

Czech and Slovak
**Journal
of Humanities**

Musicologica

2/2019

Czech and Slovak Journal of Humanities (CSJH) is a peer-reviewed scholarly journal established in 2011 at Palacký University, one of the oldest Central European universities. The journal is dedicated to various important fields of the humanities: history, philosophy, theatre & film (including TV and radio), music, and cultural anthropology, with interdisciplinary themes among these fields.

The journal is intended as a dialogue between the finest Czech and Slovak research and research abroad and as a forum where innovative approaches and current topics are discussed, as well as local themes and previously neglected research. CSJH is open to Czech, Slovak and international scholars and guarantees a fair and accurate reviewing process. In order to reach an international readership, CSJH publishes the majority of texts in English. Regular scholarly papers are particularly welcome, as well as book or conference reviews, notices, research projects reports and other kinds of academic chronicle. The Journal is indexed in ERIH PLUS and EBSCO database.

Editorial Board

George Arabatzis, University of Athens, Greece
Michael Beckerman, New York University, USA
Martin Baumann, University of Luzern, Switzerland
Paul Richard Blum, Loyola University Maryland, USA
Ian Christie, Birkbeck, University of London, United Kingdom
Yvetta Kajanova, Komenský University, Bratislava, Slovakia
Tatjana Lazorčáková, Palacký University, Olomouc, Czech Republic
Marina Righetti, Università La Sapienza, Rome, Italy
Rostislav Švácha, Palacký University, Olomouc / Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic

Czech and Slovak Journal of Humanities is published two times a year in the following sequence: *Philosophica*; *Historica*; *Theatralia et cinematographica*; *Musicologica*; *Anthropologica culturalia*.

Contact:

Jozef Matula
Filozofická fakulta UP
Křížkovského 12
77180 Olomouc
Czech Republic
jozef.matula@upol.cz

<http://csjh.upol.cz>

Zpracování a vydání publikace bylo umožněno díky finanční podpoře udělené roku 2019 Ministerstvem školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy ČR v rámci Institucionálního rozvojového plánu, okruhu Strategický rozvoj, Filozofické fakultě Univerzity Palackého v Olomouci.

Published and printed by:

Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci (Palacký University Olomouc)
Křížkovského 8, 771 47 Olomouc, Czech Republic
www.vydavatelstvi.upol.cz
e-mail: vup@upol.cz

Editor of this issue: Jan Blüml, Jiří Kopecký, Lenka Křupková

Language editor of this issue: David Livingstone

Technical editor of this issue: Monika Pitnerová

Responsible editor: Otakar Loutocký

Technical editor: Anna Petříková

Graphic Design: TAH & Lenka Wünschová

© Palacký University in Olomouc, Czech Republic, 2019

ISSN 1805-3742

On the cover: Interior of the Municipal Theatre at Olomouc (A. Rohn, 1830).

Contents

<i>Na Szkle Malowane: An Analysis of the Historical Origin of This Musical Phenomenon</i>	5
Nikoleta Bartošová	
<i>Der Fall Wagner: Hans Richter and the Composer's Reception in the Hungarian Satirical Magazin Borsszem Jankó</i>	31
Péter Bozó	
<i>The Position of Italian Opera Repertoire in Austrian Province Theatres: The Case of the Olomouc Theatre (1830–1920)</i>	45
Jiří Kopecký, Lenka Křupková	
<i>Czech Theatrical Imagination in Teatro alla Scala: František Tröster and Miloš Wasserbauer's Production of Katerina Izmailova (1964)</i>	60
Šárka Havlíčková Kysová	
<i>European Musical Theatre in the Context of Theatrical Life in Pressburg from the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century to the End of the Nineteenth Century</i>	70
Jana Laslavíková	
<i>Transforming Torment into "Happiness": Ironic National Self-portrayal in the Rap-opera Zemlja sreće ("Land of Happiness," 2007)</i>	84
Tatjana Marković	
<i>Cultural Transfer and the Writing of National Operas and Ballets in the Twentieth Century: The Case of Serbia</i>	92
Melita Milin	
<i>Running an Opera Season from Politeama Ciscutti to Teatro Bonda during the Late Habsburg Empire</i>	101
Cristina Scuderi	

Péter Bozó

Der Fall Wagner: Hans Richter and the Composer's Reception in the Hungarian Satirical Magazin

*Borsszem Jankó*¹

“Manches, was in der Zeitung steht, ist dann doch wahr – wenn auch nicht alles”
(Bismarck)

Abstract | The period when Hans Richter was active as conductor at the Budapest National Theatre (1871–1875) was the heyday of political satirical magazines in Hungary. One of them, *Borsszem Jankó*, edited by Adolf Ágai, regularly published fake news and caricatures concerning the reception of Richard Wagner, whose music was more intensively cultivated in Budapest under Richter's conductorship than earlier. In my study I attempt to contextualize and interpret the articles published in *Borsszem Jankó* about Wagner and Wagnerians in order to demonstrate some characteristics of the composer's Hungarian reception. I argue that the partly ideological opposition between Richter and Hungarian Wagnerians might have played a significant role in Richter's departure from Budapest.

Keywords | Hans Richter – parody and caricature – press history – reception history – Richard Wagner

.....

Introduction

Studying the Hungarian reception of Richard Wagner's works, it seems to be suitable to make a distinction between several groups of recipients. As a working hypothesis, one can assume that different groups of recipients reacted in different ways to Wagner's works and views. The perspective of the opera audience, comprising individuals of very different intellectual and musical gifts, was in all likelihood other than that of the critics judging his works in music magazines; musicians playing in the pit for their livelihood did not have the same opinion about his romantic operas and music dramas as the composer looking for his individual style and studying ardently his full scores.²

In this study, I deal with a quite particular group of recipients and writings: those dedicated to Wagner and published in the Hungarian magazine entitled *Borsszem Jankó* (Johnny Pepper-

¹ The present study was written as part of a larger project exploring Richard Wagner's reception in Hungary between 1862 and 1918, and was supported by a postdoctoral scholarship of the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Office (PD 124 089). The author is a research fellow of the Budapest Institute for Musicology (Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungarian Academy of Sciences). The following abbreviations are used: *BJ* = *Borsszem Jankó*; *FL* = *Fővárosi Lapok*; *ZszL* = *Zenészeti Lapok*.

