauty Spots on the Face of a Man': Gender in 18th-Century North-German Discourse on Genre." *Journal of Musicology* 13 (1995): 143–67.
- Hernández, Felipe. "Transcultural Architectures in Latin America." In *Transculturation: Cities, Spaces and Architectures in Latin America*, edited by Felipe Hernández, Mark Millington, and Iain Borden, ix–xxv. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.
- Hibberd, Sarah. "Cherubini and the Revolutionary Sublime." *Cambridge Opera Journal* 24 (2012): 293–318.
- Hooker, Lynn M. *Redefining Hungarian Music from Liszt to Bartók*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Kaczmarczyk, Adrienne. "Franz Liszt's First Hungarian Symphonic Attempt: The *National-Ungarische Symphonie*." In *Essays in Honor of László Somfai on his 70th Birthday: Studies in the Sources and the Interpretation of Music*, edited by László Vikárius and Vera Lampert, 273–86. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2005.
- . "The Genesis of the *Funérailles*: The Connections between Liszt's *Symphonie révolutionnaire* and the Cycle *Harmonies poétiques et religieuses*." *Studia musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 35 (1993–94): 361–98.
- Kalbeck, Max. *Johannes Brahms*. Vol. 2. Pt. 1. Berlin: Deutsche Brahms-Gesellschaft, 1908.
- Kregor, Jonathan. *Liszt as Transcriber*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Legány, Dezső. *Ferenc Liszt and His Country, 1869–1873*. Budapest: Corvina, 1976.
- . *Ferenc Liszt and His Country, 1874–1886*. Budapest: Occidental Press, 1992.
- . "Liszt in Hungary, 1820–46." In *Liszt and His World*, edited by Michael Saffle, 3–16. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 1998.
- Locke, Ralph P. "*Aida* and Nine Readings of Empire." *Nineteenth-Century Music Review* 3, no. 1 (June 2006): 45–72.
- . "Liszt's Saint-Simonian Adventure." *19th-Century Music* 4 (1981): 209–27.
- . *Musical Exoticism: Images and Reflections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Loya, Shay. *Liszt's Transcultural Modernism and the Hungarian-Gypsy Tradition*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2011.
- . "Liszt's *verbunkos* Legacy and the Paradoxes of Progressive Hungarian Musical Modernism." In *Liszt's Legacies*, edited by James Deaville and Michael Saffle, 17–42. Hillside, NY: Pendragon Press, 2014.

- Lutchmayer, Karl. "The *Hexameron*: Wishful Thinking, Stylistic Rivalry and Lisztian Conquest in 1830s Paris." *Liszt Society Journal* 31 (2006): 3–33.
- Main, Alexander. "Liszt's 'Lyon': Music and the Social Conscience." *19th-Century Music* 4 (1981): 228–43.
- Mayes, Catherine. "Eastern European National Music as Concept and Commodity at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century." *Music and Letters* 95 (2014): 70–91.
- McLean, Thomas. *The Other East and Nineteenth-Century British Literature: Imagining Poland and the Russian Empire*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Merrick, Paul. *Revolution and Religion in the Music of Liszt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Ortiz, Fernando. *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*. Translated by Harriet de Onis. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press, 1995. First published in Spanish in 1940; first English translation 1947.
- Pethő, Csilla. "Style hongrois: Hungarian Elements in the Works of Haydn, Beethoven, Weber and Schubert." *Studia musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 41 (2000): 199–284.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Rama, Ángel. *Writing across Cultures: Narrative Transculturation in Latin America*. Edited and translated by David Frye. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press, 2012.
- Rehding, Alexander. "Liszt's Musical Monuments." *19th-Century Music* 26 (2002): 52–72.
- Rosenblatt, Jay. "Orchestral Transcriptions." In *The Liszt Companion*, edited by Ben Arnold, 309–31. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin, 1995.
- Samson, Jim. *Virtuosity and the Musical Work: The "Transcendental Studies" of Liszt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Schneider, David E. *Bartók, Hungary and the Renewal of Tradition: Case Studies in the Intersection of Modernity and Nationality*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Searle, Humphrey. *The Music of Liszt*. With a new introduction by Sara D. Buechner. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2012. First published 1954.
- Short, Michael, and Leslie Howard. *Ferenc Liszt (1811–1886): List of Works: Comprehensively Expanded from the Catalogue of Humphrey Searle as Revised by Sharon Winkelhofer*. Milan: Rugginenti, 2004.
- Sked, Alan. *Metternich and Austria: An Evaluation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Suttoni, Charles. "Opera Paraphrases." In *The Liszt Companion*, edited by Ben Arnold, 179–91. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002.
- Szabolcsi, Bence. *A Concise History of Hungarian Music*. 2nd, enlarged ed. Translated by Sára Karig and Fred MacNicol, translation revised by Florence Knepler. Budapest: Corvina, 1974.
- Walker, Alan. *Franz Liszt: The Final Years, 1861–1886*. London: Faber and Faber, 1997.
- . *Franz Liszt: The Virtuoso Years, 1811–1847*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

- . *Franz Liszt: The Weimar Years, 1848–1861*. London: Faber and Faber, 1989.
- Wank, Solomon. “Foreign Policy and the Nationality Problem in Austria-Hungary, 1867–1914.” *Austrian History Yearbook* 3, no. 3 (1967): 37–56.
- Wessley, Othmar. “Herbeck, Johann Ritter von.” *Grove Music Online*. *Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed December 1, 2014. <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/12829>.
- Wilde, David. “Transcriptions for Piano.” In *Franz Liszt: The Man and His Music*, edited by Alan Walker, 168–201. London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1970.

Abstract

Liszt’s *Mélodies hongroises d’après Schubert*, a solo piano transcription of Schubert’s four-hand *Divertissement à l’hongroise*, provides an interesting example of the complex relationship between centers and peripheries, and between personal patriotism and public nationalism. The first transcription (S. 425, 1838–39) stands at the very beginning of Liszt’s career as a “national composer,” the most significant aspect of this rather overlooked fact being Liszt’s transformation of the second movement—a naive, dance-like march—into “republican” heroic music driven toward an apotheosis à la Beethoven. This heralded a new type of national genre, and Liszt deemed the march movement important enough to be published on its own in numerous versions between 1838 and 1883. Yet this *Marche hongroise* was not merely nationalist: it related to other, non-Hungarian identities, most notably French and Austrian. Later versions (from 1859 onward) allowed Liszt to express a progressive, liberal Hungarian identity in the face of a rising tide of chauvinism. Four transcultural readings of the work, both complementary and conflicting, follow Liszt’s revisions in roughly chronological order, interpreting the work as, in turn, a nationalist reclamation of Hungarian music, a republican response to the political status quo, the construction of an Austro-Hungarian identity, and a discontinuous text in which new, modernist ideas often merge or conflict with older ones, forcing a fresh renegotiation of national identity.

Keywords: Liszt, Schubert, *Marche hongroise*, nationalism, transculturation