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ABSTRACT

This dissertation focuses on string chamber music performances in New York City during the years 1842 to 1852. George Frederick Bristow, an American composer, wrote string chamber works in 1845 and 1849. The study discusses the broader context of chamber music during the years surrounding Bristow’s composition of his string chamber works.

From a consultation of primary sources, key performances are documented and assessed, including a discussion of the sacralization of string chamber genres in music journal performance reviews. The paper will further discuss the influence of mid-century German immigration upon repertoire selection and canon formation. More common in the earlier years of this study, string chamber music frequently appeared on “miscellaneous” performances, featuring a variety of instrumentation and genres, wherein string chamber works would often serve in a secondary role. As a contrast, early efforts to establish concerts series in New York consisting primarily of string chamber music will be presented and discussed.

The final chapter will discuss much of George Frederick Bristow’s (1825-1898) musical activity during this period. As a violinist, he appeared in public performances of string chamber music, as well as in the Philharmonic Society of New York. Bristow was also a member of the Euterpean Society, a primarily amateur social-musical group, and his compositional output of string chamber works will be discussed in the context of Bristow’s broader musical experience at the time. Finally, this project produces the first edition of Bristow’s Quartetto, Op. 1 (ca. 1849), and the work’s first appearance in a score format, previously existing only as manuscript parts.
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Introduction

George Frederick Bristow (1825-1898) was an American composer, born in Brooklyn, who spent his career in New York City, and wrote at least five string chamber works during the 1840s. As a violinist in the New York Philharmonic Society from its second season (1843-1844), as well as a performer of string chamber music, Bristow was very much at the forefront of the New York’s then-emerging classical music scene. Having never been published, Bristow’s string chamber works survive in manuscript form: Duo No. 2 in G Minor for violin and viola (1845), Duo No. 3 in G Major for violin and viola (1845), Quartetto, Op. 1 in F Major (ca. 1849)¹, Quartetto, Op. 2 in G Minor (1849), and Violin Sonata in G Major, Op. 12 (ca. 1849).² I suspect that the works would have been played or performed in a private setting, but I have not been able to identify evidence of a public performance during his time. Since then, Bristow’s string chamber works have remained concealed from hearing and view, and have been written about only occasionally.

Yet, Bristow’s string chamber works are of historical importance for several reasons. According to Roger Paul Phelps, Bristow and Daniel Schlesinger (1799-1839) were the only composers of chamber music active in New York during the first half of the nineteenth century (so far as was known at the time of publication, 1951).³ But of these two, Bristow was the only

---


² All manuscripts held at the New York Public Library: Library for the Performing Arts, Music Division. Call Numbers: Duo No. 2 (JPB 82-48 no. 26); Duo No. 3 (JPB 82-48 no. 27); Quartetto, op. 1 (JPB 82-48 no. 88); Quartetto, op. 2 (JPB 82-48 no. 89); Violin Sonata, op. 12 (JPB 82-48 no. 105). Duo No. 1 appears to not have survived.

³ Roger Paul Phelps, “The History and Practice of Chamber Music in the United States from Earliest Times up to 1875” (PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1951), 345.
American-born composer (Schlesinger was German, and arrived in New York in 1836⁴). Delmer Rogers states, of Bristow’s early period: “Among Bristow’s instrumental works, the most important in quality as well as quantity were those for chamber combinations, yet this fact is remarkable when one considers that public performances of chamber literature hardly existed in the United States.”⁵ Rogers, commenting on Bristow’s output, also states: “The chamber works, written during his early years, are especially unique and creditable representatives of a medium rarely explored by American composers in the 19th century.”⁶ Of Bristow’s duos, David Bynog writes: “The first important [American] compositions for viola from this period [mid-nineteenth century] are George Frederick Bristow’s duos for violin and viola. […] Despite Bristow’s importance as an American composer, the historical value of these duos, and the availability of the manuscripts, neither a published edition nor a recording of these duos has been produced.”⁷ The same is also true of other Bristow’s other string chamber music, as we shall see. Bristow is significant for being a composer of American birth writing string chamber music, especially when public performances of such works were only in the beginning stages.

**Research Objectives, Definitions, and Methods**

This dissertation aims to explore the social, musical, and cultural context for the development of European chamber music performance in New York City during the mid-nineteenth century, in order to discover how the 1840s string chamber works of Bristow fit within this context. In my

---

⁵ Delmer D. Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City as Reflected in the Career of George Frederick Bristow,” (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1967), 143.
view, an explanation of chamber music performance during this period is impossible without
relating it to outside historical events, such as New York’s growth and increased interaction with
Europe: and, furthermore to cultural processes such as the sacralization and canonization of
music, which are defined below and which will be a recurring theme throughout the study.

The focus on Bristow is chosen because his historical significance seems greater than the
level of scholarly attention that his string chamber music has received. As a violinist in the New
York Philharmonic Society, Bristow worked with the best string players that New York offered
at the time. Furthermore, he was arguably one of the most significant American composers of
“classical” music of his generation, producing, in addition to his chamber music, numerous
choral, orchestral, piano, and organ works, as well as many songs for voice and piano. Bristow
is perhaps best known for his Rip Van Winkle (1855), the first opera on an American subject by
an American composer. However, Bristow’s compositions are largely overlooked today,
erspecially his string chamber music. These historically significant string chamber works, never
having been published, have not received a fair chance to be performed and evaluated by string
musicians.

Bristow’s string chamber works have been much neglected in the scholarly literature. Limited
coverage of Bristow’s string chamber works exists in the scholarship of Roger Paul Phelps
(1951), Delmer D. Rogers (1967), and James Alfred Starr (1978). Rogers’s focus is on Bristow’s
entire career, while Phelps and Starr touch lightly on Bristow within a larger focus on string
music by numerous American composers. The works of Vera Brodsky Lawrence (1988, 1995)
are by far the most informative studies of musical life in New York during this period. Yet, while
Lawrence provides much useful coverage of the topic, her focus is wide, encompassing nearly all

8 See “Works” in Delmer D. Rogers, "Bristow, George Frederick," in Grove Music Online,
musical activity in New York, in seemingly countless genres, and string chamber music makes up only a very small percentage of the content. Both Bristow and the city’s chamber music activity deserve a greater degree of attention. The later subject is largely ignored by recent literature on American classical music. Joseph Horowitz’s *Classical Music in America: A History* (2007) makes barely any mention of string chamber music. The “New York” article in the new second edition of *The Grove Dictionary of American Music* devotes one and a half sentences to the subject during the scope of this dissertation. As a further example, an important series of three chamber music concerts in December 1849, January 1850, and April 1850, receive a combined total of one page of coverage in Lawrence’s 1988 and 1995 books, and much of the information is inaccurate. A much more thorough concentration on New York’s early string chamber music performances is justified. Additionally, the performance history is worthy of a greater depth of coverage, particularly through study of the repertoire performed, as well as by more quotation and discussion of performance reviews than has ever been attempted. The latter will be achieved through extensive use of period newspapers and music journals, in which string chamber concerts were often advertised and reviewed.

Before going any further, it is essential that the term “string chamber music,” as used in this study, is properly defined and understood. The term “chamber music” originally described music

---


12 The December 1849 Saroni concert is covered on approximately one half of page 609 (*Resonances*, 1988), and the January and April 1850 Saroni performances are covered about one half of page 109 (*Reverberations*, 1995).

13 See Chapter III of this paper.
to be played for enjoyment in the home, hence “chamber.” By modern definition, the genre is perhaps best exemplified by the string quartet, piano trio, and sonata for violin and piano. In these, there is no singularly principal instrument, but rather a shared, interactive network of collaborating roles, in which there is one player per musical part. Christina Bashford defines the string quartet as it evolved in the eighteenth century as: “an intimate and tightly constructed dialogue among equals, at once subtle and serious, challenging to play, and with direct appeal to the earnest enthusiast. ‘Four rational people conversing’ was how Goethe would later see it.”

For a new listener to classical music, the string quartet is often perceived as one of the less accessible genres, initially. However, the enjoyment of such music can potentially grow with increasing listening experience and greater understanding of theoretical elements, such as formal structure. This did in fact happen in the nineteenth century, especially through program notes. Bashford, writing about the emergence of public chamber music concerts in the nineteenth century, explains: “A diet of string quartets, even when mixed with piano trios and so on, was for many listeners something of an acquired taste, and palates almost always benefitted from a little education. This was particularly the case for initiates to chamber music, but it was also true for those who were familiar with some quartets from their own domestic music-making, given that perceptions gained from playing, as opposed to listening, were likely to differ; that new works were beyond many amateurs’ performance capabilities anyhow; and that appreciation could always be deepened.”

It can be argued that string chamber music, especially the string quartet, rests at the peak of the hierarchy of musical genres, sitting even higher than the symphony. The quartet, like the symphony, favors the sonata principle and the close working out of thematic material, within

---

four-movement schemas. For the nineteenth-century composer, the string quartet could be a remarkably challenging genre in which to write. It provides comparatively few options in the way of creative resources; there are merely four string instruments with relatively subtle differences in timbre, in contrast to the extensive orchestral palette available in symphonic writing. Also, as a four-voice ensemble, it is subject to many of the same concerns as four-part chorale writing, such as voice doubling rules. But it is within this limited context that Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven wrote many of their most highly acclaimed works. The genre has served as the medium through which many composers, aspiring to greatness, have chosen for their most expressive music. The emotional intensity possible in this genre is excellently displayed in Beethoven’s late quartets, particularly the fifth movement (“Cavatina. Adagio molto espressivo”) of the Quartet in B-flat Major, Op. 130, and the third movement of the Quartet in A Minor, Op. 132. Further, the string quartet was the ensemble for which Beethoven composed the *Grosse Fuge*, Op. 133, arguably his most progressive and least-accessible work, and greatest challenge to the existing quartet tradition.

The scope of this dissertation spans the decade of 1842 to 1852. As this study aims to examine the relationship of Bristow’s string chamber works to the events of their historical context, the scope includes a margin of three years before and after the composition of Bristow’s string chamber works (1845 and 1849). Further, 1842 serves well as a beginning point, as it was the year in which the New York Philharmonic Society was founded, an ensemble that would greatly influence Bristow’s career. Additionally, 1852 is a convenient endpoint, as it allows study of several important developments in string quartet concert life that occurred between 1849 and 1852.
The years in question – 1842 to 1852 – were a period of enormous change in New York. The city’s ascendance to becoming America’s principal port on the Atlantic coast, in combination with vast increases in immigration, led to unprecedented population growth. The immigrants came mostly from Ireland and the German states, and many of those from the latter region would exert significant influence on America’s developing musical culture. Accounts of the country’s musical growth and increased connection to Europe were documented at the time. In 1847, a New York periodical said:

In the United States, music has made greater advances within the last ten years than during the previous sixty of our existence as a country, and relatively, almost incredibly greater advances here than in Europe. [...] New-York, daily becoming more cosmopolitan in its character, and what is worthy of remark, more generally acknowledged as the metropolis of art in America, has been the chief laborer in the field of music, through New-Orleans, Boston and Philadelphia have themselves done much, and have shown themselves not slow in profiting by the labors and good fortunes of her whom they can no longer hope to rival. The Philharmonic Society, the American Musical Institute, the brilliant succession of vocal and instrumental artists who have sought and won from the critics and the public of this city that approval which was to be their passport to favor throughout the country, and finally the successful, and we hope, permanent establishment of an Italian Opera, have given an impulse to the higher sort of music, the effects of which are plainly visible, both in the improved taste of our public, and in the unwearying constancy with which they attend the performances of great works or distinguished artists.16

The quote demonstrates New York’s emergence as the musical center of the United States, surpassing other American cities. The approval of New York critics and audiences is considered by the writer to be the “passport to favor throughout the country.” The strengthened connection to Europe is indicated in several ways. The quote mentions the city’s growing “cosmopolitan” character, as well as the recent founding of Italian opera and a philharmonic society.

Among the many factors influencing change in the city’s musical culture were sacralization and canonization - two consistent and interrelated tendencies throughout this period. In the sacralization of musical culture, an emerging perceived superiority became associated with

certain genres of music, “lifting” them above other types. In practice, this had the effect of creating a growing rift between the music of the social and cultural elite, and the audiences of more popular forms. Sacralization elevated genres of Austro-German music such as the symphony and, most notably for this investigation, the string quartet, which were the genres the more affluent members of society were associated with.

T. C. W. Blanning has written about the roots of cultural sacralization in Europe. Eighteenth-century developments undermined the three purposes of culture in the old regime: “to represent the power of the sovereign, to assist the Church in saving souls, and to provide recreation for the élites.” Amidst the decline of monarchs and the church as patrons of the arts, a “crisis of modernization,” Blanning writes that: “culture emerged as an autonomous force. It was not only liberated by the decline or collapse of its old political, religious, or social masters, it was strengthened by the need of the growing intelligentsia to find a secular substitute for—or supplement to—revealed religion.” He continues:

[…] secularization, in which revealed religion and the churches lost their dominant position, was accompanied by sacralization, in which arts rose above its old handmaiden status to full autonomy and in the process acquired a new sense of self-importance and seriousness. Visual evidence can be found in the scores of museums which sprang up across Europe, built to resemble temples or churches. […] Whatever the original function of the building [museum], the sacral nature of a pilgrimage to the galleries was heightened by leading the visitor to the exhibits via carefully arranged steps, portico, hall, staircase, landing, and ante-chamber—in just the same way that subjects had once approached the throne room. But now it was not the sovereign but Art which was the object to be venerated.

Lawrence Levine, in his study of how classical music came to have this special status in the United States, writes: “The process of sacralization endowed the music it focused upon with the unique aesthetic and spiritual properties that rendered it inviolate, exclusive, and eternal. This

---

was not the mere ephemera of the world of entertainment but something lasting, something permanent.”

Additionally, Levine explains: “The urge to deprecate popular genres was an important element in the process of sacralization. If symphonic music was [...] divine, then it followed that other genres must occupy a lesser region.” Further, he adds: “One important result of sacralization was to call into question the traditional practice of mixing musical genres and presenting audiences with an eclectic feast.”

According to Levine, “The process of sacralization reinforced the all too prevalent notion that for the source of divine inspiration and artistic creation one had to look not only upward but eastward toward Europe.”

This eastward look toward Europe led to the works of particular composers, predominantly Austro-German, being canonized in the United States. Grove defines “canon” as: “A term used to describe a list of composers or works assigned value and greatness by consensus. The derivation is ecclesiastical, referring to those biblical books and patristic writings deemed worthy of preservation in that they express the fundamental truths of Christianity. Some connotative values associated with this derivation, notably claims for ethical qualities and a universal status, occasionally cling to the term in its aesthetic applications.”

The earliest canonized works were those of Austro-German origin: Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. As an example, Beethoven’s String Quartet in F Major, Op. 18, No. 1, for most of the nineteenth century and up to today, has held a fairly secure membership in the canon of string quartet repertoire, and most of his early and middle quartets were performed regularly throughout this time.

The process of canonization not only deemed certain works by particular composers to be “greater” than works by other

---

23 Levine, *Highbrow Lowbrow*, 140.
composers, but it created almost an immortality for them, encouraging their continued performance as the years progressed.

In New York press reviews of string chamber music performances during 1842-52, the trends of sacralization and canonization will be evident. Both the sacralization of the string quartet, and the canonization of composers (usually Austro-German), were encouraged and likely accelerated by journalists who were covering the musical scene. Significant examples of both will be highlighted as the chapters proceed.

As far as the contextual research is concerned, my primary method of data collection has been the scanning of roughly twenty periodicals and newspapers from the years 1842 through 1852 for concert advertisements and reviews, which have been immensely valuable sources of information, much of which has never yet been presented. The reviews have limitations, certainly; they are the opinion of only one person out of many at the performances. However, they remain the only surviving accounts of those events, and further, they provide excellent indications at least of how New Yorkers during this period thought about the music they were hearing. When quoting from these primary sources, the general approach has been to preserve the spelling and punctuation of the original, which often results in idiosyncratic grammar. Historical data and biographical information from comparatively recent secondary literature will be incorporated to provide further insight about the material.

Chapter I of this dissertation will discuss the major social and economic developments in New York City that had a significant impact upon its musical culture. The city’s emergence as the country’s principal Atlantic port coincided with the creation of speedier transatlantic travel. As a result, skilled European musicians came to the United States; some of whom would stay temporarily to tour, while many others permanently settled. Additionally, the chapter will
describe the various factors leading to massive German immigration to New York from the 1840s, a phase which would exert enormous influence over the city’s musical culture.

Chapter II, which covers 1842 through November 1849, will present instances of string chamber music performances within concerts of European touring artists, New York’s resident musical societies, and concerts of the city’s resident artists. Discussion will be given on ticket prices for performances, and what they indicate about the audiences. Further, the chapter will examine the role of string chamber music pieces within the concerts on which they were performed. Finally, it will discuss the emergence of a very early string quartet subscription series.

Chapter III will discuss two series of concerts (December 1849 through April 1851), more heavily focused on string chamber works. The first was organized by a journal publisher, Hermann S. Saroni, and the latter by a German musician, Theodor Eisfeld.25 It will further present “miscellaneous” concerts including string chamber music from December 1849 through the end of 1852.

Chapter IV will discuss the continuation of the Eisfeld series, and its coexistence with soirées by the singer Emma Gillingham Bostwick. Bostwick’s concerts included performance of string chamber music, often with George Frederick Bristow among the performers. The events of this chapter took place from November 1851 to February 1852.

Chapter V will present the continuation of the Eisfeld soirées through the end of 1852, and present commentary about the effect of the city’s changing demography on the success of Eisfeld’s performances. In the analysis of the many concert reviews throughout Chapters II

25 Eisfeld is often referred to with the first name “Theodore.”
through V, the trends of canonization and sacralization will appear extensively as subjects of discussion.

Chapter VI will present George Frederick Bristow’s background and development; his activity as an orchestra, solo, and chamber music performer; the critical reception of his early symphonic compositions; and Bristow’s advocacy for increased performances of American works by the New York Philharmonic Society. Further, it will provide an overview of his output of string chamber works, and examine his Quartetto, Op. 1 (1849) in relation to the historical context of the time. Additionally, I will present the first modern edition of Bristow’s Quartetto, Op. 1 in F Major (1849), as well as a detailed discussion of the work. The manuscript of this work survives only as instrumental parts, not including a score, held at the New York Library for the Performing Arts. My edition, which appears as the Appendix, will create the only score of the quartet, a crucially important resource for a critical assessment of the work.
Chapter I: Key Developments in New York City’s Culture Before 1850

Growth of New York City and Resident Musical Culture

New York was experiencing a boom in population growth during the first half of the nineteenth century. As explained by Burrows and Wallace:

Manhattan had contained roughly 124,000 residents in 1820, 167,000 in 1825, and 200,000 in 1830. Fed by a tripling in the rate of immigration, by 1835 the population exceeded 270,000, and with the annual overseas influx doubling again, Manhattan was headed toward an 1840 total of 313,000. During the 1830s New York was the fastest-growing city in the United States, and at some point during the decade it surpassed Mexico City in population, becoming the largest city in the New World.¹

In a description of New York during the founding year of its Philharmonic Society, Howard Shanet compares New York’s population with that of other major world cities, stating: “By the standards of 1842, New York, with its population of about 350,000 was not ‘a little river and harbor town,’ but one of the most populous communities of the world.” London, Paris, and St. Petersburg were larger, with populations of two million, one million, and five hundred thousand, respectively. Shanet states that New York was of “about the same size” as Vienna, Moscow, Naples, and Berlin. Manchester, Amsterdam, Madrid, Dublin, Rome, and Venice, were all smaller.²

Advances in transportation infrastructure are due sizable credit for such population growth, particularly the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825. According to Shanet: “The canal made New York the gateway from the Atlantic to the interior of the country […].”³ He adds that the decade from 1830-1840, “was the period when […] the steamboat, exploiting the growing network of

³ Shanet, Philharmonic, 14.
Navigable rivers and canals, could convert a little frontier fort like Chicago in a matter of six or seven years into a flourishing town with eight steamers joining it to Buffalo—and thereby to New York.”⁴ He expands further: “as railroad lines were built to supplement the older means of communication, New York inevitably became the chief rail terminal of the East Coast as well.”⁵ New York would eventually become, in Burrows and Wallace’s words, “the principal western terminus of transatlantic traffic […].”⁶

Let us review this series of events. The opening of the Erie Canal created a navigable waterway connecting New York City to the Great Lakes and the interior of the United States. This advantage, unique to New York among east coast cities, eventually established New York as the country’s primary Atlantic port. Hence, New York would be the primary arrival point of incoming vessels, a fact that would partially account for the increases in immigration and population growth mentioned by Burrows and Wallace.

Additionally, the emergence of steamships, which provided speedier transatlantic travel, further connected New York to Europe. Burrows and Wallace describe the arrival of two steamships from Cork and Bristol on April 23, 1838, stating of the event: “it was now doubly clear that New York had established a maritime steam link to Europe.”⁷ The authors add: “Over the next twenty years, a growing fleet of transatlantic steamers would nourish the city’s economic revival…”⁸ Because of New York’s status as the country’s principal east coast port, in combination with shorter transatlantic travel time by steamship, the city’s link to Europe was stronger than ever.

⁴ Shanet, Philharmonic, 14.
⁵ Shanet, Philharmonic, 14.
⁶ Burrows and Wallace, Gotham, 736.
⁷ Burrows and Wallace, Gotham, 649.
⁸ Burrows and Wallace, Gotham, 649.
Because of these developments, two trends would emerge which would greatly affect musical activity in New York. First, the introduction of quicker transatlantic travel would open up New York as a marketplace for European musicians. Touring solo artists and orchestras from the old continent were now able to make New York part of their concert circuit, and it would expose the city’s audiences to performances of European music which might otherwise not have been available. Second, the improved transportation infrastructure would pave the way for masses of German immigrants who, sparked by events in their homelands, entered the United States in record numbers, beginning in the late 1840s. Among the German immigrants would be many musicians and audiences, accustomed to playing and hearing Austro-German string chamber music. They would continue to do so in New York, introducing much of such music to American audiences.