² Concerning Wagner's compositional reception by Bartók, see Tibor Tallián, “Richard Wagner Magyarországon. Reflexek és reflexiók,” *Magyar Tudomány* 175, no. 1 (January 2014): 16–31.

corn) between 1869 and 1875, largely in the period, when Hans Richter was active in Budapest.³ *Borsszem Jankó* belonged to the family of the satirical magazines – it was something similar to contemporary Viennese newspapers such as *Kikeriki*, *Figaro*, *Der Humorist*, *Die Bombe*, and *Der Floh*;⁴ the Munich *Fliegende Blätter*; the Berlin *Kladderadatsch*;⁵ or the Paris *Le Journal amusant* and *Le Charivari*.⁶ A common characteristic of these magazines is that they did not publish genuine news, serious reviews and reports, but jokes and funny fake news of a topical content, sometimes in prose sometimes in verses. Apart from written texts, caricatures and satirical cartoons also played a significant role.

Needless to say, magazines of this kind cannot be regarded as reliable sources as the more objective (but likewise not always impartial) articles of a serious daily newspaper. Nevertheless, in my opinion, they can be used as sources in another way: jokes, if they are interpreted in the right context – to put it simply, if we understand them –, can serve to inform us about the popular image of a historical figure (for instance, a composer). Thus, in my article, I deal with the less than serious aspects of nineteenth-century Wagner reception. Although in an international context, namely in the German and Anglo-American secondary literature,⁷ this approach to the subject is not completely new, in connection with the composer's Hungarian reception I do not know any attempt of this kind.⁸ In Part 2, I introduce *Borsszem Jankó* in the wider context of the contemporary Hungarian press, while in the remaining parts of my study, I attempt to contextualize and interpret the articles published in the magazine about Wagner and Wagnerians in order to demonstrate some characteristics of the composer's reception in Austro-Hungarian Budapest of the 1860s and 1870s.

***Borsszem Jankó* in the Context of the Contemporary Budapest Press**

Borsszem Jankó, a magazine published once a week, first appeared in 1868, the year following the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. It was a product of the period which was called “the heyday of political satirical magazines in Hungary” in an earlier volume about the history of the press.⁹ Its founder and first Editor-in-Chief was Adolf Ágai (Rosenzweig; 1836–1916), an assimilated

³ During most of the nineteenth century, Buda and Pest were two separate cities. They were united as Budapest only in 1873. For the sake of simplicity, I use here the name “Budapest” also for the period before 1873.

⁴ The Viennese magazines in question are available in ANNO, the digital newspaper archive of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek: <http://anno.onb.ac.at/>.

⁵ Both *Fliegende Blätter* and *Kladderadatsch* can be consulted in the digital library of the Universität Heidelberg: <https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/fb>.

⁶ Available online in the digital collection of the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale (Gallica): <https://gallica.bnf.fr>.

⁷ Ernst Kreowski–Eduard Fuchs, *Richard Wagner in der Karikatur* (Berlin: Behr, 1907); Hermann Hakel, ed., *Richard der Einzige. Satire, Parodie, Karikatur* (Wien–Hannover: Forum, 1963); Wolfgang W. Parth, ed., *Der Ring der nie gelungen. Richard Wagner in Parodie, Satire und Karikatur* (München: Heyne, 1983); Manfred Eger, “Richard Wagner in Parodie und Karikatur,” in *Richard-Wagner-Handbuch*, ed. Ulrich Müller–Peter Wapnewski (Kröner: Stuttgart 1986), 760–776; Lydia Goehr, “Wagner through Other Eyes: Parody and the Wit of Brevity in Theodor W. Adorno and Mark Twain,” *New German Critique* 43, no. 3 (November 2016): 27–52.

⁸ For detailed, book-length studies of Wagner's Hungarian reception, see Emil Haraszti, *Wagner Richard és Magyarországon* (Budapest: MTA, 1916) and Ildikó Varga, *Richard Wagner, Magyarországon és a magyarok, 1842–1924* (Pécs: author's edition, 2018), which is based on her PhD dissertation written in English: “Richard Wagner, Hungary, and the Nineteenth Century. Aspects of the Reception of Wagner's Operas and Music Dramas” (PhD diss., Graz: University of Music and Dramatic Arts, 2014). Although both Haraszti and Varga's books are well documented and based on extensive research, their interpretation of the sources is not always convincing.

⁹ Géza Buzinkay, “Élclapok, 1867–1875,” in *A magyar sajtó története*, vol. II/2: 1867–1892, ed. Miklós Szabolcsi (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1985), 169–196. For another survey on *Borsszem Jankó* and Hungarian satirical

Jewish Hungarian medical doctor, writer, journalist and humorist, who edited the magazine until 1910, and published his writings under the pen names “Csicseri Bors” or “Spitzig Iczig.”¹⁰ The Editorial Board consisted mainly of young and gifted bourgeois intellectuals, habitués of the café called “Kávéforrás” – the group included among others the playwright Árpád Herczík (1842–1919), the translator of Goethe’s poems, Lajos Dóczy (1845–1919), as well as the later director of the Budapest Népszínház (Folk Theater) and Editor-in-Chief of the daily newspaper *Budapesti Hírlap*, Jenő Rákosi (Kremsner; 1842–1929).¹¹ Caricatures and cartoons were drawn by the Czech Karel Klič (1841–1926; he arrived from Brno, (his name was sometimes spelled as Karl Klietzsch) and the Hungarian János Jankó (1833–1896).¹²

Contemporary Hungarian satirical political magazines such as *Üstökös*, *Bolond Miska*, *Ludas Matyi*, and *Mátyás deák* were mostly the organs of different political interest groups, and usually functioned in association with serious daily newspapers. Only a small part of the articles were written by professional journalists and members of the Editorial Board – most of the publications were sent to the editorial office by the readers (that means, by followers of the political direction represented by the magazine). Since the editorial correspondence was normally anonymous, in most cases the identity of the authors cannot be investigated.¹³ Basically, *Borsszem Jankó* did not differ from the other political satirical magazines of the period: it functioned as the funny pair of the daily newspaper *Reform*, and represented the views of the “Deák-párt,” the political party governing Hungary between 1867 and 1875.¹⁴ Led by Ferenc Deák (1803–1876), this political party came into existence in 1861 and lasted until 1875, when it fused with its own opposition, the “Balközép Párt” (Middle-Left Party) led by Kálmán Tisza (1830–1902), under the name “Szabadelvű Párt” (Liberal Party).¹⁵

According to the media historian Géza Buzinkay, *Borsszem Jankó* represented a far higher standard than the other Budapest organs of this kind: “it aspired for characterization and dissemination of knowledge even in its political writings.”¹⁶ In addition, it also paid significant attention to the events of cultural life.¹⁷ In the columns of the journal, some recurring fictive figures can be found who represent specific social types: Berci Mokány is a dissolute provincial nobleman who is behind the times; Monocles Szent-szivari belongs to the higher aristocracy (the word “szivar” in his name means cigar); while Zirzabella Lengenádfalvy Kotlik is an ugly but busty extreme left-wing patriotic girl.