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to discuss New York’s existing musical activity. Although the city, during this period, underwent a growth phase in the introduction of Austro-German art music in the public sphere, it is certainly not true to say that New Yorkers lacked a classical musical culture before this. On the contrary, many of New York’s residents actively participated in domestic music-making as a social activity, in large degree centered around the piano. In homes during the earlier part of the century, Burrows and Wallace state, “every room accessible to outsiders was a stage for displaying the family’s wealth and sophistication. The most refined houses boasted pianofortes, which cost as much as six hundred dollars (more than a year’s wages for a carpenter or cabinetmaker) and were the basis for fashionable ‘at home’ musical performances.”9 Charlotte Everman and James Parakilas write that: “the story of the piano in the middle of the nineteenth century is a continuation of its story during the previous

---

9 Burrows and Wallace, Gotham, 464.
era: the part of society able to afford a piano and learn to play it kept expanding, from the most privileged class to the middle class and, increasingly, to the working class. Industrial-scale production of pianos increased the social role of the piano by enlarging the numbers and classes of people with access to the instrument.”

A growing market for pianos emerged in New York and other cities. As described by Irving Sablosky: “In 1823, Jonas Chickering of that city [Boston] moved beyond the experimental state of piano-making to serious production. He developed a way of constructing pianos with a full cast iron frame which enabled his instruments to withstand the rough rail, river, and canal trip into the American hinterland; by 1837, when William Knabe began manufacturing pianos in Baltimore, Chickering was exporting to Europe.”

Howard Shanet added: “By the 1840s this home market had encouraged the growth in New York of a prosperous piano-manufacturing industry—the firms of Nunns, and Dubois and Stodart, and Raven, among others—and the bringing in of additional pianos made by Chickering of Boston, Boardman and Gray of Albany, and Knabe of Baltimore”. In 1834, the American Musical Journal made the following comments on New York’s musical life: “Music is cultivated privately to a great extent. Almost all parents consider it a necessary accomplishment for their children. Every house of respectability has its piano, guitar, or harp; and music is our chief source of amusement at our social meetings. The amateurs of violin, flute, and other instruments are numerous, and many of them have attained considerable proficiency.”

---

10 Charlotte N. Eyerman and James Parakilas, “1820s to 1870s: The Piano Calls the Tune,” in Piano Roles: Three Hundred Years of Life with the Piano, ed. James Parakilas (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 182.
12 Shanet, Philharmonic, 39.
Musical life in New York was often described by contemporaries as lacking in cultivation. In 1845, *The Harbinger* said, “Our concerts are attended more from fashion, it may be, than from real love. Our daughters are taught the piano as an accomplishment, to make them ‘ladies,’ rather than to inspire their womanhood with that Music which has been termed ‘the feminine principle in the Universe.’”\(^{14}\) It also exclaimed, “Musical as yet we are not, in the true sense. We have no composers; no great performances in our churches; no well-endowed and thorough academies to train the artist, or to educate the public taste by frequent hearings of the finest compositions, except in a very limited degree.”\(^{15}\) *The Harbinger*’s latter description is somewhat unfair. It completely ignores the formation of the New York Philharmonic Society in 1842, which, while still a young organization, was perhaps the city’s most significant endeavor to perform primarily Austro-German music on a regular basis. Perhaps the author aimed to account for this with the qualification, “except in a very limited degree.”

Yet there is some truth to the statement too. Musical training in the United States was quite limited compared to the opportunities in Europe. Many Americans seeking a professional-quality musical education went overseas to receive their instruction. As it concerns string chamber music, there had been one seemingly unsuccessful attempt by Uri Corelli Hill in 1843 to establish regular performances of string quartets in New York, but the series was never repeated. It would still be a few years until the conditions sufficient for sustained string chamber music series would reach critical mass.

The descriptions of musical life in New York at this point vary widely. There is often harsh criticism of its lack of sophistication, but also abundant praise of its improvement. As a city experiencing musical “progress,” as contemporaries might have described it, New York is often

---

\(^{14}\) *The Harbinger, Devoted to Social and Political Progress*, 14 June 1845, 12.

\(^{15}\) *Harbinger*, 14 June 1845, 12.
lauded for the degree to which it has advanced, but always subject to disparagement for never yet having moved far enough. It is sometimes difficult to describe musical culture in New York accurately for this reason; in the historical sources the advocates of both views perhaps exaggerate their points, and the city’s musical development is either described as exceeding expectations, or falling far short of them.\(^\text{16}\)

**European Touring Artists**

With the link to Europe strengthened, and the duration of travel in between shortened, America opened up as a ripe ground for European touring musicians. Many leading virtuosi from the old continent made the transatlantic journey to concertize in American cities, and New York was usually their first destination. Howard stated, “Few of the early virtuosi were Americans; most of them were periodical visitors from abroad, but they affected our musical life so deeply that they cannot be ignored.”\(^\text{17}\)

European violinists who toured the United States included Ole Bull (Norway), Henri Vieuxtemps (Belgium), Alexandre Artôt (Belgium), William Vincent Wallace (Ireland), and Camillo Sivori (Italy). The *Anglo American*, describing the abundance of violin soloists, stated:

> But the fact that they have congregated in this city so largely, and their increase has of late been so rapid, that the public have been thrown into a state of fermentation almost without a parallel on this side of the Atlantic, and quite sufficient to unsettle the equilibrium of judgment on an art in which small comparative experience exists.\(^\text{18}\)

It continued, describing the resulting competitiveness among the succession of touring

---

\(^\text{16}\) Joseph Horowitz touches on the cultural duality that gave rise to these differing perspectives, writing that the: “new audience [of the 1920s] for classical music was different in scope and tone. One component was equidistant from the rabble enlivening certain mid-nineteenth-century entertainments, and the aristocrats who had calmly absorbed or propagated high culture as an entitlement.” See Joseph Horowitz, *Classical Music in America: A History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2007), 396-97.


\(^\text{18}\) *Anglo American*, 23 December 1843, 214.
violinists:

Scarcely has Wallace laid down the violin which is said to have bewitched the south and the west, when he gives way to Artot, the fellow traveller of the unequalled Cinti Damoreau, and the mover of all hearts which are alive to the graceful melody and the liquid music of the cantabile. Whilst Artot is yet but in mid-carse and winning golden opinions, over comes Ole Bull, the Norwegian, whose fame had been bruited through all the journals of Europe; he pushes aside the modest Frenchman—some may think these two words are singularly in juxtaposition, but it is fact,—rushes into the arena, electrifies his thousands, again and again, they being for the most part prepared for the shock by high anticipation, pockets a little fortune in a fortnight, and prepares himself for continued prosperity, when here arrives Vieuxtemps, the Belgian, whom the European musical critics have taken up and honoured with the sobriquet of “Prince of Violinists,” and, who fancies that he is to find a clear stage. Mistaken young man! He had foolishly put himself into a Dutch or Flemish vessel—a “slow coach”—long before Ole Bull left England, and he lands here “just in time to be too late.” He pockets his disappointment and hides his chagrin with a good grace. He waits until the first series of Ole Bull’s concerts is over, and then notifies his intention to give one himself. But as we have just said, he is too late; the public have not room for any further approbation or applause; it neither can nor shall be that any one shall make them abate of superlatives which have been uttered in favour of Ole Bull; they have reached the ne plus ultra of laudation, and what can Vieuxtemps now expect than a lower place in their temple of fame.19

This passage also illustrates the effect of oceanic travel speed as a factor in the performers’ success. Vieuxtemps apparently left earlier than Bull, but travelled on a slower vessel. Bull arrived in New York before Vieuxtemps, and gained commercial success sooner. European artists, such as these, embarking on American concert tours, were credited with exerting “beneficial influence” on the musical tastes of New York audiences. In 1846, the Harbinger stated that the city was showing progress in the “appreciation of Musical Art.” It stated the primary cause was: “the visits with which we have been favored by distinguished artists of the old world, and which have already exerted a great and beneficial influence upon the public taste; awakening a love of music where it had lain dormant [...].”20

19 Anglo American, 23 December 1843, 214.
20 Harbinger, 21 February 1846, 173-4.
However, it was not only foreign solo artists who made New York their performing destination, but also German chamber orchestras. The first of these was the Styermarkische company. Arriving in America in 1846, they debuted not in New York, but Boston, where they enjoyed a period of great vogue. But by January 1848, they were performing in New York.

It seems that the group did not succeed for long in New York, likely due to arriving competition: the Germania Music Society arrived in October 1848, Josef Gung’l and his group in November, and the Saxonia Band in December, all giving concerts of essentially the same repertory. The Germania consisted of twenty-four top-notch musicians, each an excellent soloist in his own right.

A critic, in a review of the Gung’l orchestra’s debut, gives a valuable description of the abundance of German orchestras in the city:

Mr. Gung’l has, beyond a doubt, made a decided hit, and we confidently expect that he will meet with great success in this country. But whilst penning these remarks we learn that still another band from Dresden has arrived, consisting of twenty-four instrumental artists. There are thus four complete orchestras in this country, the Germania, Gung’l’s, the Steyermarkische and the Dresden. With all the increasing love of music amongst us, four such numerous companies will drive a starving trade.

The new presence of European touring solo artists and chamber orchestras decreased New York’s isolation from European musical culture. New York audiences were able, for the first time, to see some of the finest musicians from across the Atlantic performing European music with a frequency never yet seen in the city. This had the effect of exposing the city’s concertgoers and resident musicians to a caliber of performance with which they had previously

22 See: The Albion, or, British, Colonial, and Foreign Weekly Gazette, 15 January 1848, 36.
23 Lawrence, Resonances, 545.
24 Lawrence, Resonances, 546.
25 Albion, 18 November 1848, 560.
been unacquainted. As will be shown in Chapter II, several touring artists either directly or indirectly affected the performance of string chamber music in New York.

**Immigration and Musical Culture**

Though the presence of touring ensembles served an important role in bringing more performances of Austro-German music to New York, masses of permanent immigrants from the German states would do much more to change the demography and cultural activity of the city. Many factors prompted Germans of different classes to leave their homeland. According to Stanley Nadel, the emergence of steamboats and the reduction or elimination of tolls on the Rhine led to increased importation of factory-made goods from other countries, raising the financial pressure on artisans of the region. Nadel also describes the economic hardships facing German farmers:

> The peasantry of the Rhinelands was also feeling economic pressure. Population was rapidly rising in the countryside and prices were keeping pace (especially the price of land). Small farmers found it increasingly difficult to set up their sons with viable farms (or even to keep up mortgage payments on the land they already owned). Rather than see their sons go landless or turn to industry to supplement their incomes, many farmers sold out altogether and emigrated to the United States. There, they could establish themselves and all of their sons on land purchased with the proceeds from the sale of their holdings in Germany.

Land was not the only commodity with rapidly rising costs; the decreasing availability and affordability of food was a significant factor contributing to emigration out of Germany. Nadel explains:

> The transatlantic flood began in the 1840s, as the potato rot (first noticed in 1842) spread rapidly across Germany to reach crisis proportions in 1845-47. Grain prices rose 250 to 300 percent in two years and potato prices rose 425 percent in the same period. Hunger riots

---

were widespread. […] With more and more steamboats plying the Rhine and new oceangoing steamships to ease the transatlantic passage, many people decided to abandon a Germany where their future was in peril. Farmers sold out and fled the potato rot while artisans purchased tickets to America with money that could no longer purchase food.29

Additionally, Burrows and Wallace explain how the political situation at the time led many to flee their homeland: “Emigration from German states accelerated following the suppression of the short-lived revolutions of 1848. The recapture of Berlin by forces loyal to the Prussian monarchy precipitated a flight of craft workers, small shopkeepers, and intellectuals…”30 Nadel makes a similar point, stating that the failure of the revolution: “drove many liberal and radical intellectuals into exile, along with their peasant and artisan compatriots.”31

The United States, a burgeoning democracy, was frequently the destination for German emigrants, as well as for many leaving Ireland and England. Burrows and Wallace give detailed statistics on immigration to New York and the United States during this period:

Between 1820 and 1839, better than 667,000 immigrants had arrived in the United States. Some 501,000 (75 percent) of them entered at the Port of New York, a yearly average of around 25,000. Between 1840 and 1859, however, the total number of immigrants soared to 4,242,000. Forty percent were Irish, 32 percent were German, and 16 percent were English. Three out of every four entered at New York, approximately 157,000 per year on the average. In 1854 alone, setting a record that stood for decades, the United States accepted 428,000 immigrants. Of that number, roughly 319,000 (75 percent) descended on Manhattan—more than the entire population of the city in 1840!32

Burrows and Wallace explain that New York was not the final destination for most immigrants, but enough of them settled in the city to contribute to the enormous population growth: “Of the more than three million immigrants who passed through the city between 1840 and 1860, maybe one in five or six remained—but this was enough to help drive the population of New York City from 313,000 to 814,000 and that of Brooklyn from 11,000 to

267,000, an aggregate increase of some 757,000 people.”

Additionally, according to Nadel, by 1860, 119,984 people, 15 percent of New York City’s population, were German-born. En route to roughly 120,000 German-born New Yorkers, the immigrants were creating a sizable community within the city, and brought with them much of their culture from their old lands. Many of these immigrants would have been musicians, professional or amateur, and of those that were not, many held a predilection for Austro-German music, including string chamber music, and they would provide audiences for performances of this type of repertoire.

The string quartet had its origins in Vienna, and the playing of such music in the home was a popular domestic activity in the German states. Bashford explains that the qualities that eventually became the hallmark of the Classical quartet style: “were first enshrined in Vienna by Haydn and Mozart, who brought the quartet to a notable peak of artistic maturity around the 1780s.” David Wyn Jones likewise states that: “by c. 1770 the quartet had established itself as a favoured instrumental medium in the Austrian territories.”

Concerning the social role of the string quartet in domestic music-making, Bashford describes the genre as: “intended as ‘real’ chamber music: that is, music to be performed for its own sake and the enjoyment of the players, in private residences (usually in rooms of limited size), perhaps in the presence of a few listeners, perhaps not.” Though the string quartet would eventually be performed in public concerts, Bashford states that: “the practice of domestic quartet-playing

---

34 Nadel, *Little Germany*, 22 (Table 1).
persisted, with special keenness in German-speaking lands, where Hausmusik would be an important part of life for the professional and business classes for decades to come.\(^{38}\)

Hence, the string quartet, given its Austro-German origin, as well as its popularity among many from the German states, was a key piece of Austro-German culture which was to immigrate into the United States. John Tasker Howard and George Kent Bellows offer their explanation of the German immigrants’ effect on chamber music in New York City:

A most hopeful phase of New York’s musical life, directly influenced by the German immigrants, was the development of public concerts of chamber music. Until now held only in the homes of well-to-do musical amateurs (or Pennsylvania Pietists), these concerts took place in the halls of the city, for the benefit of the public. The foreign musicians brought with them a rich heritage of court orchestras and chamber groups, and they merely transferred the scene of cultural activity from Europe to America.\(^{39}\)

But yet, even before the surge of German immigration into the United States around 1848, a smaller amount of immigration had been occurring for some decades, and many of these newcomers who became permanent residents were musicians. A German musician who visited New York wrote of financial opportunities in a letter dated July 27, 1828, which was published in the Cæcilia, a musical journal in Mayence, Germany:

Regarding it in a pecuniary sense[,] the musician who is capable of giving piano or guitar lessons, beside his regular engagement, will find it very lucrative. He will be able to accumulate a small fortune within a short time, but only as a teacher on these two instruments. One does not find lessons given on any other ones. Good teachers receive one dollar per lesson; others, eighteen dollars for twenty-four lessons.

Living is not very expensive here. Young musicians, even of mediocre talent, who are scarcely able to make a living in Germany, can do well here, and are sure, if they are saving, to make their fortune. They will be considered artists of the first rank here. But it is necessary to know English in order to be able to teach.\(^{40}\)


\(^{40}\) Ritter, Music in America, 205-206. The passage appears translated to English in Ritter.
Ritter contends that this advice to young German musicians convinced many to immigrate to America, as German musicians in New York increased in number after this point.\(^1\) Yet, it was the immigration of large numbers of Germans, surging from around 1848, which would make a much more significant impact of the performance of string chamber works in New York City. Otto Dresel and Theodor Eisfeld were two German musicians who arrived in New York during this period of mass immigration. Dresel, a pianist and composer, left Germany for New York in 1848.\(^2\) Eisfeld also arrived in New York in 1848.\(^3\) Both of these musicians, but especially Eisfeld, would be instrumental in establishing series of string chamber music performances in New York City from the late 1840s.

The impact of the c. 1848 German immigration upon New York’s string chamber music performances is almost impossible to overstate. The movement and settlement of Germans into New York City brought with it not only chamber musicians and people who would attend their concerts, but more generally a culture and tradition of Austro-German string chamber music. This had a strong effect on the development of New York’s chamber music life, as the ensuing chapters will show.

Chapter II: Chamber Music performances, 1842-November 1849

The present chapter discusses chamber music performances in New York City from 1842 until December 1849. These were not chamber concerts as such. The common practice during this period was for concerts to include a variety of genres. One would often see vocal and instrumental selections interspersed on a program, and frequently, the instrumental pieces would be of completely different types. It is in this context of “miscellaneous” concerts that the majority of string chamber works were publically performed. This chapter will explore the settings and musicians behind these performances. The last section will focus on a concert series of string chamber music led by a New York violinist named Uri Corelli Hill. It will further discuss the series’ reception as to establish a point of comparison with the developments to occur in the early 1850s, discussed in Chapters III through V.

European Touring Artists – Concerts with String Chamber Music

In the 1840s touring artists from the “old” (i.e. European) continent were taking advantage of speedier transatlantic travel via steamships, and making the United States part of their concert circuit. As discussed in Chapter I, New York had become the country’s principal Atlantic port, and it was generally the artists’ arrival point. Thus, New York was usually the first city in which visiting artists would perform.

Most of these European touring artists primarily performed as soloists. As an example, the violinists Ole Bull and Henri Vieuxtemps generally preferred more virtuosic repertoire, and I have not found evidence of their participation in public string chamber playing. However, a still sizable minority of these European touring musicians either performed chamber music at their concerts, or their concerts became a platform through which string chamber music was
performed by assisting artists. This chapter has included all such examples that I located during my review of primary sources. The principal concert-giver often did not participate in the chamber music, and this was especially true of vocalists.

Although these visiting European musicians did, on occasion, perform with a full orchestra, programming concerts with a much smaller supporting ensemble was a highly popular option. Using a small ensemble, which would make chamber music a likely repertoire choice, carried a number of possible economic advantages. First, and most obviously, there would be fewer assisting musicians to hire, hence, fewer people to pay. Additionally, such a concert might be able to occur in a smaller, less expensive venue. Generally, the lower the cost of putting on a concert, the less financial risk carried by the endeavor, and consequently, the greater the chances for success.

On Thursday, February 24, 1842, the vocalist Madame Spohr-Zahn, daughter of the composer Louis Spohr,¹ and the violinist William Keyzer, gave a concert at the City Hotel. The assisting artists were Henry Christian Timm (piano), Mr. Kossowski, Alfred Boucher (cello), and Mr. Aupick.² Timm (1811-1892), an important musical figure during this period, will appear at numerous points throughout this dissertation. A German-born pianist, organist, and conductor, he emigrated to New York in 1835, and made his debut the next year.³

For the Spohr-Zahn and Keyzer concert, a mixed program was advertised, featuring a variety of genres. Single movements of string quartets and quintets opened and closed each half. The first half of the program commenced with the first movement of a Mozart quintet, followed by various vocal pieces, and solos for piano (Kossowski), violin (Keyzer), and cello (Boucher’s own

---

² *The Albion, or, British, Colonial, and Foreign Weekly Gazette*, 19 February 1842, 92.
The first half ended with the “Scherzo, from Beethoven’s Quartett La Malinconia.” The title “La Malinconia” is applied to the fourth movement of Beethoven’s String Quartet in B-flat Major, Op. 18, No. 6; however, the quartet’s third movement is titled “Scherzo.” The third movement is most likely the one indicated by the advertisement, “La Malinconia” serving to identify the quartet as a whole. It is important to point out that a public performance of a Beethoven string quartet movement would be a notably rare occurrence in New York City in 1842. To put this in greater context, Beethoven’s Egmont Overture received its New York premiere on April 2, 1835; Fidelio’s United States premiere was on September 9, 1839, performed in English (the next performance would not occur until 1856, that time in German); and Symphony No. 5 received what is believed to be the first complete performance in the United States on February 11, 1841 (two movements were reportedly performed in New York in 1829). Still, many of Beethoven’s best-known works had yet to be performed in the city. The New York premieres of Beethoven’s third, sixth, eighth, and ninth symphonies would not occur until 1843, 1843, 1844, and 1846, respectively. The second half of the Spohr-Zahn and Keyzer concert began with a piano quintet by Spohr, with Timm as pianist, and the program ended with a minuet from a Mozart quartet in D minor.

---

4 Albion, 19 February 1842, 92.
6 Lawrence, Resonances, 22.
7 Lawrence, Resonances, 22 (footnote 39).
8 Lawrence, Resonances, 110.
9 Lawrence, Resonances, 110 (footnote 5).
10 Lawrence, Resonances, 179.
11 Lawrence, Resonances, 187-188.
12 Lawrence, Resonances, 248-249.
13 Lawrence, Resonances, 368.
14 Albion, 19 February 1842, 92.
According to the advertisement, tickets cost one dollar each, “to be had at the principal Music Stores, and at the door on the evening of the performance.”\(^{15}\) At the time, one dollar would have been a truly sizable amount for most New Yorkers. When the New York Philharmonic Society was launched later that year, the price of a single ticket, sold as part of a subscription, would be 83 cents. According to Howard Shanet’s description:

The tickets, although reasonably priced, are not cheap. A subscription covering four tickets for each of the three concerts of the season costs $10; that comes to $3.33 for one set of four tickets, or 83¢ per ticket. For 83¢ in 1842 you can provide your family with 15 pounds of beef, lamb, or mutton, or you can hire a carpenter for six hours of skilled work. The Park Theatre, where you can see the best theatrical entertainment in town, is charging only 50¢ for the boxes, 25¢ for the pit, and 12\(\frac{1}{2}\)¢ for the gallery.\(^{16}\)

For greater economic context, the *New York Daily Tribune*, in 1845, gave more information on the wages of working class residents. It estimated through “the result of much inquiry, that the average earnings of those who live by simple labor in our City—embracing at least two-thirds of our Population,—scarcely if at all exceed one dollar per week for each person subsisting thereon.” The “great majority” of shoemakers worked at rates “not averaging over five dollars a week.” It added: “The regular pay of Day Laborers in our city is, if we mistake not, $1 per day. Rainy days, severe cold weather, &c. [sic] are of course excluded.”\(^{17}\) From this, it appears that one-dollar ticket prices would have excluded working-class New Yorkers from attending such performances.

The one review I have found of the Spohr-Zahn and Keyzer concert (in *The Albion*) noted that the audience was “moderately numerous, but of a very critical description.”\(^{18}\) Disappointingly, the review mentions only the Spohr quintet, from the advertised chamber pieces: “Mr. Timm, to
our great satisfaction, put forth those superior talents in which we are always conscious he possesses, and played an Obligato, in a Quintett by Spohr.”¹⁹ (The review otherwise focuses on the solo repertoire, and makes no mention of the Beethoven or Mozart works.)

Later that year, the German cellist Max Bohrer, advertised as “concert master and violincellist to the King of Wertemburg,”²⁰ gave a series of four concerts “previous to his departure for the South.”²¹ The first concert, on Thursday, November 17, included, according to one account, a “quartett in which Mr. Timm played an obligato part on the piano,”²² or, according to another, “Spohr’s Quintette,” in which Timm’s playing “was marked by precision, brilliancy, distinctness, feelings and taste.”²³

Spohr’s Piano Quintet, Op. 130, was not composed until 1845, so a more likely candidate would be the Op. 53 arrangement for piano and strings (1820) of his Op. 52 Quintet in C Major, for flute, clarinet, horn, bassoon, and pianoforte (1820). Grove Music Online lists no piano quartet by Spohr.²⁴ (Accounts of future performances of this piece will refer to a Spohr piano quintet in C minor. This is most likely the same work; both the first and fourth movements begin in C minor and end in C major.) It seems that the cellist Bohrer did not participate in the Spohr quintet, as “on the first evening M. Bohrer played his own compositions only,” which would support such a thesis.²⁵

A single ticket to each of Bohrer’s four concerts cost one dollar, “to be had at the principal Music Stores; at his residence St. George’s Hotel, and at the door on the evening of the

---

¹⁹ Albion, 26 February 1842, 104.
²⁰ New York Herald, 16 November 1842, 3.
²¹ New York Herald, 1 December 1842, 3.
²² Albion, 19 November 1842, 560.
²³ The New World, Vol. 5, No. 22, 26 November 1842, 351.
²⁵ “M. Max Bohrer’s Second Concert,” Albion, 26 November 1842, 572.
Concert.” His first concert was apparently “remarkably well attended”27 by a “fashionable”28 audience. Likewise, his third concert “was attended by all the Dilettanti of the city.”29 The one-dollar ticket price was the same as Spohr-Zahn and Keyzer’s concert, and the audience appears to have been from among the city’s upper classes.

Concerning ticket prices, the New-York Mirror of December 10, 1842 reported the following:

We have received a communication strongly condemning the customary dollar-price of concert tickets, and warmly urging its reduction to half, or even less. The writer maintains that with this modification concerts would become the favorite resorts of multitudes who now never think of attending them, and that they would thus more effectively exert their best and noblest influence in refining and elevating the tastes and habits of the public, and substituting elegant and improving amusements for the coarser ones which now too often fill their place.30

The New-York Mirror itself disagreed with this correspondent’s view, and displayed a critical opinion of New Yorkers’ musical preferences, suggesting that the audience for such concerts was limited and not capable of expansion:

We think, too, that our correspondent is equally mistaken in supposing that the increased number of their hearers would compensate for the diminished price. Few have the taste and capacity to comprehend and enjoy music of a high order. To do so perfectly, the hearer must himself be somewhat of a musician, and have carefully educated and cultivated his taste. The best music to become popularized must lower its standard, and substitute for its delicate refinements coarser and more strongly marked features to gratify the uncultivated. “Scientific music,” which appeals to the mind and the judgment, as well as to the unreflecting ear, is never relished by the majority; while that which is distinguished only by striking effects, and strongly marked time and rhythm, will at once arrest their attention and gain their applause.

It continues:

It seems, therefore, that the proposed reduction would be a loss to the performers, to the hearers, and to the science of music, but that the first class would be the chief sufferers. It is a sacrifice which we have no right to call upon them to make.31

---

26 New York Herald; 16 November 1842, 3; 19 November 1842, 3; 23 November 1842, 3; 1 December 1842, 3.
27 New York Herald, 19 November 1842, 2.
29 “Mr. Max Bohrer’s Concerts,” Albion, 3 December 1842, 584.
31 New-York Mirror, 10 December 1842, 399.
This passage is especially valuable for two other reasons. First, it provides a better idea of the type of people who were in the audiences at these concerts. If a one-dollar ticket price was beyond the means of the majority of New Yorkers, then we can deduce that those in attendance must have been among the upper socioeconomic class. Secondly, this is a perfect example of the sacralization of “scientific” music above popular styles. Another passage in this article enhances our understanding of what is meant by “scientific” music:

In such remarkable cases as Paganini, or, to come nearer the real point, Max Bohrer (the Paganini of the violoncello,) the rarity of their wonderful ability gives it a peculiar and unique value, such as invests the diamond with its chief worth.  

If Paganini and Bohrer are artists associated with musical “science,” then the repertoire that they and similar artists perform are examples of “scientific” genres. “Science,” it seems, has a European origin, predominantly German and Italian. Yet, the article not only creates a distinction between the classical and non-classical, but it establishes art music as something higher than, and beyond, the comprehension of a regular person. Here, classical music is exalted above other music and made the exclusive domain of the wealthy.

William Vincent Wallace, an Irish violinist, gave his second concert on Thursday, June 15, 1843. It apparently drew a very large audience. According to the review:

Mr. Timm presided at the piano, and Mr. Marks acted as director of the opening quintette, and the quintette accompanyments, instead of Mr. U. C. Hill, a change decidedly for the better, for Mr. U. C. Hill, with all respect we say it, cannot lead—he frequently plays incorrectly, and he is a bad timeist. Mr. Marks’ [sic] on the contrary, is a finished musician, and his experience as the leader of an orchestra has made him perfect.  

From this, it appears that there was an unidentified piano quintet, or more likely, a single movement from one, performed at the beginning of the concert, and a piano quintet ensemble served as accompaniment to Wallace’s solo repertoire. Furthermore, this passage gives a

---

valuable critical description of U. C. Hill’s playing in a string chamber ensemble. Hill had just led New York’s first string quartet concert series during the prior March and April, a subject discussed later in the chapter.

Wallace gave another concert on Tuesday, October 17, 1843, assisted by a vocalist, Madame Sutton. The advertisement listed H. C. Timm as the “Leader of the Quintette.”\(^\text{34}\) Tickets were 50 cents each, a more reasonable price than the dollar standard, but still pretty costly. The concert repertoire was not listed, but the order might have had the same format as the June 15\(^{\text{th}}\) performance, given the programming of a piano quintet.

Also in 1843 the French soprano Laure Cinti-Damoreau and Belgian violinist Alexandre Artôt arrived in New York, and were to give three concerts, before leaving for Boston,\(^\text{35}\) in fact they actually gave four.\(^\text{36}\) Their first performance was on Thursday, October 19, 1843 at the Washington Hotel. Mr. Timm opened the concert, performing (according to The Albion)

“Spohr’s lovely quintette, with all that exquisite delicacy, and singular precision, for which he is so distinguished. He was loudly and deservedly applauded.” It is implied that Artôt did not perform in the quintet, as it is said, “his first performance was an introduction to, and variations upon, the celebrated air from Il Pirata.”\(^\text{37}\) As previously mentioned, Spohr’s Op. 130 quintet would not be composed until 1845, so the Op. 53, or Op. 52 with winds (both 1820),\(^\text{38}\) was probably the work performed. The audience numbered between twelve and thirteen hundred, and

\(^{34}\) *Albion*, 14 October 1843, 510.  
^{35}\) *Albion*, 28 October 1843, 536.  
^{36}\) *Anglo American*, 2 December 1843, 142.  
^{37}\) *Albion*, 21 October 1843, 554.  
the venue was “crowded at an early hour, by all the fashion and talent of the city.” Tickets were priced at one dollar.\textsuperscript{39}

Here, we also have actual documentation of steamship travel by foreign touring musicians. Of their first concert, \textit{The Albion} stated:

Steam is bringing us nearer to the old world every day. Paris and London seem as near to us now as Boston and Philadelphia of old. Who knows but a few years hence the Italian and French troupes will make their annual season visit to New York alternatively with Paris and London?\textsuperscript{40}

Adriend Garreau, a French cellist, gave his first concert in the United States on Thursday, October 10, 1844 in the Apollo Room, “before a large, fashionable, and critical audience, and well he came out of the ordeal.”\textsuperscript{41} There was a mixed program, featuring vocal performances by [tenor, Cirillo] Antoguini, and [bass, Antonio] Sanquirico. Garreau, Michele Rapetti, and Denis-Germain Étienne played a part of Mayseder’s “grand Trio for Piano, Violin, and Violoncello” to begin each section of the concert. Of the Mayseder, the \textit{Anglo American} said the “music was magnificent and the performance exquisite on all hands.”\textsuperscript{42}

The reviewer showed a dislike for some of the works chosen for performance, and pleaded to hear those of canonized composers:

In expressing our pleasure derived from this Concert, we shall take the liberty of adding our wish that Mr. Garreau will be satisfied to play the Music of acknowledged great masters. Practical artists seldom having time for composition are apt to run into commonplace ideas, or indulge themselves in writing passages suitable to their own peculiar style. Such compositions are rarely pleasing throughout, and detract from the real excellence possessed by the performer.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Albion}, 21 October 1843, 554.  
\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Albion}, 21 October 1843, 554.  
\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Anglo American}, 12 October 1844, 598.  
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Anglo American}, 12 October 1844, 598.  
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Anglo American}, 12 October 1844, 598.
In 1846, Camillo Sivori, an Italian violinist, and the only pupil of Paganini, arrived in New York to begin “an adventurous tour of North and South America (1846–50) across 67 cities in the north in the company of Henri Herz, and then on to Cuba, Jamaica, Lima, Valparaiso, Santiago, Rio de Janeiro and Montevideo.” On Saturday, October 17, 1846, Sivori invited an audience of musical connoisseurs to his lodgings at the Astor House for an evening of chamber music. Sivori, Rapetti, Poppenberg, and Boucher played quartets by Mozart and Beethoven, and Sivori played the “Kreutzer” Sonata with William Scharfenberg on piano. The *Anglo American* described the event:

On Saturday evening last, it was seen what a perfect Master Sivori is in “Quartette playing.” There is many a brilliant solo performer, who when he is called upon to take the lead, and mark the light and shade in a quartette of Mozart or Beethoven, is at fault, but Sivori is as prominent in this as in solo playing.

On his fourth concert, Friday, October 23, 1846, Sivori was noted as having performed “the delicious, heaven-breathing ‘Scherzo’ and variations of the Beethoven Sonata, full of delightful harmonies and modulations, with prominent Solos for Violin and Pianoforte.” Vera Brodsky Lawrence describes this as the “Kreutzer” Sonata. This is confirmed by the *Harbinger* of November 14, which states that Sivori had played the “Kreutzer” in New York, at the request “of some lovers of classical music.” Sivori’s first two concerts were “well and fashionably attended,” and his fourth was attended by “the most numerous and whole-souled audience witnessed on this side of the Atlantic.”
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The *Harbinger* wished “to hear Sivori more, and hear him also in more classic music.” It continued:

We have yet to learn by what right these modern brilliancies are allowed to reign with undivided and exclusive sway in every public concert, while of the real works of genius only the merest tastes are now and then afforded us; and then they are prefixed with an apology for being “classic,” or in other words too good for us! Sivori, we know, is a true artist, and could render a Sonata or the first part of a Quartette, in such a style as it has not been permitted to our ears to hear; why will he withhold from us what every true musician deems his choicest stores?\(^\text{52}\)

The writer clearly believes that “classic” music is performed in New York less often than would be ideal, listeners being afforded “only the merest tastes.” But it appears to be a meaningful commentary on the perceived acceptance of such music by New York audiences. If representative works are preceded with “an apology for being ‘classic,’ or in other words too good for us,” it would appear that works such as (using the *Harbinger’s* examples) sonatas or quartets, were seen as beyond the comprehension of the city’s concert audiences. There appears to be an assumption that there was little possibility for the growth of an audience for string chamber music, an assumption that the writer appears to be challenging.

Sivori gave another concert on Friday, November 27, 1846, at which he and violinist Michele Rapetti performed a “duet” by Ludwig Maurer.\(^\text{53}\) *Grove* lists a *Sinfonia concertante* for two violins among Maurer’s compositions, as well as “chamber pieces and studies.”\(^\text{54}\) There was an orchestra present at this concert, so the “duet” may have been the *Sinfonia concertante*, which likely would not fit the modern definition of chamber music, although it could have been another work that would.

\(^{52}\) *Harbinger*, 14 November 1846, 364.
\(^{53}\) *Anglo American*, 5 December 1846, 166.
Sivori and Herz gave two concerts on Tuesday and Thursday, November 2 and 4, 1847. The cellist Knoop assisted at least on the Tuesday concert, or both, according to different accounts. Knoop performed duos with Sivori, and trios, when Herz joined them. On the two concerts, held at the Tabernacle, there “must have been over five thousand persons present.”

In 1846, the Italian double bassist Giovanni Bottesini, with violinist Luigi Arditi, went to Havana, where Bottesini was principal bass at the Teatro de Tacón. There, Bottesini conducted the première of his first opera, _Cristoforo Colombo_. Concert tours and engagements followed, leading them to New Orleans, New York, London and all over Europe. They appeared in New York at a concert given by the “Italian Company” on Saturday, April 17, 1847. According to the _Anglo American:_

> the greatest feature of the evening was certainly the performance of Messrs. Bottesini and Arditi. These two gentlemen performed together two duets of their own composition for violin and double bass. Their ‘festa delli Zingari,’ which is not a feast of Bohemians as they pretend, but the greatest treat that can be given to musicians, is a most remarkable piece.

Their next appearance was at a production of Verdi’s opera _I due Foscari_ on Saturday, June 12, 1847. The review stated:

> there was a duo announced on the bills to be played by the leader, Arditi, and the contra bassist, Botesina [sic; i.e. Bottesini], both of whom were already known to be very superior artists in their way. Well, the duo took place, and astonishing it was; the artists are excellent, and the effects were absolutely imposing and extatic [sic].

These performances are worthy of mention, although they may not fit the definition of string chamber music as earlier established. In fact, this is probably impossible to know. If the pieces were unaccompanied, with alternating melody/accompaniment roles, then the works could fit a
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definition of string chamber music. But it is likely that the pieces were not “high” string chamber
genres, such as sonatas.

The Havana troupe made a prosperous set of opera performances at Castle Garden. The large
theatre at Castle Garden opened in May 1845, and it was capable of comfortably seating six
thousand people. On Wednesday, September 8, 1847, Arditi and Bottesini performed, but the
reviewer was not present to comment. Speaking of a foreign-dominated audience for opera, the
reviewer says:

By the bye, the attendance of French, of Italian, or Spanish, and of other continental European
inhabitants of this city, gives proof of the inclination of these peoples for music, much greater
than we can say of the English or the Americans. There is seldom a performance in which
persons of those countries are absent; and their accurate remembrance of the passages
afterwards tells us that they do not go for fashion’s sake merely; and they really make up the
majority of those audiences.

Here, we have direct evidence of a foreign-dominated audience for classical music, forming
“the majority” of those in attendance. Their “inclination” for music was much greater than that of
the English or Americans, the author states. Further, the writer claims that the Europeans “do not
go for fashion’s sake merely.” This heavily implies that others (Americans) do attend concerts
merely “for fashion’s sake.” The passage is quite a negative assessment of Americans’ capability
of appreciating European art music, as well as their motives for attending such events.

Luigi Elena, a young Italian violin prodigy, gave a concert on Thursday, February 8, 1849 at
the Stuyvesant Institute. “Each part opened with a portion of a Quintetto by Onslow, admirably
played by Elena, Eisfeldt, Fallgraf, and Boucher.” The review lists only four string performers
in the Onslow quintet. According to Grove, George Onslow (1784-1853), a French composer of
English descent, composed numerous string quartets, string quintets of various instrumentation,
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and piano quintets. Two pianists performed at the concert: Timm, and Elena’s brother, Annibale. It is possible that one of them joined the four strings to perform either Onslow’s Piano Quintet Op. 70 in B Minor (1846) or Op. 76 in G Major (1848), or that an unnamed string player joined them to perform one of Onslow’s many string quintets.

Onslow’s chamber music accounts for the vast majority of his compositional output. He wrote thirty-four string quintets, thirty-seven string quartets, three piano quintets (the last composed in 1852), ten piano trios, six duos for violin and piano, and three duos for viola or cello and piano. Grove gives the following description of Onslow’s string chamber works:

Onslow's string quartets and quintets come at the peak of his compositional career. His youthful quartets (opp.8, 9 and 10) are notable for great flexibility of writing, exceptional rhythmic and melodic charm, and great vitality. They are clear successors to the *quatuor brillant* and the Classical tradition. Between 1817 and 1831 Onslow composed very little for quartet, but in 1832 he returned to form with new and sudden verve. This was probably linked with his discovery of Beethoven's late quartets, which shocked and fascinated him. He composed the most significant of all his quartets (opp.46-56) within three years. With all four instruments now essential to the discourse, these works show great emotional intensity, opening up the way to new harmonic and rhythmic daring, and they contain movements of striking beauty. Finally, from 1835 to 1846, the year when he stopped composing quartets, Onslow moved away from melodic writing to concentrate on more complex thematic structures. This cost him some lack of understanding on the part of the critics, who missed the style and melodic charm of the early works.

According to Viviane Niaux, Onslow’s string quintets: “bear witness to the richness of Onslow's musical development, which departs from Classicism and embraces a style of composition in which a surprising anticipation of the language of Brahms is apparent.” Niaux states that some of the quintets belong among the masterworks of 19th-century chamber music.

From what we have seen, several characteristics seem to be shared among the touring artist performances. From what evidence we have, the prices of concerts were rather expensive, indicating that the likely audiences were from New York’s upper socio-economic classes. These European musicians, who had travelled across the Atlantic to perform in New York and other cities, probably did so less out of a desire to cultivate American musical taste, but more likely to receive a return on their investment of time and effort. Charging a premium price for their performances would best serve this agenda, so long as audience turnout was sufficient in number. As evidenced by Herz and Sivori’s reported five thousand audience members, there was certainly potential for a very sizable turnout from the city’s residents.

The desire to attract a large audience may have been a factor in repertoire selection, and it could be for this reason that chamber music seems to have generally been on the lower end of emphasis in these concerts. Often, the primary artists would not even participate in performing such works. The touring artists largely put greater emphasis on their solo performances, somewhat understandably, as many of the virtuosic soloists wanted to demonstrate their ability through virtuosic solo material. String chamber music’s secondary role in programming may have much to do with a perceived lack of interest from New York audiences. Although works by the to-be-canonized composers were often performed, the process of sacralization and canonization was not so much a conscious effort by the European touring artists, who had less interest in advancing the state of classical music in the United States. Rather, the concert reviewers played a larger role in this, interpreting performances and always directing readers toward what they viewed to be the “higher” forms of music.
Resident Musical Societies

The musical life of New York City was not limited to touring artists. Residents of the city, both native-born and immigrants, professionals and amateurs, participated in a number of musical organizations. Some of them included chamber music in their concerts. The New York Philharmonic Society’s first concert was on Saturday, December 7, 1842. The Albion reviewer called the event “the commencement of a New Musical Era, in this western world.” He continued:

The concert which was then given, at the Apollo Rooms, was the first of an attempt to form an approved school of instrumental music in this country, after the manner and upon the principles of the celebrated Philharmonic Society of London, and well, ‘excellent well,’ indeed, have the members commenced.  

Instead of the full symphonic program that we would expect today, the performance included a chamber work. Hummel’s Septet in D Minor, Op. 74, originally for flute, oboe, viola, horn, cello, double bass, and piano, was played in its quintet arrangement by Scharfenberg (piano), U. C. Hill (violin), Derwort (viola), Boucher (cello), and Rosier (double bass). Perhaps even more unusual by our standards were the performance of four different operatic scenes, with vocalists, by Weber, Rossini, Beethoven, and Mozart.

The main attraction of the first concert was Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, as noted by the reviewer, “played throughout.” This is an important example of sacralization in progress, as the symphony was performed as an uninterrupted whole, in contrast to the performance of single movements that had been common. The emergence of the musical “work-concept,” an element related to sacralization, led to musical production being seen: “as the use of musical material
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resulting in complete and discrete, original and fixed, personally owned units.”⁷¹ Lydia Goehr, writing about the emergence of the work-concept in nineteenth-century concerts, states:

An obvious difference between the old and new programmes (written or played) was the degree of respect accorded a complete instrumental work. One way to show appropriate respect was not to interrupt a performance of a symphony with too long a pause, interval, or intermission. The symphony should be played complete and at one sitting.⁷² Hence, it was during this time that the preference for complete performances of symphonies emerged. But we are still early enough into this process in New York that the reviewer felt it necessary to mention that a symphony had been “played throughout.” It was still a fairly new concept to them.