The popularity of the magazine is evidenced by the growing number of readers: at the very beginning *Borsszem Jankó* had 500–600 subscribers, with this figure increasing, however, to over 2,800 within one year. In 1870, the number of subscribers was already 4,000, which was a significant quantity under contemporary conditions, what is more, 500 further copies were

newspapers, see *ibid.*, *Borsszem Jankó és társai. Magyar élclapok és karikatúráik a XIX. század második felében* (Budapest: Corvina, 1983).

¹⁰ For Ágai’s personality, see József Szinnyei, *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, vol. 1 (Budapest: Hornyánszky, 1891), 74–78.

¹¹ Buzinkay, *A magyar sajtó története*, vol. II/2, 197.

¹² *Ibid.*, 172.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 171.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 169 and 195.

¹⁵ László Csorba, “A dualizmus rendszerének kiépülése és konszolidált időszaka (1867–1890),” in *Magyarország története a 19. században*, ed. András Gergely (Budapest: Osiris, 2005), 368–370.

¹⁶ Buzinkay, *A magyar sajtó története*, vol. II/2, 169.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 204–205.

regularly sold by the news vendors.¹⁸ *Borsszem Jankó* appeared right up until the 1930s, it should be noted, however, that after World War I it was not able to maintain its earlier popularity.¹⁹

Hans Richter and the Budapest Wagnerians

In the columns of *Borsszem Jankó*, three persons are mentioned who played a significant role in the Budapest reception of Wagner's works: Franz Liszt, Kornél Ábrányi and Hans Richter.

As is well known, Liszt was not only the conductor of the Weimar world premiere of *Lohengrin* (28 August 1850) but did a great deal for Wagner in general, both through his personal contacts and through his writings analyzing and popularizing Wagner's works.²⁰ Ábrányi (Eördögh; 1822–1903), a pianist, composer and music writer, translated two of the composer's librettos into Hungarian (*Tannhäuser* and *Der fliegende Holländer*), furthermore, as the Editor-in-Chief of the music magazine *Zenészetilapok*, he published a series of important articles – among others reviews of the Budapest Wagner premieres that took place between 1866 and 1874 (see Table 1). His music magazine propagated Wagner's music so much so that Tibor Tallián characterized it as “a kind of *Revue Wagnérienne*.”²¹ Two of the four Wagner premieres that took place at the Budapest National Theatre between 1866 and 1874 were conducted by Hans Richter, who from 1866 was Wagner's personal acquaintance and copyist. Before his Budapest activity, he already successfully propagated the composer's works in Munich and Brussels and later it was he who conducted the world premiere of *Der Ring des Nibelungen* on the occasion of the opening of the Bayreuth Festspielhaus.

Table 1: Wagner premieres at the Budapest National Theater, 1866–1874

Date	Piece	Conductor	Ábrányi's Review in <i>ZszL</i>
1 Dec 1866 (first perf.)	<i>Lohengrin</i>	Karl Huber	7/10 (Dec 9, 1866), [146]–149; 7/11 (Dec 16, 1866), [162]–166
7 Oct 1871 (revival)	<i>Lohengrin</i>	Hans Richter	12/3 (Oct 15, 1871), 33–41
11 March 1871 (first perf.)	<i>Tannhäuser</i>	Hans Richter	11/22 (March 19, 1871), [338]–343; 349–351
10 May 1873 (first perf.)	<i>A bolygó hollandi</i> [= <i>Der fliegende Holländer</i>]	Hans Richter	13/19 (May 18, 1873), [145]–147
24 Nov 1874 (first perf.)	<i>Rienzi, az utolsó tribun</i> [= <i>Rienzi, der letzte</i> <i>der Tribunen</i>]	Hans Richter	14/29 (Nov 29 1874), [229]–232

¹⁸ Ibid., 172 and 195.

¹⁹ The majority of the issues published between 1868 and 1919 are digitally available in Arcanum Digitális Tudománytár accessed 13 May 2019, <https://adplus.arcanum.hu/hu/collection/Borsszemjanko/>.

²⁰ See *Franz Liszt: Sämtliche Schriften*, Bd. 4: *Lohengrin und Tannhäuser von Richard Wagner*, ed. Detlef Altenburg (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1989), furthermore “Wagner's fliegende Holländer” and “Richard Wagner's Rheingold,” in *Franz Liszt: Sämtliche Schriften*, Bd. 5: *Dramaturgische Blätter*, eds. Dorothea Redepenning und Britta Schilling (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1989), 68–114 and 115–117. See also Liszt's correspondence with Wagner: *Franz Liszt – Richard Wagner Briefwechsel*, ed. Hanjo Kesting (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1988).

²¹ Tibor Tallián, “Pest (die unmusikalischtste Stadt). Wagner Richárd Pesten,” *Muzsika* 56, no. 7 (July 2013): 15–19.



Figure 1: Hans Richter, Wagner and Liszt on the title page of *Borsszem Jankó* (24 December 1871)

It was with Liszt's support that Richter was contracted as second conductor of the orchestra to the Budapest National Theatre at the beginning of the season 1871/1872.²² The cover caricature

²² For details on Richter's Budapest activity, see Christopher Fifield, "Chapter 5: 1871-1874: Budapest," and "Chapter 6: 1874-1875: Budapest and Bayreuth," in *ibid.*, *Hans Richter* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2016), 51-62 and 63-81.

of the 1871 Christmas issue of *Borsszem Jankó* (Plate 1) expressively characterises his situation: he can be seen turning his back on the audience and conducting the orchestra; he is attended by Wagner, whose profile can be seen in the middle of Richter's back; Liszt is applauding the new conductor in the bottom right corner of the picture.²³ This title page is all the more worthy of attention because it was published only three months after Richter was contracted to Budapest in September 1871. Already in this short early period of his activity, he successfully revived Wagner's *Lohengrin* (this was his debut at the National Theatre) and in each of the first three concerts of the Budapest Philharmonic Society in the Redoute (Vigadó) he conducted some parts of Wagner's stage works (for the Wagner pieces performed in Richter's Budapest concerts, see Table 2).²⁴

Table 2: Wagner's works conducted by Richter in the concerts of the Budapest Philharmonic Society, 1871-1873

Date	Work
8 Nov 1871	<i>Der fliegende Holländer</i> , Prelude
22 Nov 1871	<i>Tristan und Isolde</i> , Prelude and Isolde's Love Death
13 Dec 1871	<i>Tristan und Isolde</i> , Prelude and Isolde's Love Death
28 Feb 1872	<i>Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg</i> , Prelude, Prelude to Act 3, Quintet; <i>Huldigungsmarsch</i>
13 March 1872	<i>Liebesmahl der Apostel</i>
27 March 1872	-
13 Nov 1872	-
27 Nov 1872	Gluck: <i>Iphigenia in Aulis</i> (Wagner's arrangement)
11 Dec 1872	<i>Eine Faust-Ouvertüre</i>
5 March 1873	-
19 March 1873	-
9 Apr 1873	<i>Tristan und Isolde</i> , Prelude

Hence it is not surprising that the Budapest press regarded him as the composer's follower and ideal performer, already after a short time like this. An anonymous review published in *Fővárosi Lapok* claimed already after the revival of *Lohengrin* that the new conductor introduced himself with "sparkling success;" that he knew "the spirit and combinations of Wagner's operas all over;" that "he was applauded already after the prelude;" and that "he was called onto the stage several times after each of the acts."²⁵ This is of even greater interest because one year before Richter's arrival, in September 1870, a performance of *Lohengrin* by the Budapest opera company was criticised in *Borsszem Jankó* as being scandalous. "It has a splendid effect (unknown even for Wagner) when a duet is performed by three people: two singers and a prompter."²⁶ If the report, illustrated with a grotesque music example (see Plate 2), can be taken at face value, the following dialogue took place on the stage of the National Theatre during the performance in question:

²³ BJ 4/208 (24 December 1871), title page.

²⁴ The data are taken from Richter's own Conducting Book, published in Fifield, *Hans Richter*, 469-746.

²⁵ FL 8/232 (10 October 1871), 1063.

²⁶ BJ 3/142 (18 September 1870), 407.

Borsszem Jankó a színházban.

Ez a Molnár! Hogy ismeri a publikumát. Mind felültet a kritikusokat. Játsszik két jelenetet jól; ezzel megnyeri a jó kritikusokat; játszik tizet rosszul, ezért dicséri Asbóth és — a kollegák.

Marci. Jó gyerek az a Gyuri — kitünő mint szalon-színész, csak hőszerepekbe ne kapna. Jajajaj! ezekben irtóztató! Hiányzik belőle az a szent, az a magasztos ihlet. Azt a jégenkopogó miatyánkját!

Kálmán. No hálá Isten, legalább van hős színész. Marci mekképe kezd kiállhatatlan lenni. Hanem Gyurinak táncsolni fogom, ne kapjon szalon-szerepbe. Az a frakk úgy áll rajta, mint egy marqueurön. Fi done! Hjab, erre születni kell.

Miklós. Hiszen nem volna rossz az a Molnár, különösen mint hős- és szalonszínész. Ha meggondolom, hogy Marcinak és Kálmánnak mennyire megnőtt a szarva. Isten engem, örülök, hogy ide szerződtették. Csak attól félek, hogy karakter szerepekre csábítja magát. Jaj, azokban megbukik!

Ede (a kisebbik.) No, most már nem bánom, ha itt van. Ennek legalább szólhatok, mert az a Marci, Kálmán és Miklós olyan pökhendiek; miattok lehetnék rendező a garderóében, de a színpadon nem hederitenek rám. Molnár egy kicsit le fogja törni a szarvukat. Csak attól félek, hogy a rendezésbe is bele akar szólni — no, ahhoz nem ért, — ahhoz igazán nem ért.

Ede (a nagyobbik.) Nem rossz az a Molnár, igazán nem rossz. Jól deklamál, a színpadon otthon van, van hangja, alakja; csak a főfogáshoz nem ért. Jaj, scenirozni ne próbáljon — abba bele törnek a kése.

Molnár. A hős szerepeket játszani fogom; de mit ér, ha a szalon-szerepeket nem kapom hozzá? Hisz mindennap nem adhatunk tragédiát. Aztán a karakter szerepeket mégis csak reám fogják bízni. Az a szegény Feleki nem bírja. A rendezés sem megy tovább így, — jó ember az az Edus, de nincs leleményessége. Jaj, meg a scenirozás — hisz egyetlen tableaut sem tud kihozni, ez a Szigligeti is a javát mindig kitérül. Azt rám kell bízni. Intrikus meg egyáltalán nincs — vagyis mindenki az. Éu is az lesznek. Van jövője a nemzeti színháznak!

Ez a Neszveda k. a. nem volna rossz még „Lohengrin”-ben sem; csak az kár, hogy bármit énekeljen, mindig az „Alvajárót” játsza.

Hanem adott neki Ellinger — akkora három gixert, hogy szegény Elsa rögtön — fölébredt. — A publikum félt, hogy e rendkívüli állapotban valami baja esik, de szerencsére azon módon újra elaludt.

Gyönyörű, és még Wagner által sem ismert effektus az, mikor egy duetben hárman vesznek részt: két énekes, meg egy sugó. A nemzeti színházban hallható volt ily formán:

Lohengrin

Eeeeeel-saa sze -

ret-lek! (A sugóhoz.) Ne ka - ja - bál - jon ugy!

Sugó. Maga ne kiabáljon. Meghallja a közönség!

Elsa

Ooooooh u - raam meg - mentőőöm!

(ppp) Jaj, - - leesik a köpönyegem, fogja meg.

Sugó (Lohengrinnek, pianissimo.) Soha meg ne kérdjed . . .

Lohengrin (con dolore.)

Oda vesd le térded! Hol Sie der Teufel, redens doch lauter!

Sugó. Sie sein eine Grobian! Ik Ihnen werde aufschreiben lassen.

Lohengrin (énekli félhalkan Elsának más vég hiányában.)