A Philharmonic Society concert on Saturday, April 22, 1843 included Beethoven’s Septet in E-flat Major, Op. 20. The performers were Groenevelt (clarinet), Trosji (horn), Reiff (bassoon), Hill (violin), Weigers (viola), Boucher (cello), and Rosier (double bass).⁷³ The New World reviewer commented:

The second act commenced with Beethoven’s celebrated Septuour. This was a most unequal performance, nay, in many parts, it was badly played. The adagio was the most successful part of it, more attention being given to light and shade. Mr. Hill played this better than any of the rest, for in all his rapid passages, every change of position was distinctly perceptible, and he was tame and indecisive. Many of the passages he could not play, particularly in the second variation and the finale. Mr. Trosji has our warm admiration for the beautiful manner in which he played the horn throughout. Mr. Reiff was also admirable on the bassoon, and Mr. Rosier played the contra basso pointedly and firmly, only now and then he pulled out too much tone.⁷⁴

Of the audience, the reviewer then comments: “those whose tongues cannot cease from one incessant jabber, to confine themselves strictly to their own parlors. We had the misfortune, on Saturday evening, to sit behind a part of the French haut-ton, who kept up an incessant

⁷² Goehr, Imaginary Museum, 240.
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conversation in as loud a tone as they would use in the street.”75 This demand for quietness during performances was part of the sacralization of audience ritual. Most theatrical audiences of the time behaved much like one would in a sports venue today: audiences were free to vocally express their opinions over the performance. This marks an example of the progression away from that custom. Lydia Goehr writes that performances became cut off completely from all extra-musical activity (such as talking), and that this philosophy led to the building of concert halls as shrines to the performances of pieces of music.76 In these concert halls, as well as in private societies: “audiences began to learn how to listen not just to music but to each musical work for its own sake. A given performance of a work ceased to be interrupted by a long interval between movements, and audiences gradually ceased to participate in the way they had earlier on.”77

Christina Bashford writes of a similar flux in audience behavior at London’s chamber music performances:

It was customary at this period for audiences to applaud between movements, and for a particularly liked movement to be repeated before moving on to the next; respect for the unity of a musical composition was still some way off. More to the point, though, some people indulged in an old-fashioned manner of behaviour which was increasingly identified with the fashionable aristocracy; that is, of making audible interjections of approval or disapproval during the music. The Duke of Cambridge, although a great musical enthusiast, was a frequent culprit. […] Such habits were not changed overnight, though one gets the decided impression that by, say, the early 1840s the tide was turning, and that the old ways (in chamber-music concerts at least) were becoming intolerable.78

On Saturday, January 13, 1844, the Philharmonic concert included two movements of Hummel’s Septet in D Minor, Op. 74. This was the same piece that was performed at the inaugural concert; however, it was performed this time in its original instrumentation by

75 *New World*, 29 April 1843, 519.
Scharfenberg (piano), Kyle (flute), Wiese (oboe), Woehning (horn), Johnson (viola), Boucher (cello), and Rosier (double bass).\textsuperscript{79} A reviewer in \textit{The Anglo American} called it “truly the gem of the evening’s instrumentation.”\textsuperscript{80}

The New York Vocal Society gave its first performance on Friday, January 19, 1844. Hummel’s Septet in D Minor, as had been heard at the Philharmonic concert the previous Saturday, was given. The performers were the same individuals as had played it then, except for the absence of Woehning (horn), who had defected without notice. H. C. Timm, in a last-minute substitution, played the horn part on the trombone.\textsuperscript{81} Timm, aside from being one of the city’s top pianists, was also a multi-instrumentalist. \textit{Grove} lists more of his activity as a brass performer:

An extremely versatile musician, he doubled as chorus master and horn player in the American première of C.E. Horn’s opera \textit{The Pilgrim of Love} at the newly reopened National Theatre (12 October 1840). During the first season of the New York Philharmonic Society (1842–3) he doubled as trombone player and pianist, and at the inaugural concert (7 December 1842) conducted operatic scenes from Mozart, Beethoven, Rossini and Weber.\textsuperscript{82}

The New York Vocal Society’s third concert on April 11, 1844, included a trio by Reissiger performed by Henry Christian Timm (piano), Henry Marks (violin), and Millon [S. Milon?] (cello). The vocal portion of the concert consisted entirely of madrigals and glee. The Reissiger Trio, according to the \textit{Albion}, was performed “in most excellent style […] The composition is by no means popular in its character, but it abounds with many distinguished beauties.”\textsuperscript{83} The reviewer seems to be marking a distinction between popular music, and chamber music of this serious type. The trio was probably a work by Carl Gottlieb Reissiger (1798-1859), a German
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composer. He composed twenty-seven piano trios, eight string quartets, seven piano quartets, and various other string chamber works.\textsuperscript{84}

The Euterpean Society was New York’s oldest musical society, established about 1799.\textsuperscript{85} Mainly composed of amateurs,\textsuperscript{86} it was fundamentally a social group, which met weekly or semi-weekly for private music making, and put on an annual concert and ball.\textsuperscript{87} Many of the Philharmonic Society’s founding musicians were members of the Euterpean Society, and remained so after joining the Philharmonic.

The Euterpean Society’s annual concert and ball was held on Wednesday, January 29, 1845. It included two movements, the Allegro and Scherzo, of the Septet by Hummel, played by Timm (piano), Boucher (cello), Pirsson (double bass), Johnson (violin), Hart (flute), Munson (horn), and de Ribas (oboe).\textsuperscript{88} According to the \textit{Broadway Journal}:\textsuperscript{89}

\begin{quote}
The Septette by Hummel was undoubtedly the best performance of the evening. Mr. Timm, on the piano, executed his portion exquisitely, and Mr. Boucher, (violencello) [sic] is justly entitled to the same praise. The other parts were well sustained, and the Amateurs deserve much commendation for the careful way in which they played their several portions.
\end{quote}

The \textit{Anglo American} reported that the Septet was “delightfully executed,” and “the instruments were kept in due restraint and their effects were finely blended; this was in fact the gem of the concert.”\textsuperscript{90}

The next Euterpean Society concert and ball took place on February 4, 1846. A piano sextet by Henri Bertini (1798-1876) was performed by the Philharmonic musicians: Bristow (piano),
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Hill and Ensign (violins), Derwort (viola), Johnson (cello), and Pirsson (double bass). Here, we see George Frederick Bristow, a significant subject of this dissertation, appear as a performer in a string chamber work. His activities as a performer, in my view, had significant influence on his own string chamber compositions. (This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter VI.) Concerning Bristow’s performance in the Bertini sextet, a reviewer stated, “The piano part of this sestette was admirably performed by Mr. Bristow, though he was somewhat wanting in force, the other instruments would have been more effective if they had been stopped somewhat better in time.” The concert and ball was attended by “an immense concourse of beauty and fashion, by far the greater portion of whom remained after the concert was concluded, to ‘trip it on the light fantastic toe.’”

The Euterpean Society’s 1847 concert and ball took place on January 20th of that year. A Henri Bertini sextet was performed, apparently the same one as in the previous year’s concert. There was said to be a very large audience present, “and the greater portion remained, and partook of a ball and a capital set-out of supper, that evening.”

Of the society, the paper said:

When first it came under our notice it was not greatly better than a private, amateur association, of a not very distingué [sic] body of performers, but even then the members were strongly imbued with a love of the science, and a strong determination that their society should at some time become eminent. They have been successful, and like scholars who have a reverence for the alma mater, they cling to the Euterpean although many are also members of the Philharmonic Society of this city, which may be said to have risen out of the “Euterpean.”
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This is quite a strong endorsement of the Euterpean Society’s role in New York’s musical life, particularly as a stepping-stone to the Philharmonic Society.

In some ways, chamber music seems a fitting genre for inclusion in concerts by the city’s musical societies. These performers worked with each other on a fairly regular basis. Since chamber music originated as a domestic activity and is often considered to be the music of friends, it is not surprising that when the city’s musicians worked together in a larger group, that music for the chamber would make its way onto the stage. Further, since high-serious string chamber music has a predominantly Austro-German origin (at this point), it is not surprising that New York’s musicians would perform such works by Hummel, Beethoven, and Reissiger (Bertini being a French exception).

**Resident Artists’ Concerts**

While considering European touring artists who flocked to New York to perform to American audiences, we should not overlook the activities of the city’s resident musicians. The musicians living in New York often gave performances very similar to those of the visiting Europeans. It is easy to see how and why these musicians’ concerts could be a natural platform for the performance of string chamber music, in contrast to the many European touring artists who were often more interested in presenting themselves as virtuosi.

Michele Rapetti was a violinist and conductor of Italian origin. He arrived in the United States in 1832, and from 1835 worked primarily in New York. He was the orchestra leader of several opera companies, and was an active member of the Euterpean Society.\(^{97}\) Rapetti gave a concert on Tuesday, October 4, 1842. In addition to solo violin repertoire, a piano quintet was

performed. A Beethoven “Quintetto—For piano and quartet” was originally advertised to open the concert. The selected piece would have been Beethoven’s Quintet in E flat, Op. 16 (also written for winds with piano), but it was changed to Spohr’s Op. 53 in C Minor. Henry Christian Timm played the piano part with a string quartet led by Uri Corelli Hill. The New World declared Timm’s performance “most brilliant.” It is unclear if Rapetti performed in the quintet.

Rapetti gave another concert during the week before Saturday, February 25, 1843. The New World claimed: “We have not seen so fashionable an audience in a concert room for many months. It was formed from the élite of our society, and must have been a highly gratifying proof of the estimation of the talents of the beneficiare.” Hummel’s Trio in D Minor was performed with William Scharfenberg on piano, and Alfred Boucher on cello. The reviewer commented:

Mr. Scharfenberg’s performance of Hummel’s beautiful trio in D Minor, deserves the highest praise. It was distinguished by a perfect appreciation of his author; rapid and brilliant execution, clearness and precision in articulation, and refinement in taste and expression. We have never to speak of this gentlemen but in terms of praise. Every performance gives evidence of untiring study. His execution of the above piece at the first Philharmonic concert drew down from a crowded audience the most rapturous applause. Mr. Boucher played the violincello in Hummel’s trio. It was an admirable performance, devoid of affectation or trickery; displaying much fine taste and refined feeling. If he would carry the same strict style into his solo playing, he would have but few rivals on this side the Atlantic. Mr. Timm conducted, and his accompaniments to Mrs. Loder’s songs were, as usual, masterly.

Mrs. Loder (Elizabeth Mary Watson), following the collapse of her marriage to the British composer Edward Loder, had abandoned a promising career in England to start a new life, and

---

98 New York Herald, 4 October 1842, 3.
99 New York Herald, 4 October 1842, 3.
100 New World, 8 October 1842, 240.
101 New World, 25 February 1843, 245.
102 New World, 25 February 1843, 245.
arrived in the United States in 1840. She had been performing regularly in other people’s concerts since her arrival, but she finally gave one of her own on Monday, March 20, 1843. The press noted a “crowded and fashionable” audience was in attendance. Also that: “[t]he room was filled at an early hour by the elite of the city. Indeed, all those who love music, and patronize for that love’s sake, were to be seen among the audience.” Tickets were priced at 50 cents, “in accordance with the times.”

Hummel’s Military Septet, Op. 114, was performed for here for the first time in New York. Lawrence lists the performers as Rapetti and Marks (violin), J. A. Kyle (flute), George Loder (double bass, cousin of Edward Loder108), and W. Musgriff (cello). However, a somewhat different roster is listed in the review, as seen below. The advertisement stated that the Septet would “alone be worth the price of admission.” The review said of the piece:

> It is a composition abounding in beauties peculiar [to] the author’s style. Melodies which, for grace, pathos, and elegance have never been excelled—passages which, though learned in [the] extreme, never merge into crudeness. Hummel stands alone as writer for the piano; and his works will live when the idiosyncratic productions of Thalberg, Listz [sic], and others of the Monster School [are] quietly sleeping with the past.

This quote anticipates the idea of the canon. The critic expresses the idea that Hummel’s music will achieve, if not permanence, at least a great deal of longevity. He also suggests that Hummel’s music will outlive that of Franz Liszt, but it is probably accurate to say that Liszt’s music generally receives more attention today than that of Hummel.
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Of the performers, it said:

Mr. Timm’s performance in this Septette was distinguished by [his] usual excellencies of touch, taste, and flexibility of finger. [The] charm of his playing consists not in his mechanical power, which [is] great, but in the perfect appreciation of the style and feeling of [the] author. Mr. Marks took the violin part. We have never [heard] this gentleman in public as a solo player. We hope to do so, for [he] exhibits all that is requisite to make a fine player. His tone is [?] firm, and telling; his execution is clear and distinct; his [stopping] true, and his style strictly classical. We should judge that [?] arduous duties prevent him doing himself justice as a solo player; but a man of his talent should make time. Mr. Musgrove was the violincello. This gentleman is also new to us. We have seldom heard a more faultless tone than that he produces. There was not much room for the display of his powers in the Septette, but there was sufficient to lead us to admire the pure tone, the expression, style, and smoothness in this gentleman’s performance. Messrs. Saur, Kyle, and Mason completed the Septette, and to their admirable playing we must attribute the perfection of the whole. This was certainly the instrumental gem of the evening, and gave universal satisfaction. We trust to hear it repeated entire.112

The use of the word “entire” in the last sentence is given greater meaning in an advertisement for a later concert to include the piece: “Among other pieces, will be performed […] Hümmel’s grand military septette entire—a portion only having been performed at Mrs. Loder’s concert, in consequence of the lateness of the hour.”113 Apparently the septet was not fully completed, because the concert had run longer than anticipated. This may provide further evidence to the state of sacralization at this point in time. As sacralization progressed, a multi-movement composition became seen as a whole and complete work. To leave off some movements, during a performance of the work, would be to leave it incomplete, one might say. The willingness to do so because the concert was running late suggests that this idea had not yet advanced so far.

Henry Christian Timm gave a concert on Tuesday, April 18, 1843 at the Apollo Saloon. Here, Hümmel’s Military Septet, Op. 114 was performed in its entirety, as opposed to the abridged

---

112 New World, 1 April 1843, 398-399. [?] indicates that a word on the edge of the page was cut off during the microfilm scanning.
113 New World, 8 April 1843, 427.
version heard at Mrs. Loder’s concert. The piano part was split up for four hands, played by Timm and Alpers. Philharmonic members performed the other parts.114

A review in The New World declared:

Hummel’s septette was charmingly played throughout. On each performance it gains fresh admiration; but we must condemn the departure from the author’s score. Turning the piano solo into a duett, had certainly the effect of rendering the piano part more brilliant, but it entirely spoiled many of the delicate and beautiful instrumental points. It was, to say the least, ill-judged.115

This passage serves as an example of reverence for the work-concept, and opposition to any alteration of the original score. Lydia Goehr writes on this subject:

Allying themselves again with all creators of fine art, composers began to conceive of their works as discrete, perfectly formed, and completed products. Music soon acquired a kind of untouchability which, translated into concrete terms, meant that persons could no longer tamper with composers’ works. The demand that one’s works be left alone was rationalized according to the romantic belief that the internal form and content of each such work was inextricably unified, or by the belief that works were specified in toto according to an underlying or transcendent truth. That a work’s determining idea was an expression of an individually inspired genius effectively meant that its content was necessarily elusive and not subject, therefore, to mundane description or change. That being so, that practical outcome was to instill fear in those who dared to touch a work, on the grounds that they would probably damage it irreparably and forever.116

So the performers’ “departure from the author’s score” may have yielded aesthetic results with which the reviewer may have disagreed; and his allegiance to Hummel’s original score seems to be tied to the work-concept, as described by Goehr.

Mrs. Sutton was a soprano from New Orleans who had been singing in New York since at least 1838.117 She gave her “farewell” concert on Wednesday, May 17, 1843. The Anglo American stated, “Mrs. Sutton is on the eve of departure, as we are informed, for Italy.”118

114 Lawrence, Resonances, 183.
115 New World, 29 April 1843, 518.
116 Goehr, Imaginary Museum, 222.
117 Lawrence, Resonances, 49.
118 Anglo American, 20 May 1843, 94.
However, she would continue singing in New York for quite some time, not leaving until early summer of 1844. She would never return to the United States.\textsuperscript{119} The “farewell” concert included a performance of a trio by the Austrian violinist and composer Joseph Mayseder (1789-1863). The trio was performed by William Scharfenberg (piano), Alfred Boucher (cello), and Jules Bley (violin). It was:

\begin{quote}
\begin{flushleft}
a perfect gem of composition, and was given in a style superior to anything we have heard in America; but it was somewhat out of place, the piano predominating over the delicate touches of the violin and the violoncello; it would have been much more effective in a room. The general performance of Mr. Bley was quite confirmatory of the opinion which his former efforts had produced. He is a master in the severe school of the violin.\textsuperscript{120}
\end{flushleft}
\end{quote}

The \textit{Anglo American}, on June 3, 1843, reported unusually on a private gathering at the home of M. Gaillardet, the editor of the \textit{Courrier des Etats Unis}:

\begin{quote}
\begin{flushleft}
It is by no means our plan or intention to enter into reports of private assemblages, but that which we are now about to occupy ourselves is of so artistic and semi-public a nature that we should deem ourselves guilty of a sin of omission did we not notice it under our musical head.\textsuperscript{121}
\end{flushleft}
\end{quote}

Among the works performed, was a trio by Mayseder (played by Boucher (cello), Timm (piano), and Rapetti (violin)). The \textit{Anglo American} remarked:

\begin{quote}
\begin{flushleft}
Such a night as we have endeavoured to describe will be long remembered by the dilettanti and gentlemen who were present; it adds one more assurance that the taste for refined music is becoming daily more and more firmly established, and at one glance it shews what an assemblage of musical talent in every department there is now in the city. Why could we not have, at this juncture, a grand musical celebration which might be remembered hereafter as the beginning of an era.\textsuperscript{122}
\end{flushleft}
\end{quote}

This notice gives a rare and valuable glimpse into the domestic performances held in private homes, which generally were not reported in the press. It shows a growing predilection for classical music among the “dilettanti and gentleman” of New York.

\textsuperscript{119} Lawrence, \textit{Resonances}, 224.
\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Anglo American}, 20 May 1843, 94.
\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Anglo American}, 3 June 1843, 142.
\textsuperscript{122} \textit{Anglo American}, 3 June 1843, 142.
The flutist W. J. Davis gave a concert on Monday, April 22, 1844 at the Apollo Rooms. He was “assisted by a large Orchestra comprising Forty of the most eminent Musicians in the City,” as well as several vocal and featured instrumental artists.\textsuperscript{123} The \textit{Albion} announced: “The admission is 50 cents—such a concert has never been given at such a price.”\textsuperscript{124} There may be some truth to this; recall that ticket prices at William Vincent Wallace’s concerts during the previous year had varied from 50 cents to a dollar, seemingly determined by the size of the accompanying ensemble. To see an orchestra-assisted concert for 50 cents would have been a bargain compared to the costs for other similar performances. A Spohr quintet was listed in the advertised program, to be performed by Timm (piano), Marks (violin), Weigers (viola), Musgriff (double bass), and Davis (flute).\textsuperscript{125} However, the quintet is not mentioned in the concert review.\textsuperscript{126} 

Nearly two years later, Davis would give another concert featuring chamber music, on Thursday, April 16, 1846. An announcement reported: “The programme is classical, and contains many novelties. Two of the two part songs by Mendelssohn which have created such a sensation in Europe, will be sung upon this occasion.”\textsuperscript{127} An advertisement listed “an exquisite sextour by Bertini” to be on the program,\textsuperscript{128} but instead, a quintet by Hummel was performed. The \textit{Albion} commented: “Mr. Timm did all he could, and that all was admirably done, to render justice to Hummel’s beautiful Quintette, but the violin and violincello were so miserably out of tune, and so exceedingly imperfect, that all his fine playing was rendered of no avail.”\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Albion}, 20 April 1844, 196. 
\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Albion}, 20 April 1844, 195. 
\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Albion}, 20 April 1844, 196. 
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Albion}, 27 April 1844, 208. 
\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Albion}, 11 April 1846, 180. 
\textsuperscript{128} \textit{National Press, Journal for the Home}, 11 April 1846, 2. 
\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Albion}, 18 April 1846, 191.
composed only one piano quintet: Op. 87 in E flat for piano, violin, viola, cello, and double bass; it was written in 1802 and published c. 1822. The review seems to have viewed the quintet as a piano-centric work; it mentioned only Timm by name, and stated that “all his fine playing” was thwarted by what appears to have been seen as a supporting cast of strings.

Alfred Boucher, a French cellist, gave a concert on Wednesday, February 7, 1846. Lawrence incorrectly attributed this performance to Wilhelm Boucher, a German tenor. But the *Anglo American* is quite clear:

One of the most respected as well as most talented musicians in this country will have a benefit concert this evening at the Apollo Saloon; we allude to M. Boucher the tasteful violoncellist, who after delighting musical cognoscenti by the skill, and musical amateurs by the sweetness of his performances, for several years in this city, presents himself, we believe, for the first time as a candidate for more substantial marks of approbation than mere applause.

Assisting instrumental artists were Loder, Timm, Rapetti, Weigers, and the members of the “German Quartette party.” The German Quartet ensemble played a string quartet by Spohr, “appropriately nicknamed (for that stormy season) Dem Schnee and Regen,” according to Lawrence.

In September and October 1846, Mademoiselle Rachel, a seventeen-year-old German singer, made a few appearances in New York. She was a student of Johann Kalliwoda, who had come to New York to become gain further instruction under George Loder. Consequently, she does not fit well into either the “touring artist” or “resident artist” category. Her motive was educational, and not as financial as it was for touring artists. At her debut performance on Wednesday, September 16, 1846, George Loder (piano), George Frederick Bristow (violin), and Alfred Boucher (cello)
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performed string trios. As these artists were truly residents of the city (as well as the only reason that Mademoiselle Rachel is mentioned here), this perhaps further justifies the concert’s placement in the resident artist section. Loder, Bristow, and Boucher performed William Sterndale Bennett’s Trio in A Major, Op. 26 (1839), and an unidentified trio by Hummel.

If the string chamber music being performed in New York at this time was overwhelmingly of European origin, this section has hopefully shown that the presence of fresh European soil on one’s shoes was not required to play such music. Musicians living in New York, many American, also participated in the city’s concert scene, and their performances served as platforms for string chamber works as well.

The Subscription Concert and U. C. Hill’s Soirées

Before continuing to a discussion of an important set of string quartet performances, it is necessary to discuss the concept of the subscription concert series. For such performances, individual tickets were not sold; rather, attendance required the purchase of a subscription, forcing the customer to buy tickets to the complete series, rather than to individual concerts. This method helped to mitigate the financial risk associated with putting on a concert series, as it ensured a sizable initial source of revenue. The system was not in itself new, having an established lineage in Europe; and the newly founded New York Philharmonic Society operated on such a subscription system. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, the price per individual ticket in a subscription for the Philharmonic Society’s founding season was 83 cents. However, the subscription itself, providing four tickets for each of the three concerts of the season, required

135 Lawrence, Resonances, 404 (footnote 13).
136 Lawrence, Resonances, 404 (footnote 13).
spending ten dollars. Complaints had been made to the *New-York Mirror* that a one-dollar ticket price was out of the reach for many New Yorkers. That being so, it is fairly clear that a commitment of ten dollars for a concert series would have been all the more economically exclusive. Furthermore, attendance at subscription concerts may have been an indicator of social status. On the subject of concert life in late eighteenth-century London, Simon McVeigh writes:

A critical factor in the rise of public concerts during this period was not the ability to attract large bourgeois audiences but the establishment of subscription concerts within the fashionable week. The subscription was much more than a convenient method of financial planning, for the expense defined prestige and effected social screening. He goes on:

Certainly the principal concerts were aimed at the *bon ton*, and the entire system […] was built on an ‘exclusive principle.’ Exclusivity could be engineered in a number of ways. The subscription system in itself was essentially designed for this purpose. More generally, prices could be maintained at an artificially high level, as at the Pantheon, where the half-guinea entrance fee was specifically designed to exclude “the Bourgeois.”

Obviously, late eighteenth-century London is a different time and place than mid-nineteenth-century New York. But just as subscription series had been economically exclusionary in the British capital in that time, the same was true in the United States during the era studied here. Whether or not “social screening” was a goal of the subscription, as it had been in London, the requirement for a large up-front payment likely made such concerts financially out of reach for the New York’s working-class residents. On the subject of New York’s theatrical life, Lawrence Levine writes:

In 1810 John Howard Payne complained, “The judicious few are very few indeed. They are always to be found in a Theatre, like flowers in a desert, but they are nowhere sufficiently numerous to fill one.” By the second half of the century this was evidently no longer the case. Separate theatres, catering to the “judicious,” appeared in city after city, leaving the other theatres to those whom Payne called “the idle, profligate, and vulgar.” The psychologist

---

Robert Somer has shown the connections between space and status and has argued that “society compensates for blurred social distinctions by clear spatial ones.” Such scholars as Burton J. Bledstein and William R. Taylor have noted the Victorian urge to structure or rationalize space.\textsuperscript{140}

If sacralization, in general, is the separating of the “high” out from among the “low,” then subscription series served this agenda socially by excluding the lower economic classes and associating high art with the domain of the wealthy and “judicious.”

In 1843, violinist Uri Corelli Hill organized and presented, for the first time in the United States, a subscription series of Quartette Soirées, consisting of chamber music, predominantly (though not exclusively) for string quartet. As shown in the previous sections of this chapter, string quartets had been performed at numerous miscellaneous concerts in the city, but according to Lawrence, Hill introduced “Americans to a full program solely devoted to chamber music of the highest quality, principally works for string quartet.”\textsuperscript{141} She further adds that the Hill soirées were “unrelieved by the conventional assistance of vocal and instrumental artists.”\textsuperscript{142} An advertisement in the \textit{New York Herald} announced:

\begin{quote}
SUBSCRIPTION QUARTET SOIREEES OF INSTRUMENTAL CHAMBER MUSIC,—Mr. U. C. Hill[,] associated with Messrs. A. Apelles, G. H. Derwort, and W. H. Hegevind,\textsuperscript{143} will give four Quartet Soirées, consisting of classical productions for stringed instruments. The first one will take place at the Apollo Rooms, March 4\textsuperscript{th}. To commence at 6 P.M. The remaining three will take place at the same rooms on the 18\textsuperscript{th} March, 1\textsuperscript{st} and 15\textsuperscript{th} April. Subscriptions $5 for eight tickets. For further particulars, see circulars and programmes at the music stores.\textsuperscript{144}
\end{quote}

It would appear that the concerts were not very well attended. Lawrence states: “That the series was not sold out is evidenced by a later offer of half-subscriptions at two dollars and fifty

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{141}] Lawrence, \textit{Resonances}, 221.
\item[\textsuperscript{142}] Lawrence, \textit{Resonances}, 222. Original context: “Unlike Hill, however, Rakemann did not venture to offer programs unrelieved by the conventional assistance of vocal and instrumental artists.”
\item[\textsuperscript{143}] W. H. Hegeland, apparently a misprint. It appears as “Hegeland” in a reprint of the advertisement in the \textit{New York Herald} of March 2, 1843, page 3.
\item[\textsuperscript{144}] \textit{New York Herald}, 2 March 1843, 3.
\end{itemize}
cents for four tickets.” Furthermore, *The New World* stated, “That its success has not been greater, is attributable to the fact, that the enlightened portion of the press were not notified of its projection or existence.”

The quartet ensemble consisted of U. C. Hill and A. Apelles on violin, G. H. Derwort on viola, and W. H. Hegelund on cello. There is some discrepancy over the exact repertoire of the early concerts. A review in the *New World* begins: “CLASSICAL QUARTETTE SOIREE.—The first series of these truly classical entertainments was projected and carried out by Mr. U. C. Hill, and two or three gentlemen associated with him.” Later, the review states: “A quartette by Mozart, one by Ries, and another by Beethoven, were given the Saturday before last.”

Lawrence interpreted this as being the first Hill performance: “At Hill’s first concert an unidentified quartet by Mozart was admirably performed—according to Watson—another by Ferdinand Ries was less felicitously given, and one by Beethoven, ‘an enormously difficult and wild work, but wondrously beautiful, was, on the whole, excellently played.’”

However, a problem arises when comparing the content of the review to the advertised dates of the performances. The review in question appeared in the *New World* of Saturday, April 15, 1843. It refers to the Mozart, Ries, and Beethoven quartets as having been “given the Saturday before last.” The Saturday two weeks prior to April 15 was April 1, which according to the original series advertisement, was the third concert out of four, not the first as Lawrence stated. Although it is possible that the article was written with the intention of being published earlier, its publication date, April 15, was the date originally announced for the series’ last performance.

---
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The review ends, “Our space forbids us to particularize, but on the next occasion we shall speak more fully. We cordially recommend these charming concerts to the liberal patronage of the public.”

Assuming that the reviewer intended for the article to be published on April 15, and also knew that there would be only one more Hill performance, it would seem odd to recommend the “charming concerts,” in the plural form. Therefore, the date of the reviewed concert is uncertain, and the repertoire of the early concerts at best, unclear.

Of the reviewed concert, whenever it was held, it was said:

A quartette by Mozart, one by Ries, and another by Beethoven, were given the Saturday before last; that by Mozart was admirably performed, delicately, pointedly, and with expression. Reis’ quartette did not please us much. Though distinguished by many beauties, it is on the whole a labored composition. The performers, too, seemed uncertain throughout, and rendered many parts very ineffectively. The scherzo was taken altogether too slow, and in the andante the time was not sufficiently marked, nor the expression sufficiently pointed. Beethoven’s quartette is enormously difficult and wild, but wondrously beautiful. With but a few exceptions it was admirably played.

The fourth and last soirée was advertised in the Herald:

THE LAST QUARTETTE SOIREE will take place at the Apollo Saloon, on Wednesday evening, 19th inst. On this occasion will be performed Spohr’s Double Quartette, No. 1 for four Violins, two Tenors and two Violoncellos. Also Beethoven’s celebrated Septet, for Violin, Tenor, Violoncello, double Bass, Clarionette, Fogotto, [sic] and French Horn. At the solicitation of several friends, half subscriptions of $2.50 will be received, entitling the subscriber to four tickets. Apply for tickets at Mr. Hoyer’s, 301 Broadway; Stodart, Worcester and Dunham’s, 351 Broadway, or of the undersigned, No. 63 Franklin street. U. C. Hill.

The final concert was originally advertised to be on April 15, but apparently was postponed until the 19th. The additional forces required for the larger chamber ensembles of this concert were members of the Philharmonic Society.
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Perhaps the *New World* review of the unascertained early soirée has its greatest value not in detailing which works were performed on specific dates, but as an excellent example of sacralization and canonization in progress. First, it establishes a musical hierarchy in which quartets are near the top, and explains that only those with a “refined” or “cultivated” taste will understand such works.

We look upon the establishment of these Soirées as an important step toward directing the public taste in the right channel. Quartette music ranks next to the sinfonia and descriptive overture in the scale of instrumental composition; and, like those works, it requires a highly refined musical taste to enable the hearer to fully, or even partially, appreciate its beauties. It has not the aid of language or description of any kind to point out its subject—to direct the mind to its point of interest; it rests entirely upon the strong impression of the subject in the mind of the master, and the lucid manner of portraying that impression through all its relations and ramifications. The cultivated amateur will at once appreciate the beautiful design of the composer, and will trace, in its harmonious structure, the subject worked out in every way—now contracted, reversed; anon extended or elaborated into a thousand beautiful fantastic musical images, all bearing strict relation to one perfect idea.\(^{154}\)

In many ways, the review seems at odds with itself. It credits the soirées with “directing the public taste in the right channel.” But yet it states that the quartet, “requires a highly refined musical taste to enable the hearer to fully, or even partially, appreciate its beauties.” Hence, those lacking a “highly refined” musical taste will be unable to fully, or even only partially, derive any pleasure from this musical genre. Yet, the “cultivated amateur” will “at once appreciate” several aspects.

How is it that the soirées could direct public taste in the “right channel,” yet direct away those who lack the “refined musical taste” or “cultivated” palate? The “refined” and “cultivated,” by the review’s definition, were probably a fairly small percentage of New York’s population. The claim that Hill’s soirées directed public taste contradicts such statements that exclude the vast majority of the city’s public from being able to enjoy such performances.

---
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The review proceeds to glorify the works of specific composers, detailing how the string quartet served as the ultimate genre in which to display their creative genius:

We find in the Quartettes, Quintettes, &c. &c. of Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven, Onslow, Spohr, Reissiger, and others, the most exquisite thoughts that these great men ever conceived. They used this class of composition as the channel through which to pour forth the most secret, beautiful, and impassioned aspirations of their muse; for here they are not restricted to the conventional rule of language, but the imagination is allowed its full and untrammeled flight—now soaring to the sublime, or resting upon the impassioned and tender. These works are as various in their character as the day-dreams which haunt us in our youth—now carrying us beyond the skies, or making an Elysium of earth—anon filling us with indescribable joy or undefinable sorrow, but all the result of impulses of the imagination, lovely in their essence, and too strong to be restrained.\footnote{New World, 15 April 1843, 457-8.}

It continues:

That there can be found, in our mercantile community, so many eager and willing to listen for hours to this refined species of composition, proves satisfactorily that the seeds of a pure taste have not been scattered in vain, but may yet become a goodly tree whose roots shall remain unshaken through time.”\footnote{New World, 15 April 1843, 458.}

Frédéric Louis Ritter, in his 1890 book, \textit{Music in America}, provides the following account from one who was familiar with the Hill concert series:

Mr. Richard Grant White, who was accepted by the past generation of New York musical amateurs as an authority in musical matters, once asserted in his peremptory manner that these \textit{soirées} “were well attended and successful.” I thought at the time I read Mr. White’s rose-colored description of that enterprise that such could not be the case, since neither of these players had any distinction as an executant.\footnote{Ritter, \textit{Music in America}, 290.}

Ritter then provides an account from Samuel Johnson, one of the original violists of the New York Philharmonic Society,\footnote{Roger Paul Phelps, “The History and Practice of Chamber Music in the United States from Earliest Times up to 1875” (PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1951), 338.} who, according to Ritter, “knew well the Hill Quartet.” Johnson stated of the series:

A miserable failure, artistically and financially. It would be gross flattery to call Mr. Hill a third-rate violinist; Apelles was a good clarinet, but a poor violinist; he afterwards became leader of the West Point Band; Lehmann was a good second flute; Hegelund was a bassoon.
player, and naturally best adapted to that instrument; he was a very small sized man, with hands too small to grasp the neck of the ‘cello. The whole enterprise was dead at its conception.\footnote{Ritter, \textit{Music in America}, 290.}

Johnson’s assessment of Hill’s playing roughly concurs with \textit{Brother Jonathan’s} opinion during its review of William Vincent Wallace’s concert on June 15, 1843, discussed earlier in this chapter:

Mr. Timm presided at the piano, and Mr. Marks acted as director of the opening quintette, and the quintette accompaniments, instead of Mr. U. C. Hill, a change decidedly for the better, for Mr. U. C. Hill, with all respect we say it, cannot lead—he frequently plays incorrectly, and he is a bad timeist.\footnote{\textit{Brother Jonathan}, Vol. 5, No. 7, 17 June 1843, 209.}

Hence, the accounts of Uri Corelli Hill’s quartet soirée, and the perhaps disappointing ticket sales evidenced by the later offer of half-subscriptions, indicate—on balance—that Hill’s series was not as successful as might have been hoped. Further, Hill never again attempted the endeavor. It would be over another six years before the first seeds of a string chamber music concert series would be planted again.

In this chapter, many contextual elements surrounding chamber music performances in New York City from 1842 through November 1849 have been shown. The most notable is the variety of musicians, ensembles, and types of concerts in which these works were generally performed. By and large, string chamber works were one of usually several genres of pieces performed in concerts. Uri Corelli Hill’s string chamber concert series was certainly the exception to the norm during these years, but the beginning of further such attempts would soon commence.
Chapter III: Saroni and Eisfeld Chamber Music Series, December 1849-April 1851; Miscellaneous Performances, December 1849-1852

To this point in the study, performances of string chamber works have occurred almost always as just a portion of a concert, usually mixed with various other types of pieces. The genre had received primary emphasis during only one series of performances, produced by Uri Corelli Hill. The scarcity of performances primarily dedicated to string chamber music, and the lack of success for what little there was, is important to restate. This would not be the case forever though, as the path toward regular string chamber performances in New York was about to commence.

Saroni’s Musical Times as Concert Giver

On November 3rd, 1849, the weekly periodical Saroni’s Musical Times, a new periodical that released its opening issue on September 29 of that year,1 made the following announcement:

CONCERT OF CLASSICAL MUSIC.
We have made arrangements for a soiree [sic] musicale, in which a series of quatuors for stringed instruments and other classical compositions will be performed. We have been promised the assistance of Messrs. Joseph Burke, Alfred Boucher, Otto Dresel, The. Eisfeld, Wm. Scharfenberg, and others, and we hope that our musical dilettanti will avail themselves of this occasion to become acquainted with a style of music, for hearing which, opportunities are rare.

Tickets of admission will be sold to our subscribers only, and will be given gratuitously to those who have paid their subscription on or before the 15th of this month. The soiree [sic] will be given in the Apollo Rooms during the last week in November or the first week in December. For further particulars see our next number.2

And with this, plans commenced for a concert of predominantly string chamber music, the first of this type in New York since the U. C. Hill series in 1843. It seems quite unusual that a periodical should sponsor a concert series. In modern times, the media should ideally be non-
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biased presenters of current events, so the idea of a news source organizing, presenting, and promoting a concert would definitely be a substantial overreach of the media’s role as we see it today. The founding of Saroni’s Musical Times had been recently discussed in the Message Bird:

SARONI’S MUSICAL TIMES.—This is the title of a new weekly journal “devoted to Music, Literature, and the Fine Arts;” by which the latter term we presume he means sculpture and painting. It is edited by Mr. H. S. Saroni, a teacher of music in this city. There is no surer way, probably, of awakening, directing and refining the dormant musical taste of this country than by the circulation of periodicals devoted exclusively to the object. We are a nation of newspaper readers; ambitious of acquirements, but, as a general thing, without leisure or patience to scan the progressive unfoldings of science in books, we are the more anxious to glean what of value may be gathered in the newspapers. Hence it is by newspapers that we are effectually to stimulate the public mind to be properly affectioned in the matter of music. The more of the right sort of these there are in the field, the sooner will the desired result be accomplished. We therefore wish the “Times,” all possible success. It is published at $2 per year, in advance.

These two journals made their appearance at roughly the same time: The Message Bird in August 1849, and Saroni’s Musical Times, a month later. According to Lawrence: “Thus, two lively vehicles for the divergent pursuit of professedly similar musical goals came into juxtaposition.”

Given the last name “Saroni,” one might assume that the critic was of Italian background, but that is not the case. Hermann S. Saroni was born in Bernburg, Germany in February 1824. In Grove, David Francis Urrows gives us more on Saroni’s life:

American composer, author, and publisher of German birth. Saroni received his musical training in Germany, and referred to himself as a student of Mendelssohn. In 1844 he applied for naturalization in New York, where he later edited Saroni’s Musical Times between 1849 and 1851. [...] Through critical writing and translating, he helped to spread German pedagogical approaches to music education and appreciation in America, while his English-language parlor songs demonstrate a shift away from bel canto traditions towards a lied-influenced style in this genre.
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Saroni’s desire to promote serious string chamber music in New York was likely influenced by his German upbringing and musical education. Many of the other musicians involved in Saroni’s concerts were also recent immigrants from Germany.

*Saroni’s Musical Times* unveiled more details about the upcoming performance in following issues. On November 10, 1849, the publication announced its completion of arrangements; the concert was to take place at the Apollo Rooms on December 1, and numerous artists had “volunteered their services” (a point I shall return to). Miss Julia Northall, Joseph Burke, Otto Dresel, Theodor Eisfeld, Francis Habordt, Mr. Noll, and William Scharfenberg were listed as the artists.

Julia Northall was a “young American soprano,” whose father was a local playwright, dentist, and editor of the *Brooklyn Daily Advertiser*.8 The presence of a vocalist on a chamber music concert was not an unusual occurrence, as we would typically think today. In fact, the norm was to include a variety of genres in one performance. Writing about concert formats in nineteenth-century New York, Nancy B. Reich states: “During the years 1848 to 1898, concerts generally followed a format similar to that of European concerts: an overture, arias, lieder, a concerto, instrumental solos, and similar works might all appear on the same program.”9

Joseph Burke (1819-1902) was an Irish-born10 violinist who, after a childhood career on the New York stage (1830-1839) as an actor and a violinist, spent a year in Europe studying with Charles de Bériot, and returned to New York in 1845.11

---

8 Lawrence, *Resonances*, 279.
10 Lawrence, *Resonances*, 654.
11 Lawrence, *Resonances*, 353.
With the exception of Burke, the cast of pianists and string players on Saroni’s concert were heavily German-dominated. William Scharfenberg, a pianist mentioned frequently in the previous chapter, was born in Kassel, Germany, in 1819.\footnote{Spencer A. Huston, “Scharfenberg, William,” in Grove Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/A2085554 (accessed October 8, 2012).} Grove states:

A student of Hummel and Spohr, he made his New York début at the Apollo Salon on 15 November 1838. He was highly praised as a pianist, accompanist, and chamber musician. Many accounts document him accompanying important singers and instrumentalists of New York during the mid-nineteenth century. He also performed piano duos, collaborating with Daniel Schlesinger, Frederick Rakemann, Otto Dresel, and Henry C. Timm, whom Scharfenberg called his “twin brother” because of their frequent appearances together.\footnote{Spencer A. Huston, “Scharfenberg, William,” in Grove Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/A2085554 (accessed October 8, 2012).}


Otto Dresel (piano) and Theodor Eisfeld (viola) were recent immigrants from Germany, having come to New York during the so-called “Foreign Invasion of 1848.”\footnote{“The Foreign Invasion of 1848” is a section title in Chapter VI of Howard and Bellows, A Short History of Music in America, 114.} Dresel, also a composer, was born in Geisenheim am Rhein 1826.\footnote{John Gillespie and David Francis Urrows, "Dresel, Otto," in Grove Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/A2085054 (accessed October 8, 2012).} According to Grove:

He studied briefly with Liszt in Weimar and, on advice from Ferdinand Hiller, later with Moritz Hauptmann in Leipzig. Here he had further guidance from Mendelssohn and Schumann. In 1848 he left Germany for New York. He supported himself as a teacher and pianist, and appeared as a soloist and in ensembles with, however, only slight success. After a year in London (1851–2) he settled in Boston […]. Through his repertory, tastes, and standards he exercised a strong influence on the formation of the classical music canon in America.\footnote{John Gillespie and David Francis Urrows, "Dresel, Otto," in Grove Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/A2085054 (accessed October 8, 2012).}
Theodor Eisfeld was born in Wolfenbüttel 1816. Grove states: “He studied violin with Karl Müller in Brunswick and composition with K.G. Reissiger in Dresden. Eisfeld conducted the Wiesbaden court theater from 1839 to 1843, then led the Concerts Viviennes in Paris. He also studied with Rossini in Bologna.” After immigrating to New York, Eisfeld quickly became one of the city’s prominent conductors. Grove provides more detail:

Eisfeld arrived in New York in 1848, and in the spring of 1849 conducted a concert of the New York Philharmonic Society with such success that he was engaged to conduct three of the four concerts in the 1849–50 season. These part-time engagements continued until Eisfeld became the first conductor entrusted with a complete season in 1852–3. […] Eisfeld was a member of the Society’s board of directors from 1850 to 1866, serving as vice president from 1856.

As stated in Saroni’s Musical Times on November 10, 1849, the program for the chamber performance was to contain: “Quatuor in D-minor, by Mozart, Scena from Oberon, Quatuor for Piano and Stringed Instruments, by Otto Dresel, Quatuor in E flat-major, by Beethoven, three songs by Taubert, Robert Franz and Otto Dresel, and Trio in D-minor, by Mendelssohn.” Lawrence lists this repertoire as that being that which Northall “was programmed” to sing, and which the others “would perform.” However, this announced program would change significantly before the actual performance.

The advertisement continued:

The names of the performers warrant the good execution of these pieces, and the reputation of the composers is such, that we need not urge our subscribers to avail themselves of their privileges and attend this soiree [sic] of classical music.

All of the performers have kindly volunteered their services, partly in compliment to ourselves, and partly in encouragement of our journal.

20 Saroni’s Musical Times, 10 November 1849, 75.
21 Lawrence, Resonances, 609.
Tickets will be issued gratuitously to those of our subscribers who have paid their subscription for the year, and extra tickets can be procured of our carrier, or at our office, by subscribers only, at fifty cents.  

At this point, there are several items worthy of notice. First, Saroni was organizing, financing, and promoting a concert consisting primarily of string chamber music (though with some songs) at a time when such a thing was never done in New York. It seems likely that he would have been aware of Uri Corelli Hill’s less-than-successful attempt to do the same in 1843. But at the least, he probably would have known that embarking on this medium would carry a great deal of risk. Chiefly, putting on a concert required a fair amount of monetary investment, without a guaranteed return. Typically one had to compensate the musicians rehearsing and performing in the concert, pay to advertise the performance in order to gain an audience, as well as rent a venue.