Gro - bi - an, Gro - bi - an

(A sugónak) * = pedál, azaz = lábával megrugja a sugót)

Tutti

Ez istenitélet! Ez istenitélet!

(A kaszinóban.) **Kricsi.** Te Bódog, igaz-e, hogy te léssz az intendans?

Bódog. Annyira még nem bódogultam meg.

Figure 2: Music example characterizing a *Lohengrin* performance of the Budapest National Theatre from *Borsszem Jankó* (18 Sept 1870)

LOHENGRIN: Eeeeeelsa, I love you! (to the Prompter): Don't shout so loudly!

PROMPTER: It's you who shouldn't shout! The audience will overhear it!

ELSA: Ooooooh my lord and rescuer! (ppp) Poor me, my cloak has fallen down, take it.

PROMPTER: (to Lohengrin, *pianissimo*) "Never shall you ask me..."

LOHENGRIN: (to the Prompter, *con dolore*) Kneel down there! *Hol Sie der Teufel, redens* [= *reden Sie*] *doch lauter!*

PROMPTER: *Sie sein eine Grobian!* [recte: *Sie sind ein Grobian!*] *Ik* [= *ich*] *Ihnen werde* [*werde Ihnen*] *aufschreiben lassen.*

LOHENGRIN: (he sings semi-softly to Elsa, in the lack of another cue): Grobian! Grobian! (He gives the Prompter a kick with his foot.)

TUTTI: This is an ordeal! This is an ordeal!²⁷

Beyond the shared principles, there were, however, certain conflicts among the members of the “*musikalische Fortschrittspartei*,” and the articles published in *Borsszem Jankó* reacted with sharp eyes and tongue to these conflicts. At least this consequence can be drawn from an anonymous article entitled “Liszt banquet,” published in May 1869. In this account a certain Wöhler (probably Gottfried Wöhler, organist of the Pest Jewish community and reviewer of the daily newspaper *Pester Lloyd*)²⁸ states the following: “Liszt, Wagner und Ábrányi, das ist der Einklang im Dreiklang” (Liszt, Wagner, and Ábrányi: this is the concord in the triad).²⁹ The sentence attributed to Wöhler has ironic overtones: the concord was emphasized at a moment when the earlier harmony was disturbed between Liszt and Wagner by the “augmented triad.” By November 1868 at the latest, it was obvious even for Liszt that his daughter Cosima wanted to divorce Hans von Bülow, and wished to continue her life as Wagner’s companion, with whom she had a liaison from the summer of 1864 (in 1865, she also gave birth to a child, who received the name Isolde Bülow).³⁰ Not surprisingly, the affair caused a severe conflict in the relationship between Liszt and Wagner, and the disagreement became even more intense on the occasion of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1871.³¹

Another writing entitled “Ányi-ényi,” published in *Borsszem Jankó* on 3 March 1872, also attests to the conflicts between the Budapest Wagnerians.³² This article, which is, according to its subtitle, “A great conspiracy against the Wagner Association,” is a dialogue between Ábrányi, the violin virtuoso Ede Reményi (1828-1898), and Reményi’s violinist pupil, Nándor Plotényi (1844-1933). The three musicians decide to establish its own association, which is called “Ányi-ényi Association” after the ending of their names. The fictional dialogue is a reaction to the fact that certain Budapest Wagnerians felt an aversion to Richter’s activity and were jealous of him, particularly when at the beginning of 1872 the idea of a Budapest Wagner Association (following the example of the German *Wagnervereine*) occurred, and on February 25 a gathering was held in the Hungaria Hotel in order to establish the new organisation:

ÁBRÁNYI: Well, my friend, we don’t do anything against this Wagner Association?

REMÉNYI: For Wagner, it cannot be forbidden...³³

PLOTÉNYI: But for Richter, it can be!

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Szinnyei, “Wöhler Gottfried,” in id., *Magyar írók élete*, vol. 14 (1914), 1654.

²⁹ *BJ* 2/71 (May 9, 1869), 188.

³⁰ For the story of the love triangle, see Alan Walker, *Franz Liszt*, vol. 3: *The Final Years, 1861-1886* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997), 106-146.

³¹ For Liszt and the German unification movement, see Dana Gooley, *The Virtuoso Liszt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); furthermore Péter Bozó, “A kaméleon és a nacionalizmusok: Liszt és a német egység” [The Chameleon and the Nationalisms: Liszt and German Unification], in id., *A dalszerző Liszt* [The Song Composer Liszt] (Budapest: Rózsavölgyi, 2017), 87-102.

³² *BJ* 5/218 (3 March 1872), 8.

³³ The text attributed to Reményi paraphrases the title and first verse of a poem by Sándor Petőfi: *A virágnak megtiltani nem lehet...* (For the flower, it cannot be forbidden...).

ÁBRÁNYI: Richter? Richter!... Actually, what kind of right does this man have to exist? I can't remember whether I read his name in the *Gazette* among the appointments when the judges were appointed.³⁴

REMÉNYI: You're right! Maybe, he's not appointed at all, he only usurps the title "Richter."

ÁBRÁNYI: I've got to investigate this! I'll unveil the deceit. Because this Richter is almost a true Scharfrich[t]er!³⁵ He cuts out Reményi with Beethoven, and cuts me out with Wagner. It's a scandal! If at least Beethoven were Beethovényi, and Wagner were Wágnényi, and Hungarian music were rescued due to the fermatas of the composer's names!³⁶

Although the polemics concerning the Wagner Association were mentioned both by Haraszti³⁷ and Varga,³⁸ they failed to explain the hidden motives behind the phenomenon. In my opinion, the debate revealed the (partly professional, partly ideological) controversy that occurred among the Budapest Wagnerians following Richter's appearance and initial successes. The tension is already evident in Ábrányi's music magazine, *Zenészeti Lapok*, at the turn of November and December 1871. It can be regarded as a sign of this that in the November 26 issue, Ábrányi republished Wagner's letter on Hungarian music, written to him nine years earlier, what is more, he even added a polemic commentary, in which he warned of the dangers of Germanization in connection with the Wagner cult:

Since in our country, and particularly in the capital city, every kind of Germanization began to spread, so much so that it resulted in the categorical resistance and reaction of the entire Hungarian press and public opinion, we sadly experience that in the field of the arts, the opponents of Hungarian artistic efforts also began to appear in a more and more audacious, pitiless and provocative way, and they detract and despise everywhere even the most honorable representatives of Hungarian art, and overtly and secretly emphasize that Hungarian artistic efforts should be terminated, because they are useless obstacles, and they only hinder the great German civilization in this field! Sinful agitations of this kind are all the more dangerous and harmful, because their powerful impact and influence can be felt even within the walls of the most prestigious artistic circles and institutions, and through the power of authority and influence they attempt to annihilate, underplay and control every small result, which already belong to Hungarian national culture.³⁹

Although in the writing I quoted above neither Richter's name, nor the National Theatre is mentioned, the reference that "Richard Wagner's name, his working and his omnipotent German direction are always emphasized and propagated by these anti-Hungarian agitations,"⁴⁰ leaves no doubt whom the critics meant.

One week later the reader of *Zenészeti Lapok* could learn that the concertmaster of the National Theatre orchestra, Reményi, resigned from his post, what is more, the magazine published in full length his letter of resignation written to the intendant Bódog Orczy, in which he gave the following reason for his decision:

[...] I have experienced and I am always experiencing that in our theatre national culture is not the main goal, but there are much more visible and invisible agents at work (which do not take into consideration in our artistic conditions) [...] - after these regrettable experiences, however sadly, I am obliged to

³⁴ This is word play: *Richter* means "judge" in German.

³⁵ Continuation of the word play: *Scharfrichter* means "executioner" in German.

³⁶ *BJ* 5/218 (3 March 1872), 8.

³⁷ Haraszti, *Wagner Richard és Magyarország*, 359–367.

³⁸ Varga, *Wagner, Hungary and the Nineteenth Century*, 215–217.

³⁹ *ZszL* 12/9 (26 November 1871), 134.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

leave the institution, whose flourishing for the sake of our national culture was and remains the ideal of my heart.⁴¹

At the end of the year, in the New Year's Eve issue of the magazine, an article evaluating the musical life of the past year appeared, criticizing the intendant Orczy in the following way:

He made the National Theatre a true Germany colony, where reverence of Hungarian art is tolerated and always profaned. Hungarian artists were either expelled or discouraged, and instead of them, Germanizing and Bohemianizing people are sitting now on the throne!⁴²

It was after such antecedents that the idea of a Wagner Association occurred to Richter. On 2 January 1872, he informed the composer that, following German models, he also wanted to establish a *Patronatsverein* in Budapest, in order to support financially the construction of the Bayreuth Festspielhaus. This is attested to by Wagner's letter to Theodor Kafka, the organiser of the Vienna Wagner-Verein (Richter's letter addressed to Wagner does not survive):

Today I received a letter from my young friend Hans Richter in Pest, in which he reports that as soon as the Viennese association will be launched, a subsidiary association will also be established there.⁴³

Thereafter, *Zenészet* criticized Richter directly, mentioning him by name. In an anonymous article published in the January 28 issue, the author denied his intention to offer the entire income of the next Philharmonic Concert for the benefit of the future Bayreuth Festspielhaus.⁴⁴ However, on March 3, reporting on the inaugural meeting of the Wagner Association, the anonymous author of the leading article (probably Ábrányi) wrote that it is not so much the support of the Bayreuth Festspielhaus that he objected to, but the other main goal of the Wagner Association, pertaining to Hungarian musical life:

During the meeting it became clear that they want no less than to establish a so-called Hungarian Wagner Association in Hungary under the composer's banner, for influencing the inland musical movements, and secondly, to achieve the sale of the 300-coins patronage certificates [*Patronatsscheine*] and their draw among the stockholders, in order to support the construction of the Bayreuth Wagner Theatre.⁴⁵

From other contemporary press reports it is clear that the sentences criticizing Richter, attributed to the Ábrányi-Reményi-Plotényi triad in *Zenészet*, were not completely fictitious. From a report published in *Fővárosi Lapok* on the inaugural meeting of the Wagner Association, it turns out that Ábrányi (he was also present) – despite being a Wagnerian – expressed his reservations about the Wagner cult. He also used a deliberately nationalistic rhetoric: “he protested against incorporating foreign elements, until our own music is undeveloped, and suggested that

⁴¹ *ZszL* 12/10 (3 December 1871), 151.

⁴² *ZszL* 12/11 (31 December 1871), 212.

⁴³ “Heute empfangen ich einen Brief meines jungen Freundes, Hans Richter, aus Pest, in welchem mir gemeldet wird, dass dort, ‘sobald der Wiener Verein in das Leben getreten sein werde,’ ein Zweigverein gegründet werden solle.” *Richard Wagner: Sämtliche Briefe*, Bd. 24: *Briefe des Jahres 1872*, ed. Martin Dürer (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2015), 33.

⁴⁴ *ZszL* 13/18 (28 January 1872), 273–277.

⁴⁵ *ZszL* 12/23 (3 March 1872), 355.

the Association should focus particularly on participating in the Bayreuth Wagner Festival,”⁴⁶ furthermore, “he declared that the improvement of native music is a more urgent task.”⁴⁷

It should be noted that Ábrányi also took part in the creation of the statutes of the Budapest Wagner Association and his objections proved to be in a certain measure effective. The reference to the Hungarian music historical mission (“influencing the inland musical movements”) was left out of the document, what is more, it was included that “the Association will be established only for the period until the epochal Bayreuth Music Festival and after that it will dissolve itself.”⁴⁸

The Ábrányi–Richter Opposition in Historical Context

As we have seen, the main argument of *Zenészet* against Richter and intendant Orczy was the charge of Germanization. In order to understand this, we have to know that in the period in question, Budapest was a multi-ethnic city and had more German speakers than Hungarian. It should be noted, however, that significant changes began to take place in the theatrical life and landscape of the capital city in the years following the Austro-Hungarian Compromise (that is, shortly before Richter came to Budapest).

In 1870, the Pest German Theater closed down and German performances in Buda were prohibited by the authorities: the Buda Summer Theater (Budai Nyári Színkör) and Castle Theatre (Várszínház) became Hungarian theatres. Yet, for a long time, it remained a problem for Hungarian theatres to attract a mostly German-speaking theatre-going public. Although a new German theatre opened in 1869 in Pest’s Gapjú utca, this Deutsches Theater in der Wollgasse was to be the last German theatre in the capital and burnt down in 1889. Nevertheless, as late as 1876, there stood a German theatre in the same place where now the Hungarian State Opera House is to be found.⁴⁹ Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that the cult of the emphatically German Wagner was a tender spot. This is even less surprising because the European status quo changed dramatically following the 1870/1871 Franco-Prussian War: the unified German state came into existence, what is more, it became a great power by inflicting a humiliating defeat on France.