Obtaining a venue could be quite an expensive endeavor. The Message Bird, on May 15, 1850, included an article about P. T. Barnum’s production of the concert tour of Swedish vocalist Jenny Lind. The publication speculates as to the likelihood of Barnum turning a profit, and in doing so, it provides valuable details about the cost of venue rental:

Much speculation has been rife as to whether Barnum will be a loser by his liberal course in reference to Jenny Lind, and as a sort of answer to many queries put to ourself in respect to the result, we have taken the trouble to compare the rents and capacities of different halls in the city, proposing $2 per head to be the rate of admission, and taking 30 nights as a run. We begin with the least capacious hall, the Apollo Rooms:

\[
\begin{array}{l|c}
\text{Apollo Rooms, holding 1600 persons, at $2 per head,} & 96,000 \\
\text{Deduct Rent, $50 per night, 30 nights,} & 1,500 \\
\hline
\text{94,500} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l|c}
\text{Niblo’s, 1,800 persons,} & 108,000 \\
\text{Deduct Rent, $100 per night} & 3,000 \\
\hline
\text{105,000} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l|c}
\text{Chinese, 1,800 persons,} & 108,000 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[22\text{ Saroni’s Musical Times, 10 November 1849, 75.}\]
Deduct Rent, $50 per night,  
1,500  
106,500

Opera House, 2,000 persons,  
Deduct Rent, $200 per night,  
120,000  
6,000  
114,000

Tabernacle, 2,500 persons,  
Deduct Rent, $75 per night,  
150,000  
2,150  
147,850

As reported by the *Message Bird*, the nightly rental fee for the Apollo Rooms was fifty dollars in May 1850. Assuming that this figure had not changed significantly since the prior November and December, it indicates the approximate cost that Saroni would have faced in renting the Apollo Rooms for his chamber music soirees. Given the substantial cost of renting the venue, compensating performers (if he had), in combination with the general public’s apparent relative lack of thirst for Austro-German string chamber music, Saroni would have been making a dangerous financial gamble in producing this concert. Consequently, there are numerous ways it appears that Saroni attempted to save on costs, and hence, minimize his financial risk.

First, and most obviously, the performers for this concert had “volunteered their services, partly in compliment” to Saroni, “and partly in encouragement of” the journal. Hence, Saroni eliminated the significant cost of employing musicians, as they were working for free. Next, a number of tickets to the concert were given “gratuitously,” without charge, to subscribers of *Saroni’s Musical Times*. In all likelihood, Saroni was partially subsidizing the cost of the performance with earnings from his periodical, the annual subscription to which was two dollars, according to the *Message Bird*.

---

24 *Saroni’s Musical Times*, 10 November 1849, 75.
But most importantly, Saroni was probably attempting to attract more subscribers to his journal, which was still barely over a month old when the first concert was announced. As stated in the journal, one had to have been a subscriber to receive the initially-distributed free tickets, and only Saroni’s subscribers could purchase additional tickets. Effectively, anyone not subscribing to *Saroni’s Musical Times* was unable to attend, without a connection to a subscriber. This had the effect of making the soirée more exclusive, and perhaps as a result, interested parties would be encouraged to subscribe to the new periodical. But further, by limiting the audience membership to his own journal subscribers and their friends, Saroni eliminated the need to advertise in other papers. Anyway, advertising could be done in his own journal for free. By employing these strategies, Saroni set up the performance under favorable financial conditions, increasing the probability of commercial success.

More details emerged in the November 24th issue of the periodical. A “Mr. Muller,” a singer from the Imperial Theatre at Vienna, was to appear in the concert:

>This gentleman has a voice of surpassing power and fullness, and his method and style entitle him to be ranked amongst the first artists of the day. The selection of music will be such a one, as to give a general view of the best masters of the different ages from Handel down to this day. The chamber music there performed for the first time in this country will be quite a novel feature…\(^\text{26}\)

It is important to note the canonizing language, emphasizing composers who were the “best masters of the different ages,” particularly citing Handel as among them.

Saroni’s advertisement, after declaring the restriction of ticket availability to journal subscribers, generously informs the readers: “Subscriptions for this paper also will be received at Scharfenberg and Luis’, 483 Broadway; Vanderbeek’s, 479 Broadway; Kerksieg and Breusing,

\(^{26}\) *Saroni’s Musical Times*, 24 November 1849, 99.
421 Broadway, and at all the principal Music Stores in the city.”\textsuperscript{27} It seems fair to conclude that Saroni was making use of the concert, in part, as a means of increasing his magazine subscribership and income.

The last advertisement, with the finalized program, did not appear until the day of the performance, December 1, 1849. It further clarifies the ticketing policy: “Every subscriber, having paid his subscription for the year, will be entitled to one ticket, gratis. Extra tickets will be sold at Fifty Cents each to OUR SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, and can be had of our carrier, at our office, and at the door on the evening of the Concert. SARONI & Co., 251 Broadway.”\textsuperscript{28} The listed program was:

\textbf{QUATUOR, \textit{D-minor}, } \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \textit{Mozart.}

Performed by MESSRS. JOSEPH BURKE, THEODORE EISFELDT, FRANCIS HARBORDT AND MR. NOLL.

\textbf{*REST THEE, GENTLY REST,} \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \textit{Taubert.}\}

\textbf{FLOWERS OF MAY, } \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \textit{Otto Dresel.}\}

\textbf{THE CHARMER, } \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \textit{Mendelssohn.}\}

By MISS JULIA L. NORTHELL.

\textbf{TRIO, \textit{B-Flat-major,} } \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \textit{Beethoven.}

Allegro Moderato.
Scherzo.
Andante Cantabile.
Allegro Moderato.

Performed by WM. SCHARFENBERG, ALFRED BOUCHER, and JOSEPH BURKE.

\textbf{-----------}

\textbf{THE DIVISION OF THE EARTH } \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \textit{Haydn.}\textsuperscript{29}

By H. MUELLER, from the Imperial Theatre, at Vienna.

\textbf{SCENA, from “Der Freischütz,” } \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \textit{Weber.}

By MISS NORTHELL.

\textbf{TRIO, \textit{D-minor,} } \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \textit{Mendelssohn.}

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times}, 24 November 1849, 99.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times}, 1 December 1849, 110.

\textsuperscript{29} Probably from \textit{The Creation.}
Performed by OTTO DRESEL, JOSEPH BURKE, and AL-FRED BOUCHER.

Concert to commence at 8 o’clock.

*This song has been published in Saroni’s Musical Times, extra copies of which can be had at the Publication Office.  

As is evident, the final program varied quite substantially from the one advertised on November 10. The emphasis of the concert seems to be on the string chamber works by Mozart, Beethoven, and Mendelssohn, with vocal selections interspersed between them. The presence of vocal selections, however, stands in contrast to the U. C. Hill soirees, which had consisted entirely of string works.  

At this point, a mix of instrumentation and genres was the norm for public concerts. In describing public recitals, William Weber writes:

The use of ‘recital’ to describe a solo concert marked a major departure from the conventions of concert-giving. Since the early 18th century, most concerts put on by a musician in his or her own name […] involved a variety of performers, both vocal and instrumental […] The chief aim of such an event was not necessarily for the sponsor to display musical prowess and artistry, which was best done privately, but rather to demonstrate publicly the prominence of one's musical colleagues and patrons, and thereby to gain well-paid teaching engagements.  

Christina Bashford, in writing about nineteenth-century European string chamber music performances with mixed-genre programs including vocal pieces, describes that a set of:

[…] concerts in Paris presented instrumental repertory only (typically five ensemble works and one violin solo, played […] with piano accompaniment), whereas the longer programmes of many London concerts, which included piano and duo sonatas as well as works for larger instrumental ensembles, were relieved by the interspersion of songs and duets between the instrumental items; the programmes of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde concerts [in Vienna] offered few large-scale instrumental chamber works, being chiefly made up of small-scale instrumental and vocal pieces (including a number of Schubert’s lieder), usually with a string quartet to open proceedings and a work for vocal ensemble (often one of Schubert’s vocal quartets) to end.

---

30 Saroni’s Musical Times, 1 December 1849, 110.
31 A possible exception is that the last Hill soirée (April 19, 1843) featured Beethoven’s Septet, Op. 20, which includes wind instruments (clarinet, bassoon, French horn).
The interspersion of vocal pieces between string chamber works stands in stark contrast to the standard today of programming only string quartets at string quartet recitals. The U. C. Hill soirées were incredibly forward-looking in that sense; such a program format would not become the standard until the early twentieth century.\textsuperscript{34}

Returning to the Saroni concert, we note that the listed program began with a quartet in d minor by Mozart. Mozart composed two string quartets in d minor, K. 173 (1773) and K. 421 (1783),\textsuperscript{35} but the piece performed was more likely K. 421. Of piano trios in B-flat major, Beethoven composed a single-movement Allegretto, woo39 (1812); the Op. 11, for piano, clarinet or violin, and cello (1797); and the Op. 97 “Archduke” (1810-11).\textsuperscript{36} The trio at the Saroni performance must have been the Op. 97 “Archduke,” as it is the only Beethoven piano trio in B-flat major with four movements, each of which correspond in title to those listed in the program. Mendelssohn composed only one trio for piano, violin, and cello in d minor, the Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 49 (1839).\textsuperscript{37} That the movement titles were displayed for the Beethoven trio, but not the other chamber works, suggests the possibility that the Mozart and Mendelssohn may not have been performed in entirety, but perhaps only a single movement of each. However, one can only speculate, lacking further evidence.

Following the performance, on December 8, 1849, \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times} announced:

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[34]{“Instrumental concert programmes began to crystallize into formats of three or four contrasting works by different composers (and often including one modern work) during the 1920s and 30s, as the diversity of programming characteristic of the 19th century began to be replaced by a new homogeneity. Song recital programmes developed similar coherence.” See Christina Bashford, "Chamber music," in \textit{Grove Music Online}, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/05379 (accessed August 3, 2013).}
\end{footnotes}
CONCERT OF CLASSICAL MUSIC
FOR OUR SUBSCRIBERS

In mentioning this entertainment at all, we do it merely to inform our readers abroad that it has taken place, and to return thanks to all who assisted us on the occasion. Indeed it was, as if every artist engaged in it had but one object in view: to make it a truly classical entertainment. There was no striving for effect; no indifferent music to mar the enjoyment; there was nothing to disturb the tone, if we may so call it, of the concert.

A glance at our prospectus will explain to our readers the object of the concert. It was given, neither to increase our subscription list, nor for the sake of any pecuniary gain, but simply to carry out our original design; “to lead the cultivators and lovers of music to the exercise of a correct taste, and to a knowledge of the noblest ends and purposes of music.” It was for this reason that the music at the concert was selected from the very best masters; it was for this reason that all the performers threw aside minor considerations and only aimed at the perfect rendering of master works; IT IS FOR THIS REASON ALSO, THAT WE HAVE MADE ARRANGEMENTS FOR A SERIES OF SIMILAR CONCERTS, TO WHICH OUR SUBSCRIBERS WILL BE ADMITTED, FREE OF CHARGE.38

Just as it was unusual by today’s standards for a news source to produce a concert, it would seem similarly questionable to write a review of one’s own concert. Saroni seems to be downplaying his involvement in this manner, claiming to mention the performance “merely to inform” his readers of its having occurred, and to “return thanks” to those who assisted. But he then journeys into more promotional language, citing the concert’s aim of “truly classical entertainment,” followed by more positive remarks.

After testing the waters with a first performance, it appears that the concert’s success was sufficient to undertake further similar endeavors. Saroni denied the existence of financial motivation in programming the first concert, maintaining that the performance was not given to increase his journal subscriptions. However, one must be fairly skeptical of this. Otherwise, why limit the sale of extra tickets to his subscribership? Saroni’s goal was to gain new subscribers from among the New Yorkers interested in attending the concert. Effectively, any non-subscribers desiring to attend would have needed to become a subscriber, or to procure tickets

38 *Saroni’s Musical Times*, 8 December 1849, 123.
from a subscriber. If Saroni’s main concern had been the commercial success of the concert, then it would make more sense to allow anyone to purchase a ticket. But by limiting the ticket sales as he did, Saroni maximized the incentive for interested parties to purchase a journal subscription. Saroni even used all capital letters when he announced that additional tickets are available to “OUR SUBSCRIBERS ONLY.” And as stated previously, his advertisement kindly informed readers of where to purchase subscriptions to his periodical. Saroni seems to have been concealing his own commercial goals.

The downplaying of commercial motives has its roots in Romanticism’s rise in Europe. As stated by T. C. W. Blanning: “The high culture of nineteenth-century Europe was shaped by a tension between two opposing concepts of art: between art as consumerism and art as redemption. What should take priority: making money or saving mankind?” Blanning later explains the artistic contempt for the commercial in this context:

Everywhere, commercialization and industrialization brought democratization: but, in the eyes of Europe’s cultural élites, popularization had become synonymous with vulgarization. […] Of all the cultural stereotypes created by the romantics of the early nineteenth century, the most durable has been the bourgeois Philistine. The modern (as opposed to the biblical) use of the word ‘Philistine’ was invented by German students as a term of abuse to describe the town burghers they both envied—for their wealth—and despised—for their materialism. That contribution of two powerful if unattractive emotions led to the intelligentsia distancing itself from the rest of the population, fleeing an increasingly commercialized society for the austere purity of the bohemian garret.

Much of Saroni’s denial of financial motivation in this concert was likely designed to portray the event as being “art as redemption,” rather than “art as consumerism,” to use Blanning’s words. Additionally, it is important to note Saroni’s efforts of sacralization, as he intended “to lead the

---

cultivators and lovers of music to the exercise of a correct taste,” and also canonization, having proclaimed the selected composers as being “the very best masters.”

On January 12, 1850, it was announced that the second concert would occur on Saturday evening, January 19, 1850, at Hope Chapel. Artists were to include Madame Stephani, “an artist of extraordinary talent and capacity,” Madame Lazare, “so justly celebrated for her superior attainments on the Harp,” as well as Mr. Eisfeld, Mr. Eichhorn, Mr. Noll, Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Wm. Scharfenberg. It was further announced, “The Æolian Piano-forte, as manufactured by T. Gilbert & Co., Boston, will be introduced by Mr. B.[H?] Saroni, in a series of compositions, expressly arranged for it.” The listed “Schmidt” might have been Henry Schmidt, a German violinist who was a pupil of Spohr. Lawrence lists Henry Schmidt as being one of the “most often heard instrumentalists” in New York concerts during 1836. L. Eichhorn was a German cellist who would play an important role in New York’s public string chamber music concerts. Additionally, it is important to note the conspicuous mentioning of T. Gilbert & Co.’s “Æolian Piano-forte.”

Regarding the financial aspects, the same policy as before remained in place: each subscriber who had paid their subscription for the year was entitled to one free ticket, with additional tickets for purchase only by subscribers at 50 cents each. Even though Saroni had previously stated that his intention was not to increase subscriptions to his journal, he announced in this advertisement: “For the convenience of those who wish to become subscribers, or to pay their subscription, a

---

41 Perhaps a less expensive venue. A concert review in Chapter V will compare it unfavorably against the Apollo Rooms.
42 Saroni’s Musical Times, 12 January 1850, 183.
43 Lawrence, Resonances, 679.
44 Lawrence, Resonances, 32.
45 Lawrence, Resonances, 32.
book will be open at the door on the same evening.”

How generous of Saroni to be altruistically unconcerned with attracting subscribers, yet selflessly make it possible for audience members to purchase subscriptions at the door! He further revealed that two more concerts would be given during the season. Saroni stated, regarding the Æolian Piano-forte, “which will be introduced at that concert, we can only say, that our objective in performing is not to enter the list of pianists, but only to illustrate practically, what we said in some former number of our journal, and to show the variety of effects this instrument is capable of.” Here, Saroni creates visibility, and promotes the sales, of T. Gilbert & Co.’s instrument. T. Gilbert & Co. was an advertiser in Saroni’s Musical Times. As an example:

T. GILBERT & CO., 400 WASHINGTON-ST., BOSTON. Manufacturers of Coleman’s Patent Æolian—take these means of informing the public, that they are exhibiting at the Fair, Castle Garden, a number of their Pianos, which for brilliancy of tone, excellency of touch and solidity of material, challenge competition. The Æolian Attachment can be [illegible] with or without the Piano, and being entirely independent of the mechanism of the piano, does not injure it in the least, while it affords the most beautiful combinations of two different elements. Four of these pianos have been sold at the Fair; and all who have previously bought such instruments, are unanimous in recommending them, and for their superiority over other attachments for beauty of tone and durability.

In a sudden change, the January 19 issue of Saroni’s Musical Times announced the postponement of the second concert to Monday, January 21. The reason was to avoid an interference with a Saturday concert of the Hungarian violinist, Ede Reményi, whose assisting artists were to include several of Saroni’s personnel: Stephani, Eisfeld, and Scharfenberg.

(Reményi, in 1848, had been “involved in the Hungarian uprising against Austria, as a result of which he was exiled and left for the USA, where he resumed his career as a virtuoso.”

---

47 Saroni’s Musical Times, 12 January 1850, 183.
48 Saroni’s Musical Times, 12 January 1850, 183.
49 Saroni’s Musical Times, 12 January 1850, 184.
50 Saroni’s Musical Times, 27 October 1849, 54.
Furthermore, since there was no opera performance on that Monday night, “many of our
subscribers will be enabled to attend, who would otherwise have been prevented.”52
The advertised program for the January 21 concert was:
PROGRAMME
QUATUOR, .
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
Mozart.
By MESSRS. EISFELDT, NOLL, EICHHORN AND SCHMIDT.
ARIA DI CONCERTO,

.

.
.
.
.
By MADAME STEPHANI

.

.

FANTASIE for Harp and Piano,
.
.
.
.
.
.
By MADAME LAZARE AND MR. SCHARFENBERG.
SONG,

.

.

.

.
.
.
.
By MR. JULES HECHT.

IMPROMPTU FOR THE ÆOLIAN PIANO,
QUATUOR, .

.

.


.

.

.

--------------.
.

Labarre.

.

Mendelssohn.

.

.

By Mr. Saroni.*

.

.

.

Fesca.

.

.

Mozart.

.
.
.
.
By MADAME STEPHANI

DUETT for Harp and Æolian piano.

Nicolai.

By MADAME LAZARE and Mr. Saroni.

Mr. William Scharfenberg has kindly consented to preside at the Piano.
* Mr. Saroni begs leave to state, that far from competing with the virtuosos or composers of the
day, his only object, in introducing this instrument, is to exhibit [illegible] of the effects it is
capable of. The instrument is from the manufactory of T. Gilbert & Co., Boston, who have
established an agency in this city at No. 447 Broadway.53
On January 26, Saroni’s journal revealed that the performance “was not as well attended as
we should like to have seen it; and yet much better than under the circumstances we had a right
to expect; but since the inclemency of the weather was the only cause of it, we shall make

52
53

Saroni’s Musical Times, 19 January 1850, 196.
Saroni’s Musical Times, 19 January 1850, 195.
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preparations to repeat the same programme, and we advise our subscribers to retain their tickets for that occasion. Further particulars in our next number.”

The weather was quite horrible, as reported in the *New York-Daily Tribune* on day following the performance:

**CITY ITEMS.**

THE STORM.—“Items” acknowledges his utter inability “to do justice to this subject.” Such an awful reign of the horrible Northeaster stultifies his choicest expletives. Twenty-four mortal hours of nothing but one persistent pouring—twenty-four hours of ankle-deep mud and snow, are beyond expression. May we hope a clear blow from the West in the *Commercial* will deliver us from our sufferings!

In addition to the weather, it likely did not help that the concert’s postponement was announced on the day that it was supposed to have taken place, at which point many would-be audience members may have been unavailable for the new performance date. Furthermore, the concert was never repeated, as claimed it would be.

A more complete review appeared in the February 2 issue, borrowed from another source. In this case, Saroni felt it unethical to write such a lengthy review of his concert. He explained:

We take the following from “the Literary American,” which, even at the risk of being called partial in this instance, we pronounce an ably conducted periodical. We insert the article as an act of justice to those artists who were concerned in the therein mentioned concert, since we could not well criticize a concert given by ourselves.

The review stated:

SARONI’S CONCERT.—We attended this gentleman’s second concert, given at “Hope Chapel,” on Monday, the 21\(^{st}\) inst., and to say that we were pleased, would be very far from expressing our real sentiments, for we were much more than pleased,—we were delighted, and do not remember ever having enjoyed a richer musical treat.

The entertainment opened with a grand quartette selected from Mozart, and executed by Messrs. Eisfeldt, Noll, Eichhorn, and Schmidt, with the most profound artistic skill; —the precision with which the difficult passages so frequently occurring in the Allegro and Andante of this gifted composer, far surpassed our anticipations, while the soul-stirring expression, at times almost moving the audience to tears, with which some of the other

---

54 *Saroni’s Musical Times*, 26 January 1850, 207.
56 *Saroni’s Musical Times*, 2 February 1850, 220.
portions were given, exceeded any thing we have listened to this many a day; it seemed like the soul breathing forth its very immortality in the sweet strains of melody.\textsuperscript{57}

This is a fairly detailed account of the Mozart quartet performance, but insufficient information is given in both the program and review to determine which Mozart quartet was performed. The review makes no mention of the “Quatuor” by Fesca. There are two possible composers named Fesca: Friedrich Ernst Fesca (1789-1826), and his son, Alexander Fesca (1820-1849). According to \textit{Grove}, Alexander Fesca composed four string quartets;\textsuperscript{58} while Friedrich, a German violinist and composer, wrote sixteen string quartets between 1815 and 1825, and his quartets and quintets were the primary basis for his reputation as a composer.\textsuperscript{59} From the amount of string quartets by both Fesca composers, one would suspect Friedrich to be the composer of the work performed, but future performances of Alexander Fesca’s works by some in this present ensemble (discussed later) suggest that the quartet performed could have been his.