In this historical context, it is particularly interesting that *Borsszem Jankó* made fun of Wagner’s fondness for German mythology exactly on the day following the French declaration of war against Germany. On 17 July 1870, a fictional scholarly paper entitled “On the Epopée” appeared in the magazine, which was allegedly held on the general meeting of the Kisfaludy Society (a literary society) by a certain “Deák F. (not [F]erenc but [F]arkas).” According to the article, “the modern epopée began with the Nibelungs of the Germans; the author of this epic poem is Richard Wagner, who used as source the work of Károly Szász, a respectable member of our Society.”⁵⁰ Concerning the “authorship,” it should be noted that Farkas Deák (1832–1888) was not only councillor at the Ministry of Justice and a prolific journalist, but also a scholar: he was a corresponding member from 1876, an ordinary member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences from 1885, and played a significant role in the foundation of the Hungarian Historical Society (Magyar Történelmi Társulat).⁵¹ It is all the more amusing that the article published in *Borsszem*

⁴⁶ FL 9/46 (27 February 1872), 199.

⁴⁷ FL 9/47 (28 February 1872), 203.

⁴⁸ ZszL 12/24 (10 March 1872), 376.

⁴⁹ For changes in the nineteenth-century Budapest theatrical landscape, see Péter Bozó, “Theatrical Landscape: Intersections between the Reception of Wagner and Offenbach in Nineteenth-Century Budapest,” *Studia Musicologica* 58, no. 3–4 (December 2017): 329–339.

⁵⁰ BJ 3/133 (17 July 1870), 301.

⁵¹ Szinnyei, “Deák Farkas,” in *Magyar írók*, vol. 2 (1893), 667–671.

Jankó attributes to him a text, in which the order of historical antecedents and consequences is deliberately reversed. The Middle High German *Nibelungenlied* is of course not a modern but a Medieval epic poem, and, needless to say, it is not Wagner's creation. The article cannot be taken seriously, even less because the *Nibelungenlied* was not the only source, not even the main source for Wagner's own Nibelung tetralogy: for him, Old Icelandic literary works, such as the *Völsunga Saga*, the Poetic Edda, and the Prose Edda were much more important.⁵² The other comically false claim concerns Károly Szász (1829–1905), who is mentioned as the source of the composer. He is of course not the author of the *Nibelungenlied*, but instead its translator. It was he who prepared the Hungarian translation of the complete Middle High German epic poem, which was published two years before that the article in question appeared in *Borsszem Jankó*.⁵³

Wagner versus Offenbach

Wagner was regarded in Hungary as a par excellence German composer already well before the Franco-Prussian War. It is of particular interest that his name was frequently mentioned together with that of Offenbach, and the two musicians were often measured against one other in the nineteenth-century Budapest press.⁵⁴ Both their problematic relationship⁵⁵ and Wagner's un concealed antisemitism might have contributed to this cliché of the reception. The Wagner–Offenbach opposition is even less surprising, because Wagner's stage works and Offenbach's Europe-wide popular operettas appeared in Budapest approximately at the same time.⁵⁶ What is more, within two years both Offenbach's company and Wagner gave guest performances at the National Theatre (the former in July 1861, the latter in July 1863).

The Wagner–Offenbach opposition also appears in *Borsszem Jankó*. In December 1869, an anonymous article was published in the magazine under the title “Urváry as Bluebeard,”⁵⁷ which is obviously a reference to Offenbach's opéra-bouffe *Barbe-bleue* (first perf. 1866), already known in Budapest at that time. The Hungarian premiere of *Barbe-bleue* (entitled *Kékszakáll*) took place on 26 December 1867 in Košice/Kassa/Kaschau, and shortly after, in January 1868 it was also premiered at the Pester Stadttheater (in German, as *Blaubart*).⁵⁸

The target of the parody is Lajos Urváry (1841–1890), a journalist, who from 1869 was editor of the daily newspaper *Századunk*, then between 1869 and 1887 that of another daily newspaper, *Pesti Napló*. The timeliness of the article is due to the fact that in the year of its appearance Urváry became a deputy of the Hungarian parliament.⁵⁹ The journalist, who is mentioned by the author

⁵² For the literary sources of Wagner's *Ring*, see Stanley R. Hauer, “Wagner and the *Völospá*,” *19th-Century Music* 15 no. 1 (Summer 1991): 52–63.

⁵³ *A Nibelung-ének. Ó-német hősköltemény*, trans. Károly Szász (Pest: Ráth, 1868; reprint Máriabesnyő–Gödöllő: Attraktor, 2008).

⁵⁴ For a more detailed survey on Wagner versus Offenbach in the nineteenth-century Budapest press, see Bozó, “Theatrical Landscape.”

⁵⁵ For the relationship between Wagner and Offenbach, see Peter Ackermann, “Eine Kapitulation. Zum Verhältnis Offenbach–Wagner,” in *Jacques Offenbach. Komponist und Weltbürger*, ed. Winfried Kirsch–Ronny Dietrich (Mainz: Schott's Söhne, 1985), 135–148.

⁵⁶ The first known performance of an Offenbach operetta in Budapest took place on 24 May 1859 at the Buda Summer Theatre (Budai Nyári Színkör) during a guest performance of Karl Treumann from the Viennese Carl-Theater. Wagner's first stage work played in Budapest was *Tannhäuser*, whose German-language premiere took place on 6 March 1862 at the Pest German Theatre.

⁵⁷ *BJ* 2/103 (19 December 1869), 502.

⁵⁸ *Blätter für Musik, Theater und Kunst* 14/4 (10 January 1868), 15.