The third concert was advertised to take place on Wednesday, April 24, 1850, in Hope Chapel, at 8pm. The advertised program consisted of:

1. Quatuor in D., by Haydn, under the direction of Mr. Theodore Eisfeld.
2. Song, with accompaniment of the Violoncello, by Messrs. Brandt and Eichhorn.
3. Solo for Piano, with \textit{Æolian} Attachment, by H. S. Saroni.
4. Solo for Violoncello, with accompaniment of the Piano Forte, by Mr. Eichhorn.
5. Song, with accompaniment of \textit{Æolian} Piano, by Messrs. Brandt and Saroni.
6. Quatuor in F., by Mozart, under the direction of Mr. Eisfeld.\textsuperscript{60}

The advertisement also noted that Mr. Brandt had “kindly volunteered his services.” Again, Saroni promoted the piano from T. Gilbert & Co., stating: “The Piano to be used for the occasion

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times}, 2 February 1850, 220.
\textsuperscript{58} Gaynor G. Jones, "Fesca, Alexander," in \textit{Grove Music Online},
\textsuperscript{59} Markus Frei-Hauenschild, "Fesca, Friedrich Ernst," in \textit{Grove Music Online},
\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times}, 20 April 1850, 351.
is one of T. Gilbert & Co.’s manufacture, and has been kindly furnished to us by their agents, Messrs. Waters and Berry, 447 Broadway.” And further announced, “Subscribers, having in their possession tickets for our last concert, can have them exchanged for tickets admitting them to this one, by calling at the office. No tickets are valid, but those exchanged at our office, or issued with or after this number.”

After the disappointing turnout for the second concert, on January 21, subscribers were encouraged to hold onto their tickets, which would be accepted at a promised repeat performance. As has already been noted, a repetition of that concert never occurred, but Saroni used the occasion of the third performance as a means to honor the promise to ticket-holders of the second. No review of the third performance appears in subsequent issues of the journal.

It is worth noting a particular trend in this series of performances. While these were the first seemingly successful attempt at concerts focused on string chamber works (mainly Austro-German), the later concerts seem to be progressively less devoted to this genre. The first performance, December 1, included the complete Beethoven “Archduke” piano trio, and at least one movement of both a Mozart string quartet and a Mendelssohn piano trio. Vocal selections were performed between these. The second concert, January 21, included a quartet by Mozart (at least an Allegro and Andante, according to the review), and a quartet by (either Friedrich or Alexander) Fesca; vocal selections by Nicolai, Mendelssohn, and Mozart; a Labarre work for harp and piano, a Saroni piece for the Æolian piano, and a duet for harp and Æolian piano by Ms. Lazare and Mr. Saroni. The third concert, April 24, included string quartets and Haydn and Mozart, a song with violoncello accompaniment, a song with Æolian piano accompaniment, and a solo for Æolian piano.

---

61 Saroni’s Musical Times, 20 April 1850, 351.
The first concert included three string chamber works, a quartet and two piano trios. The second concert contained only two quartets. The harp pieces with piano would probably not qualify as high-serious chamber music, like the string quartets, by modern criteria. The third concert included Haydn and Mozart quartets, and a song accompanied by violoncello (again, not a typical string chamber work).

The trajectory of the programs shows a decrease in the number of “traditional” high-serious string chamber works (i.e., string quartets and piano trios), an increase in what might more loosely be considered chamber works (harp and piano, voice with cello), and a definite increase in use of the Æolian piano. Through use of the harp and Æolian piano, there seems to be greater use of the novelty of timbre, arguably resulting in easier listening for the audience. Remember that a key characteristic of the string quartet is its comparatively uniform timbre.

Saroni’s sharp business acumen has already been discussed, particularly his measures to minimize the costs of concert production. In the later two concerts, his use of, and composition for, the Æolian piano seems worthy of note. Saroni specifically mentioned that: “The Piano to be used for the occasion is one of T. Gilbert & Co.’s manufacture, and has been kindly furnished to us by their agents, Messrs. Waters and Berry, 447 Broadway.”62 The Æolian piano seems to be significantly featured in the programs, and even promoted in the advertisements. It seems reasonable to suspect, especially given Saroni’s skill at minimizing costs, that the Æolian piano was donated for the performances, probably in exchange for mentioning the instrument in the concert advertising. Lawrence referred to it as an instrument that Saroni was promoting, “another of the endless succession of pianos doctored to produce unpianolike sounds.”63

62 Saroni’s Musical Times, 20 April 1850, 351.
63 Lawrence, Reverberations, 108.
Saroni’s Musical Times would continue until being renamed The Musical Times on October 25, 1851. On November 11, 1851 the journal commented on recent changes:

The paper will be under the editorial charge of HERRMAN S. SARONI, as heretofore. Mr. J. S. BLACK has been engaged as Associate Editor and general superintendent. Extensively as this gentleman is known, by his long connection with the “Message Bird,” the publisher feels that in presenting his name, he gives to subscribers and advertisers the strongest possible guarantee of the energy and precision with which the business department of this paper will in future be conducted.64

Lawrence claims (citing Weichlein) that Saroni had left the Musical Times by November 15, 1851.65 In February of the next year, Richard Storrs Willis took control of the publication. The journal stated:

ANNOUNCEMENT.
The publishers of the “MUSICAL TIMES” have the pleasure of announcing to their Subscribers and the Public generally, that an important change has been effected in their arrangements. The editorial department [sic] of this journal will, after this number, be under the able conduct of Mr. R. Storrs Willis.66

With this new management, Saroni’s Musical Times made no more attempts at concert production.

The First Quartet Soirées of Theodor Eisfeld

The conclusion of the Saroni concerts after only one season should not be seen as a failure in all respects, for they seem to have served to encourage a further series of string quartet performances in New York. Eisfeld, Noll, and Eichhorn, three of the string performers in Saroni’s concerts, would soon join forces to begin the next step in the city’s chamber music concert life.

Saroni’s Musical Times, on February 15, 1851, announced:

64 Musical Times, 8 November 1851, 11.
66 Musical Times, 21 February 1852, 243.
QUARTETT SOIRÉE.—Our repeated remonstrances have at last aroused the proper feeling, in regard to chamber music. Theodore Eisfeld has announced a Quartett Soirée for this evening, in which the works of Haydn, Mendelssohn, Schubert and Beethoven will be performed. Success to this noble entreprise. 67

An advertisement in the Home Journal the same day stated:

THEODORE EISFELD

RESPECTFULLY announces to his friends and the public, that the first of his CLASSICAL QUARTETTE SOIRES will take place at the Hope Chapel, Broadway, opposite the New-York Hotel, on Saturday evening, 15th instant; on which occasion he will be assisted by Mrs. LAURA A. JONES, Mr. OTTO DRESEL, Mr. J. NOLL, Mr. H. REYERS, and Mr. L. EICHHORN. 68

A program appeared in both the February 8 and 15 issues of Saroni’s Musical Times:

-------------------

PROGRAMME.

1. Quartetto (No. 78 B flat,) for string instruments, - - - - - - - Haydn

2. Song, - - - - - - - - - Mendelssohn
   Mrs. LAURA JONES.

3. Trio (D minor,) for Piano, Violin, and Violincello, - - - - Mendelssohn
   performed by Mr. Otto Dressel, M. Noll, and Eichhorn.

4. Song, - - - - - - - - - Fr. Schubert
   Mrs. LAURA JONES.

5. Quartetto, (No. 1 T major,) - - - - - - - - - Beethoven
   Performed by M. Noll, Reyer Eichhorn, and Theo. Eisfeld 69

The Beethoven quartet, No. 1 in “T” major, I presume, is Op. 18, No. 1, in F major. The Mendelssohn trio would have been (again) the Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 49 (1839), Mendelssohn’s only composition of that type in that key, 70 and also a hugely popular work in the nineteenth century. It had been performed at the first Saroni concert on December 1, 1849. The

67 Saroni’s Musical Times, 15 February 1851, 212.
68 Home Journal, 15 February 1851, advertisement section.
69 Saroni’s Musical Times, 8 February 1851, 202; 15 February 1851, advertisement section.
Haydn quartet “No. 78 B flat” may have been Op. 76, No. 4, in B flat “Sunrise” (Hoboken No. III:78), as it is the only Haydn quartet in this key to which the number 78 has ever been ascribed.\textsuperscript{71} Lawrence concluded the same.\textsuperscript{72}

Of those in attendance, it was said, “The Hope Chapel, the place of performance, was filled by an intelligent, appreciating audience, and evidently gave great satisfaction to all concerned.”\textsuperscript{73}

According to the \textit{Message Bird}, the performance resulted in:

entire success, both as to the audience collected, and the quality of musical performance. No person we presume, left the Chapel that evening, who was not \textit{entirely} satisfied; and—considering the character of the auditors assembled—in saying this, we express more than we could do by any accumulation of admiring superlatives.\textsuperscript{74}

\textit{Parker’s Journal} expressed:

Notwithstanding the rain, the Hope Chapel was nearly filled on Saturday evening by an audience drawn together under the expectation of hearing some of the masterly quartettes of the great composers. And, judging from the rapt attention of every individual in the room during the performance, and the outward manifestation of delight at its close, the pleasure derived from the most artist-like and finished manner in which those classics of the science were played, more than compensated for the trouble and inconvenience of coming out on so stormy a night.\textsuperscript{75}

From these descriptions, we can infer that the audience was drawn from those in the city who were the more knowledgeable about classical music: an “intelligent, appreciating” audience. They possessed the “character” such that their satisfaction with the concert was a perceived compliment to its quality. Furthermore, they endured the difficulty of poor weather conditions to attend this concert, at which their attention was “rapt,” and they experienced delight and pleasure from the evening. It is fair to say that this was not an audience of average New Yorkers.

\textsuperscript{72} Lawrence, \textit{Reverberations}, 199.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times}, 22 February 1851, 222. Hope Chapel was probably a small venue, as reviews in Chapter V will suggest.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Message Bird}, 1 March 1851, 642.
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Parker’s Journal}, 22 February 1851, 118.
From this point forward in this dissertation, frequent and sometimes lengthy quotations from primary sources will be used. Many of these reviews have never, or only minimally been published since their original printing in the 1850s. Short quotations are sometimes used throughout Lawrence’s coverage, but I aim both to present valuable first-hand accounts which would otherwise never be seen, and to provide valuable commentary about them.

Of the performance on February 15, the critic in Saroni’s Musical Times (whom Lawrence identifies as Saroni) noted that the Haydn quartet:

fresh and blooming, as if it had but just come from the hands of the composer, was played with great precision and accuracy, but owing probably to the dampness of the atmosphere, Mr. Noll’s violin sounded somewhat harsh.

Meanwhile the Message Bird (edited by a “frustratingly anonymous” gentleman, assisted by “several of the most popular composers and masters of music now before the public”) stated:

Haydn’s Quartette, in B, with which the programme opened--that ever fresh and youthful creation!—was distinguished by a very prompt, and, so to speak, musical rendering, on the part of the performers, though there might have been, perhaps, somewhat more delicacy and lightness of execution; a quality ever strongly demanded, by the finely-woven and flowery creations of this peculiarly elegant master. Haydn’s pinion is always a light and aerial one, requiring all who soar on it to be fleet and light as itself.

Parker’s Journal (co-edited by William R. Parker and Spencer Wallace Cone, first appearing on December 21, 1850) commented:

The soirée commenced with the seventy-eighth quartette of Haydn, in B flat, for stringed instruments; one of the most graceful, pleasing, and fascinating compositions of a writer, who, of all others, is the truest interpreter of all that is sweet and gentle, as well as brilliant and sparkling in nature. Not so grand as Mozart, nor so sublime as Beethoven, Haydn reaches every human heart by his mastery over each tender emotion, and his intense sensibility to every form of the beautiful. This quartette was admirably played by Noll,

---

76 Lawrence, Reverberations, 199.
77 Saroni’s Musical Times, 22 February 1851, 222.
78 Lawrence, Resonances, 572.
79 Message Bird, 1 August 1849. Cited in Lawrence, Resonances, 572.
80 Message Bird, 1 March 1851, 642.
81 Lawrence, Reverberations, 134 (footnote 4).
Reyer, Eich[j]orn and Eisfeld; names, which of themselves furnish sufficient guaranty for the excellence of the performance, but one must hear them play a German quartette, to know what soul and expression can be given to music which they love and reverence, and associate with the dearest and holiest recollections of home and fatherland.\textsuperscript{82}

The language used in describing the quartet related is quite interesting. The quartet was called “fresh and blooming, as if it had but just come from the hands of the composer,”\textsuperscript{83} an “ever fresh and youthful creation.”\textsuperscript{84} If the quartet was, in fact, Haydn’s Op. 76, No. 4 “Sunrise,” then it would have been one of Haydn’s late compositions in the genre. The six quartets of Op. 76 were written in 1797, and published in 1799.\textsuperscript{85} Haydn was sixty-five years old while composing them. If the quartet is a “youthful creation,” it is not due to the youth of the composer at the time. The Op. 76 works were followed only by the two quartets of Op. 77 (composed 1799, published 1802) and an unfinished quartet, Op. 103 (two movements composed 1803, published 1806).\textsuperscript{86} Haydn died in 1809. If the quartet seemed “fresh,” and “as if it had but just come from the hands of the composer,” it could be because it was in fact, one of the last to come from his hands.

Of the Mendelssohn trio, \textit{Parker’s Journal} said,

Otto Dresel, Noll and Eich[j]orn then played a trio op. forty-nine of Mendelssohn for piano, violin and violoncello, which left nothing to desire, except perhaps that the strings had been a little more subdued; the piano playing in this trio was of the very highest order of merit.\textsuperscript{87}

A contrasting view of the ensemble’s balance was presented in \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times}:

Mr. Dresel played the Trio of Mendelssohn, as perhaps no one else in this country can play it; yet he requires a little more calmness and expression [sic], before he can claim the title of ‘performer of chamber music.’\textsuperscript{88}

\textsuperscript{82} \textit{Parker’s Journal}, 22 February 1851, 118.
\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times}, 22 February 1851, 222.
\textsuperscript{84} \textit{Message Bird}, 1 March 1851, 642.
\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Parker’s Journal}, 22 February 1851, 118.
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times}, 22 February 1851, 222.
According to the *Message Bird*:

The succeeding Trio, by Mendelssohn, was decidedly the most successful performance of the evening. The audience were completely electrified by this masterly composition. It was admirably played—Otto Dresel presiding at the piano, and proving himself, as ever, a thorough-bred artist, capable not only of playing, but truthfully interpreting what he plays. We only wished the instrument used on this occasion, had been one better calculated to do even more justice, both to the composition and the performer. It could not have been one of Chickering’s best pianos, or it would have done so.\(^89\)

These comments convey what may have been the contemporary thought about chamber music with piano and strings: namely, the opinions tend to place more emphasis on and interest in the piano part. *Parker’s Journal* called for the strings to be “more subdued,” as the piano playing “was of the very highest order of merit.” *The Message Bird* failed to make any mention of the string playing whatsoever, focusing solely on Dresel’s performance, as well as the instrument on which he played. *Saroni’s Musical Times* hinted at the opposite view, suggesting that Dresel acquire more calmness and expression in his playing, before he could be properly considered a chamber musician. But yet, the review still focuses exclusively on the pianist, and makes no mention of the string playing.

The Beethoven quartet “gave more satisfaction” than the Haydn, according to *Saroni’s Musical Times*. “It was that favorite one in F major. Mr. Eisfeld has exhibited much judgment in his selection. He evidently indents to elevate the taste of his audience by a gradual transition from every-day unison, to the higher branches of art.”\(^90\) According to *Parker’s Journal*:

\(^89\) *Message Bird*, 1 March 1851, 642.
\(^90\) *Saroni’s Musical Times*, 22 February 1851, 222.
present at the soirée, and what everybody was there present does know, that this quartette
was beautifully played, so as we had never heard it before, and it has left an impression on
our auditories not soon to be effaced. Where all performed their parts so well it would be
difficult to specify any particular excellence without doing seeming injustice to the other
instrumentists. The first violin (Noll) had of course the most difficulties written for it, but
the violoncello (Eich[h]orn) has some very exacting passages in Beethoven’s quick
movement (the Scherzo, we mean), which were very smoothly complied with. But to us,
aside from the general effect of the whole, or, rather, inside of it, there was a peculiar and
inexpressible personal sympathy with that delightful, pure tenor tone of Eisfeld, which
came occasionally stealing out from among the other instruments in a stream of rich
melody flowing into our very souls and filling it with an extacy [sic] of delight, which, like
the first passionate love of youth, to those who have never felt it, no words can ever
describe.  

The Message Bird said, simply, “One of Beethoven’s ever welcome masterpieces concluded a
performance, [which] everyone regretfully saw draw to a close.” But it continued:

We have but a single word to add, with regard to the succession of pieces. Next to a good
selection for a concert, a judicious succession is the most important. In this respect, the
programme, we think, might have been improved. The Quartette, by Beethoven, for
instance, would, doubtless, have been much better placed first in order, and
Mendelssohn’s Trio last. There would thus have been secured the musical climax, which
is always so desirable in performance; this being not a climax of merit or artistic worth,
but one of brilliancy and effect.

It is important to note several aspects of sacralization and canonization in the reviews of this
concert, particularly pertaining to the Beethoven quartet. It was said that Eisfeld, by selecting the
Beethoven quartet, Op. 18, No. 1, intended to “elevate the taste of the audience by a gradual
transition from every-day unison, to the higher branches of art.” It is clear that Beethoven is
meant to represent this “elevated” taste, and “higher” form of art. Parker’s Journal felt it entirely
unnecessary to complement the work, “for if any of our readers don’t know that it is one of the
greatest quartettes that ever has been or ever will be written, we don’t mean to enlighten their
ignorance at the expense of saying something that would be equivalent to the solemn enunciation

---

91 Parker’s Journal, 22 February 1851, 118.
92 Message Bird, 1 March 1851, 642.
93 Saroni’s Musical Times, 22 February 1851, 222.
of the fact that Niagara is a great waterfall.”

Indeed, the Beethoven quartet is hurled into the musical canon with such vigor that anyone unfamiliar with it is simply deemed “ignorant.” It is also important to note the increased stature granted to Beethoven over Mendelssohn. The Message Bird stated that if the Beethoven had been played first, and the Mendelssohn last, the musical climax achieved would have been one of “brilliancy and effect,” not “merit, or artistic worth.” Further, a pro-German sentiment is expressed, stating that one must hear the Eisfeld group “play a German quartette, to know what soul and expression can be given to music which they love and reverence, and associate with the dearest and holiest recollections of home and fatherland.” As much as it stresses the music, this is probably a statement about the performers (and also the German sympathies of the critic). The quartet members were all German immigrants. Three of the four members (Eisfeld, Noll, Eichhorn) have already been identified as such, but the same was true of Henry Reyer.

In an article about recent classical music activity in New York, the Albion made mention of the Eisfeld performance, and announced that two more would follow. “The first of the three ‘Quartett’ soirées was given at Hope Chapel on Saturday evening last. Let no one miss the two succeeding concerts, who wishes to hear beautiful music, most musically and admirably performed.”

The next Eisfeld concert took place on March 15. Saroni’s Musical Times stated: “Theodore Eisfeld has announced his Second Classical Concert for this evening. His first one has given so

---

94 Parker’s Journal, 22 February 1851, 118.  
95 Parker’s Journal, 22 February 1851, 118.  
96 Lawrence, Resonances, 677.  
97 The Albion, or, British, Colonial, and Foreign Weekly Gazette, 22 February 1851, 92.
general satisfaction that we would advise him to repeat the whole programme, and to select a larger place of performance.”98 The *Message Bird* declared:

Mr. Eisfeld’s Second Quartette Soiree [sic] will be given on Saturday next, (to-night) at the Hope Chapel. The programme is an exceedingly rich one, there being offered two Quartettes, one by Beethoven, in C minor, and one by Mozart, in E flat, major; as also, for the first time, a quintetto, by Robert Schumann, for piano and stringed instruments, Mr. Scharfenberg presiding at the piano. All true lovers of the art will not fail to be there.99

Reviews of the performance came shortly after, and remarked on a larger audience than the first concert. *Parker’s Journal* said: “Last Saturday night was another of the ‘noctes ambrosianæ’ for the lovers of classical music. And we were glad to see a much larger number in attendance than at the first soirée, for certainly the meritorious providers of this delightful entertainment deserve encouragement.”100 The term “noctes ambrosianæ” deserves discussion. These are the Latin words for “nights” and “Ambrosia.” In ancient Greek mythology, ambrosia “and nectar are the food and drink of eternal life—usually in that order, though nectar is for eating […] and […] ambrosia [is] a drink […]. They are thus properly reserved for the gods, as traditional stories emphasize.”101 The critic might have been implying that these concerts carried “eternal” or “godlike” characteristics.102

---

98 *Saroni’s Musical Times*, 15 March 1851, 254.
100 *Parker’s Journal*, 22 March 1851, 165.
102 The term may also be a literary reference. As described by J. H. Alexander, “The *Noctes Ambrosianae* are a series of seventy-one largely imaginary conversations which appeared in *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* between March 1822 and February 1835. Most of them are set in the actual tavern run by the Yorkshireman William Ambrose at 1 Gabriel’s Road, and from No. 29 (November 1826) in his superior establishment, Ambrose’s North British Hotel, Tavern, and Coffee-House at 15 Picardy Place. […] The conversations—often lasting till dawn or beyond—are conceived of as being taken down in shorthand by Nathaniel Gurney of Norwich, ensconced in a convenient cupboard.” See: J. H. Alexander, ed., *The Tavern Sages: Selections from the Noctes Ambrosianae*, (Aberdeen: Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 1992), (Introduction) vii.
Richard Storrs Willis (who would later assume editorship at the *Musical Times*), reviewing Eisfeld’s soiree in the *Journal of the Fine Arts*, remarked: “The second quartette soiree of Mr. Eisfeld was even more successful than the first, as evinced by the increase, both of attendance, and of interest manifested in the performance. Hope Chapel would not comfortably hold more than were present on this occasion.”

*Saroni’s Musical Times* described an audience of connoisseurs, stating:

> There was an excellent attendance, not as numerous as we could have wished, but comprising most of those who love music for itself—as an art. These soirées must be successful; they have in them the best elements of success[,] sterling excellence, and contrasts at once pleasing and full of beauty.