⁵⁹ Szinnyei, “Urváry Lajos,” in id., *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, vol. 14, 685–686.

as “Luigi” (which is the Italian equivalent of the Hungarian Lajos), appears in the article at the deathbed of his fifth wife. It should be noted that his biography mentions only one spouse, the actress Laura Helvey (1852–1931). They only married each other, however, in 1885,⁶⁰ that is, two decades after the article in question appeared in *Borsszem Jankó*. Thus, it can be assumed that the article either referred to another (perhaps extramarital) relationship of his, or it is simply an attempt to discredit Urváry by mentioning fictitious love affairs. The dying woman, mentioned in the title of the article, is called “Századunkhild,” which is an interesting combination of the title of Urváry’s newspaper (*Századunk*) and the name of Wagner’s Brünnhilde. In her delirium, she sings a song whose text is quite reminiscent to that of the mermaids’ song from *Das Rheingold*: “Weyala, weyala, wagala, weya! Wagala, weyala, weyala, wey!” According to the article, Urváry reacts in the following way: “I don’t understand, said Luigi, the Bluebeard, fingering his blond sideboards. Be an ordinary R[hinemaiden] if I understand this. For this is Wagner, and I am from Offenbach.”⁶¹

The allusion to *Das Rheingold* (rather an allusion than an exact quotation) is made reference to in a magazine issue published in 1869, regarding the fact that Wagner’s work was premiered in Budapest only two decades later: the German-language premiere of the piece (and that of the complete tetralogy) took place at the Gyapjú Street German Theatre, when Angelo Neumann’s company gave a guest performance there in May 1883; the Hungarian premiere was conducted by Gustav Mahler in the Opera House on 26 January 1889. Even its world premiere took place on 22 September 1869 at the Munich Königliches Hof- und Nationaltheater, that is, only some months before the article in question appeared in *Borsszem Jankó*. Of course, the libretto was already available earlier, since Wagner published his text in 1853 in Zürich, even if this version slightly differed from the definitive one;⁶² new prints appeared in 1863 and 1869, furthermore, the printed vocal score of the piece also became available in 1861.⁶³ In my opinion, the allusion to Wagner’s work premiered in Munich only some months before, and the mention of the Offenbach(ian) origin can be regarded as deliberate references to Urváry’s German birth, whose grandfather named Herrenröther migrated to Hungary from Bavaria, according to his biographer.⁶⁴ It is also worth mentioning, concerning the article in question, that in 1864 a German romantic opera by Offenbach was performed in Vienna under the title *Die Rheinnixen* (The Rhine Nixies).

The Failure of *Rienzi*

Turning back to Richter’s activity, in my opinion, the resentment of Ábrányi and other Hungarian Wagnerians might have played a significant role in his early departure from Budapest. Another event, namely the failure of *Rienzi* at the National Theatre, might also have contributed to his decision. The premiere of Wagner’s historical grand opera was conducted by Richter, but it had only four performances – this is attested to not only by the contemporary almanacs of the National Theatre, but also by the extant performance material of the piece, preserved now at the

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ *BJ* 2/103 (19 December 1869), 502.

⁶² Among others, in this version *Götterdämmerung* still bears the title *Siegfrieds Tod*.

⁶³ For a detailed description of the printed editions of *Das Rheingold* published between 1853 and 1869, see John Deathridge, Martin Geck, and Egon Voss, *Wagner Werk-Verzeichnis (WWV). Verzeichnis der musikalischen Werke Richard Wagners und ihrer Quellen* (Mainz: Schott, 1986), 352–359.

⁶⁴ Szinnyei, *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, vol. 14, 685.

Music Department of the Budapest Széchényi National Library.⁶⁵ Wagner's work (and Richter's choice) was heavily criticized in a satirical review published in *Borsszem Jankó*, which characterised the work in the following way:

It is a crunching and terrible trumpeting, a bombastic drumming, an inflated Meyerbeer, a fat Berlioz, an elephant embryo – with lion's claws, an attenuated Bellini. It is like Hercules strangling a worm in its cradle instead of a snake; a Hindu magician filtering sweets and measuring out lukewarm sugar water. Sometimes it is like an ululating nightingale, sometimes like a yearning hippopotamus. It is doubtful whether Zubovics can sing like Ellinger; but it is certain that Ellinger cannot ride a horse like Zubovics.⁶⁶

Fedor Zubovics (1848–1920) was a Hussar captain and a famous rider.⁶⁷ The reference to him is in all likelihood a not-too-flattering allusion to the acting of the tenor József Ellinger (1820–1821), who sung the title role in the Budapest premiere of the piece. (According to Wagner's scenic instruction, Rienzi and the Roman senators have to appear on horseback in Act 3). The mention of the “inflated Meyerbeer” is correct, so far as Wagner's youthful work was written at the end of the 1830s in the hope of a Paris premiere, and emulates the genre of French historical grand opéra. In its Budapest failure it might have played a significant role that compared with *Lohengrin*, *Tannhäuser*, and *Der fliegende Holländer*, pieces already known also in Budapest at that time, it might have seemed to be bombastic, and a pale imitation.

Although the sequence of the Budapest Wagner premieres was quite unfortunate, Richter cannot be condemned because of programming this piece. It is a question as to what kind of Wagner opera could be staged at that time: the full score of *Götterdämmerung* was only finished in November 1874, and the composer insisted on staging the complete tetralogy. (It should be noted that Richter left Munich in 1869 because he did not want to assist in the separate first performance of *Das Rheingold*, whose staging he considered as inadequate as Wagner.) With its emphatically German historical milieu, *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg* was not ideally suited for the Budapest audience – it is characteristic that one decade later the Hungarian premiere of the piece (8 September 1883) was a great failure, it had only five performances. I assume that in 1874 neither the opera company nor the Budapest audience were ready for the premiere of *Tristan und Isolde* (it was premiered only three decades later, on 28 November 1901, with great success with Karel Burian and Italia Vasquez-Molina in the title roles).

All in all it can be argued that the Editorial Board of *Borsszem Jankó* followed Richter's Budapest activity and the development of the Hungarian Wagner cult with attention. In its funny and ironic style, the magazine reacted sensitively not only to the local Wagner premieres, but also to the personal conflicts, as well as the political and cultural contexts affecting the composer's reception in Hungary.

Péter Bozó

Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute for Musicology

Táncsics M. u. 7

H-1014 Budapest, Hungary

bozo.peter@btk.mta.hu

⁶⁵ The following sources survive: a manuscript promptbook (shelf mark: MM 13.896); the manuscript performing full score with printed additions (ZBK 280/a); several printed piano vocal scores (ZBK 280/b); as well as the manuscript orchestral parts with some printed additions and with numerous handwritten entries by the musicians (ZBK 280/c).

⁶⁶ *BJ* 7/361 (29 November 1874), 7.

⁶⁷ *A Pallas nagy lexikona*, vol. 16, ed. Lajos Gerő (Budapest: Pallas, 1897), 1184.