It continued:

> The class of music performed at these concerts, is of the very highest order of intellect, and so replete with quietly beautiful and fascinating effects, the result of pure melody and refined harmony, that its influence must of necessity become widely extended in every cultivated community. As it is, we are sincerely glad to find so many in our midst who so warmly appreciated the delicate and beautiful imaginings of the great master minds of music.

The programme was as follows:--

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Quintette in E flat, No. 4,</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Song—The Wanderer,</td>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. P. Mayer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Quintetto—Op. 44, (1st time,)</td>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Song of Rest,</td>
<td>Ulsell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. P. Mayer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Quartette, No. 4, C minor,</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, let us examine the language used above. The “class” of music performed “is of the very highest order of intellect.” It has “refined” harmony, and its influence should be extended in every “cultivated” community. The sacralization of the string quartet is quite clear, being

---
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considered an intellectual enjoyment for the refined and cultivated. The passage also promotes the canonization of the composers whose works were performed, being the “great master minds of music.”

Concerning the repertoire, the Mozart “Quintette” was actually a quartet, as will be shown. Mozart wrote three string quartets in E flat: K. 160 (1773), K. 171 (1773), and K. 428 (1783). An edition of K. 428 was published in Vienna in 1785, labeled, “op. 10, no. 4.” Given the historical use of “No. 4” in labeling this quartet (and the popularity of the Op.10 set in the period), K. 428 was most likely the one performed at the Eisfeld concert. The Schumann Quintet in E flat, Op. 44, was relatively new at this time; it was composed in 1842 and published in 1843. The Beethoven quartet was almost certainly the Op. 18, No. 4 (published 1801).

Of the Mozart, *Parker’s Journal* commented:

The first piece was Mozart’s Quartette, No. 4 in E flat major for stringed instruments, which was admirably played by Noll, Eisfeld, Eichhorn and Reyer. This composition is probably more difficult of execution than most of his works of a like description, and the first two movements are grand and elaborate, even for Mozart. With this divine composer, however, elaborateness is not the object, but only the accessory; and harmony, although it includes within itself the power of pleasureable excitement, is confined by him to its proper office, that of being the handmaid to melody. And in the exhibition of this great principle of the art, Mozart, we say it boldly, has never been equaled. The minuet and allegro are in striking contrast to the preceding movements of the piece, presenting to the senses a perfect world of sparkling, brilliant, merry strains, where gloom could never come.

*Saroni’s Musical Times* reported:

The Trio of Mozart is familiar to all; it is so calm in its feeling, so dreamily beautiful, that it is a universal favorite. It is so simple in its form that is is comprehensible to every one, and the heart-tone which pervades every work from Mozart’s pen, finds a ready sympathy in the breasts of all who listen. The execution of this Quartette was very excellent; it needed perhaps a shade more thoughtful reading, and a little more feeling emphasis on the

---

110 *Parker’s Journal*, 22 March 1851, 165.
part of the first violin, but it had evidently been carefully studied, and the general effect was very fine.\textsuperscript{111}

_\textit{Parker’s Journal}_ referred to Mozart as a “divine” composer. Peter Kivy’s 2001 book, _The Possessor and the Possessed: Handel, Mozart, Beethoven, and the Idea of Musical Genius_, discusses the historical progression of theories of “musical genius.” The idea of Mozart being divinely inspired existed for years before this concert review. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe is transcribed as saying:

“The musical talent,” said Goethe, “can well show itself earliest, while music is something innate, inward, which required no great nutriment from outside and no experience drawn from life. But a phenomenon like Mozart remains always a miracle, which is not to be further explained. How would the Godhead, however, find everywhere opportunity to do his miracles, if it did not at time attempt it in extraordinary individuals, at whom we are astonished and cannot understand where they come from.”\textsuperscript{112}

Of this passage, Kivy states:

The message here, in Goethe’s words, […] is that a certain kind of creativity, at a high enough level, is simply inexplicable in the sense of there being no known recipe or explanation for how the ideas come. Hence the suggestion, metaphorical or not as the case may be, of an outside, divine origination.\textsuperscript{113}

Richard Storrs Willis, in the _Journal of the Fine Arts_, recommended that more attention be paid to tempo and rhythm. He believed that the minuet third movement had been played like a scherzo, and that the “acceleration of the tempo at the close of the first movement, and its retardation before the first repetition of the theme in the Rondo Finale, are instances in which the musical sympathies of many in the audience would not perhaps be enlisted.”\textsuperscript{114}

He also criticized the omission of a repeat in the slow movement:

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[111]{Saroni’s Musical Times, 22 March 1851, 266.}
\footnotetext[113]{Kivy, _The Possessor and the Possessed_, 91.}
\footnotetext[114]{Journal of the Fine Arts, 1 April 1851, 19.}
\end{footnotes}
The non-repetition of the first part of the exquisite andante, was a cause of regret to us. An omission occasioned, no doubt, by Mr. Eisfeld’s fear of wearying the audience, which, we think, was very causelessly entertained. The form of this andante is not a broad, but a very compact one, and the repetition, therefore, would seem the more desirable and necessary. We had an instance, by the way, in the last movement of this quartet, of the great effect which can be produced by the shortest musical figure, skillfully managed. The leading and prominent figure comprising only a single ictus, or measure, (an “einer,” in the language of musical technichology [sic]). Such a figure, well contrasted with longer ones, is always striking and effective.\(^{115}\)

This view aligns with the emerging opinion that canonized works should be performed in the unaltered, original form. Of the Schumann, Parker’s Journal said:

The quintett, \textit{op. 44}, by R. Schumann, for piano and stringed instruments, we heard for the first time, and are, therefore, not properly qualified to speak of its merits. It did seem to us, however, to be so excessively elaborated as to be brought to a very respectable degree of dryness; the 3d \textit{[3rd]} movement, the minuet was pleasing, but in the other movements the melodies were so incessantly repeated, worked over and covered up in every imaginable shape and form of harmonization, that to us all the beauty seemed evaporated, and nothing but dry art left. The shell, handsomely speckled and filigreed, was there, but the bird had flown. 'Tis true that Mr. Schumann was placed in a trying position; sandwiched between Mozart and Beethoven, any given number of Schumann’s would be very apt to have their seasoning extracted. The performers deserve great praise. Mr. Scharfenberg, by his firm, masterly touch, and finished style of playing, justified the public in the favorable opinion they have long entertained of his merits; and which they never fail to testify by hearty applause whenever he approaches the piano. The stringed instruments were well played, but if we must be critical on a performance from which we derived such thorough delight, we would quarrel a little with the tone of the first and second violins; both of those instruments were coarse and hard, and all the skill of Noll and Reyer could not disguise the fact.\(^{116}\)

\textit{Saroni’s Musical Times} took a largely more disapproving position:

The Quintetto by Robert Schumann, though containing some marked beauties, as a whole, is somewhat rambling and unsatisfactory. The composer seems all the time to be striving after originality, and the music seems to spring rather from labor than from love. Schumann has undoubtedly abilities of a high order, but he seems not to have the power to ingraft the music of the soul upon his compositions. If the melodies breathe the beauties of sentiment, they are in a great measure destroyed, by a strange and injudicious overloading of harmony, in the crudeness and remoteness of which the composer seems fairly to revel. Still the merits of the composition cannot be denied, although it cannot stand comparison with the perfect works of Mozart, Haydn, Mendelssohn and Beethoven,

\(^{115}\) \textit{Journal of the Fine Arts}, 1 April 1851, 19.
\(^{116}\) \textit{Parker’s Journal}, 22 March 1851, 165.
in the same class fronting. We cannot admire his general treatment of the stringed instruments; he too frequently uses them orchestrally, instead of keeping their character as solo instruments in tact. Much is lost and nothing gained by such treatment. The Quintetto was well played throughout; the clear, neat and delicate touch of Mr. Scharfenberg was very pleasant to hear, and his distinct and accurate execution worthy of much commendation.\textsuperscript{117}

It is worth noting that the works of Mozart, Haydn, Mendelssohn and Beethoven are described as “perfect.” The critic considered these composers’ works to be members of a canon which the newcomer Schumann had yet to join.

In contrast, Richard Storrs Willis (\textit{Journal of the Fine Arts}) spoke very highly of the quintet:

The most attractive feature of the programme was Robert Schumann’s quintetto for Piano and stringed instruments. This is one of the most remarkable productions of one of the most remarkable composers of our age. It is characterized by loftiness of conception, symmetry of form, a masterly use of musical materials, depth and warmth of expression, richness of effect—in short, everything that gives a truly classical stamp to a composition. The public are indebted, we understand, to Mr. Scharfenberg for the production of this work, who deserves, not only for this, but for his own masterly and finished share in the performance of it, our warmest thanks. This gentleman has the rare artistic merit, of being willing to sink his own individuality, when the musical occasion demands it, for the sake of general effect, and consequently there is an unusual, and singularly beautiful blending of tone, whenever his skillful hand is engaged in a concerted piece. While we are charmed with the eminently finished and chaste execution, we cannot but admire the modesty of the man. Our only regret was that the limited space did not permit the stringed instruments to be placed, where they should have been, behind the Piano.\textsuperscript{118}

He continues, to say of the composer:

The author of this quintetto, attained rather late to the European celebrity, which he is now enjoying. Some of his musical studies, indeed, were not commenced till an advanced period, for a composer of so great eminence. Instrumentation, for instance, he did not begin till he was past thirty, (if we mistake not) he commencing the study of the Violin at that period. This, we perhaps, observe, occasionally, in his management of the orchestra, some of his scores presenting very formidable and unnecessary difficulties. But, then, his great genius shines so brilliantly through all this, as to cause us to overlook and to forget it. Nor is Schumann the only composer of great eminence, who writes for instruments, with the peculiar advantages and idiosyncrasy of which he is not so intimately acquainted. We can often see in Spohr’s manner of treating the Piano, that he is a Violinist, but not a Piano player—composing, though he may, very much at that instrument. A master so

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{117} Saroni’s \textit{Musical Times}, 22 March 1851, 266.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Journal of the Fine Arts}, 1 April 1851, 19.
thoroughly skilled and so perfectly at home in all instruments as was the accomplished Mendelssohn, we rarely find.\(^{119}\)

As previously mentioned, Schumann’s quintet was composed in 1842 and published in 1843, so that it would transfer from Europe to New York and receive an American public performance in 1851 seems a relatively quick migration for the work. Additionally, the Schumann quintet is quite a significant step into Romanticism, compared to other works being performed in the city at this time. But the coming years would see a significant increase in performances of Schumann’s works in the city. According to Nancy B. Reich:

All four Schumann symphonies, all the string quartets, the Piano Quintet, op. 44, and the Piano Quartet, op. 47, were premiered in the city before 1860. Between 1851 and 1860 the quintet, especially favored by performers and audiences, had at least ten public performances and was sometimes performed twice in one week by competing chamber groups.\(^{120}\)

The surge in performance of Schumann’s works were in large part due to the composer’s enthusiasts among New York’s German musicians. Reich states:

The artists who performed Schumann’s music in New York City were almost all multitalented German emigrés. The most prominent supporters of his music were Henry Timm (1811-1892), Theodor Eisfeld (1816-1882), Carl Bergmann, Otto Dresel (1826-1890),\(^{121}\) Theodore Thomas, and later, Leopold Damrosch and his son, Walter Damrosch (1862-1950). With the exception of Dresel, all the others served as conductors of the Philharmonic Society of New York and directed other groups as well. All were born in Germany but spent their productive years in America—and except for Dresel, who settled in Boston—mainly in New York.\(^{122}\)

Not much was said about the Beethoven quartet by two sources. Willis (\textit{Journal of the Fine Arts}) stated only: “The last piece of the programme was Beethoven’s quartette in C Minor, every

\(^{119}\) \textit{Journal of the Fine Arts}, 1 April 1851, 19.

\(^{120}\) Reich, “Robert Schumann’s Music in New York City, 1848-1898,” 11.

\(^{121}\) Appears as endnote 12 in Reich, “Robert Schumann’s Music in New York City, 1848-1898,” 13. The note states: “Dresel was the only one of the group who knew Schumann personally. When he left Germany in 1848, he sought letters of recommendation from a number of eminent musicians including Schumann. The original Schumann letter of 9 October 1848 (in Houghton Library, Harvard University) is translated in part by David Francis Urrows in his article ‘Apollo in Athens: Otto Dresel in Boston, 1850-90,’ \textit{American Music} 12 (Winter 1994): 348.”

way admirably performed. The second movement, particularly, was truly exquisite."\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Parker’s Journal} called the Beethoven:

a fine specimen of the breadth and richness as well as the delicacy and beauty of the great symphonist’s genius. An extended criticism of such production[s] as these, well known and thoroughly judged as they have been for many years by the musical authorities of the world, would be but a very unnecessary repetition of oft pronounced eulogiums.\textsuperscript{124}

However, \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times} had much to say:

The magnificent C Minor Quartette of Beethoven, was played with great unction and spirit; the bold and broad efforts of Beethoven seem to be more than those of any other writer, in accordance with the feelings of the executants, and therefore it is that his works seems rendered, as it were, with a more loving and appreciative spirit. It would be waste time to expatiate upon the beauties of C minor Quartette; its analysis would occupy half a dozen columns, and those unacquainted with it would be none the wiser, while to those who know it, it would be a repetition of what they already know. It formed a delightful finale to a most charming concert, and a truly pleasant evening.\textsuperscript{125}

Concluding remarks stated that the “getting up of these concerts is highly creditable to Mr. Eisfeld, and their support is no less creditable to his subscribers.”\textsuperscript{126} “Mr. Eisfeld’s enterprise is, beyond question, entirely successful, and we trust that these ‘Quartettes’ are now permanently established among us, as much as the Philharmonic concerts, a kindred emanation of which they may properly be considered.”\textsuperscript{127}

The third and last Eisfeld performance occurred on Saturday, April 5, at the Apollo Rooms. Henry Christian Timm was advertised to appear as a pianist, along with vocalists Philip Mayer and I. Beutler. “The principal pieces of the programme are composed by Haydn, Mozart, Spohr, and Mendelssohn,” the advertisement said.\textsuperscript{128} Reviews noted that there was a “numerous and

\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Journal of the Fine Arts}, 1 April 1851, 19.
\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Parker’s Journal}, 22 March 1851, 165.
\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times}, 22 March 1851, 266-7.
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Saroni’s Musical Times}, 22 March 1851, 267.
\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Journal of the Fine Arts}, 1 April 1851, 19.
\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Home Journal}, 5 April 1851, 3.

Saroni’s Musical Times noted that the Spohr quintet was not performed, “in consequence of the indisposition of Mr. Timm.” Apparently, Timm was supposed to play the Spohr quintet, as he has done in earlier concerts. A Capriccio Brillante was performed by Scharfenberg, accompanied by the string quartet. (Lawrence labels this Mendelssohn’s “Rondo brilliant.”)

Some Beethoven variations, “from Op. 18,” were played too slowly. Beethoven’s String Quartet in A Major, Op. 18, No. 5, includes a set of variations on a theme in its third movement, Andante cantabile. This movement was likely the piece performed. Lawrence states that Scharfenberg played: “an unnamed set of piano variations by Beethoven.” However, this cannot be true; the variations were indicated as being from Op. 18, and Beethoven’s only works in Op. 18 are the string quartets.

String Chamber Music in Miscellaneous Concerts, December 1849-52

With the advent of the string chamber concerts of Saroni’s Musical Times, then Eisfeld’s soirées, the establishment of sustained, regular performances of this music had begun. (Eisfeld’s
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soirées continued to 1859.\textsuperscript{137} However, string chamber works also continued to be performed on other types of concerts through this period. It is necessary to discuss these performances as well.

Paul Roultz, a violinist, made his first appearance at the Tabernacle on Thursday, April 25, 1850. Mrs. Edward Loder (vocalist) and Mr. W. A. King were assisting artists, and the instrumental works were conducted by George Loder.\textsuperscript{138} In its press announcement, great expectations were made as to Roultz’s ability:

We do not wish to forestall public opinion, but we are bound to state from personal knowledge that the reports of his extraordinary powers are by no means exaggerated. He executes such wonders upon the violin that we are surprised; and we cannot but believe that the public will share in our surprise and admiration. He does not depend entirely upon his marvelous execution for success, but will perform at his concert some of that classical music which is the test of sterling excellence.\textsuperscript{139}

It is safe to say that Roultz did not live up to these expectations. According to Saroni:

The gentleman (he is not a professional) has nothing prepossessing in his manners or appearance, and the first bow across the strings proved again [that Roultz was merely a] gentleman[.] [T]he tuning of the instrument in the middle of a cadenza, or after every variation, of course with due regard to the accompaniment, (never caring in the least for it) we say that all this can only be done by a gentleman amateur.\textsuperscript{140}

More important, from our perspective, the concert apparently included, according to Saroni, “the classical Quartett” by Spohr. It continued: “Of the various pieces he performed, the first one, the \textit{capriccio}, was a failure; the second, grand Fantasia and variations, on a combination of \textit{Verdi} and \textit{Mozart} was again a failure; the classical Quartett of Spohr, was anything but classically played.”\textsuperscript{141} The performers of the quartet are not included; it may or may not have included Roultz. There was, however, an orchestra present in the concert, so other string players
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from this group likely would have been involved. If Roultz did not perform the quartet, then this would be another instance of string chamber music being “beneath” the soloist, who preferred to focus on solo repertoire rather than participate in a chamber work.

On Monday, May 13, 1850, the American violinist James W. Perkins gave a concert. It took place at the Apollo Rooms, and tickets cost a more reasonable fifty cents. Assisting artists included the violinist, Rapetti; pianists, Scharfenberg and Timm; and included an accompanying quartet. Perkins was a pupil of Rapetti, and the concert was the student’s debut before a New York audience. The concert opened with Spohr’s Piano Quintet in C Minor. This was probably the Op. 53 arrangement for piano and strings (1820) of his Op. 52 Quintet in C Major, for flute, clarinet, horn, bassoon, and pianoforte (1820). Saroni said:

Mr. Scharfenberg took charge of the Piano part; the first violin was sustained by Rapetti, and the other parts by Messrs. Johnson, &c. When we say that this performance was the best of the kind ever offered in New-York, we can give but a faint idea of the masterly manner in which this composition was performed. Mr. Scharfenberg was all life, and Mr. Rapetti was all soul, and from such combination none but good could arise. Rapturous applause followed the artists to the green-room, and we, for one, would have given much for a repetition of the Quintuor.

In the second half of the performance, Rapetti and Perkins performed a Duo for Viola and Violin, by Spohr:

It was executed with that same excellence which was characteristic of the whole concert. By the manner in which Mr. Rapetti handled the Viola, we should judge that he has taken a great fancy for this instrument, and we certainly cannot blame him for it. There is a character of manliness in this instrument, combined with gentleness and dignity, which no other instrument possesses, and when it is in the hands of a master, like Rapetti, we always regret the modesty which prompts it to be contented with a second or third part of a composition. Spohr’s harmonies are peculiarly appropriate for the Viola, and in its vibrations it carries us to a dream-land, entirely different from that which is produced by

---
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other instruments.\textsuperscript{146}

Here, the viola gets a rare bit of appreciation in the press. It might say something that in a duo performed by Perkins and Rapetti, the latter (the teacher) receives all the commentary. It is interesting to note the attachment of gender to the instrument, with the critic noting the viola’s “character of manliness.”

The violinist, pianist, and composer William Vincent Wallace gave a concert on Tuesday, April 22, 1851 at Tripler Hall. Tickets were one dollar each.\textsuperscript{147} Saroni’s Musical Times reported:

There was a very fashionable and critical audience present, numbering, we should suppose, between two and three thousand. We were glad the hall was so full, for if ever one man deserved the support of the public, Wallace surely does. The programme was wholly composed of Mr. Wallace’s compositions, with three exceptions, Geo. Loder’s Overture \textit{Marmion}, which was very well played, Mozart’s Aria, \textit{Non mi dir}, and Spohr’s new double Quartette.\textsuperscript{148}

Spohr, still living at this point (until 1859), composed four double quartets. His last, Op. 136 in G Minor, was composed in 1847 with parts published in 1849.\textsuperscript{149} This was likely the piece performed, given the description “Spohr’s new double quartet.” The piece was performed by Wallace, Griebel, Bristow, Herwig (violins), Schuberth, Tyte (violas), Boucher, and Hegelund (violoncello).\textsuperscript{150} Accounts of the performance vary. The \textit{Albion} felt that the piece:

would have been more enjoyable in a smaller place than Tripler Hall. Added to its size, the noise from the street on the carriage side of the hall was such as to drown the most delicate part of the performance. The players seemed equal to their task, and rendered the old master \textit{con amore}.\textsuperscript{151}
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Henry Cood Watson, writing in *Saroni’s Musical Times*,\(^ {152} \) stated, “The Double Quartette of Spohr was unfit for so large a room, and its performance was scrawlly and unsatisfactory.”\(^ {153} \)

*Parker’s Journal*, however, called the piece, “the gem of the performance, in itself.”\(^ {154} \)

On Tuesday, April 29, 1851, organist Pieter Hendrik van der Weyde put on a concert at the Dutch Reformed Church. With Kiefer (clarinet) and Eichhorn (cello), they played a “Mozart Trio ‘for piano, clarinet, and cello’ (probably K. 498 in E flat (1786), for piano, clarinet, and viola,\(^ {155} \) “Kegelstatt”).

A young violinist named Henry Appy gave a concert on Thursday, October 23, 1851. The program included string chamber works by Spohr and Hummel. According to *Parker’s Journal*:

> Mr. Scharfenberg, who, like our old friend Timm, is the exponent of an unknown quantity of pure pleasure, presided at the piano, and together with Hill, Hegelund, and others, played a noble quintette of *Spohr*, and a beautiful one of *Hummel*. These two admirable compositions, models of classic beauty, are not often heard in the concert room. Not so often as their own merits deserve, or a due regard to our own improvement in taste demands. For ourselves, we are free to confess that we listened to them with quite as much pleasure and rather more profit, than to the idealess and disjointed overtures which, as their own compositions, recent concert directors have compelled us to hear.\(^ {156} \)

On Monday, December 29, 1851, the American Musical Fund Society put on a benefit concert. The society’s mission can be inferred from the following portion of the review:

> It has become a settled fact, confirmed by every experiment, that a concert will not produce much, if its proceeds are to be applied to charitable purposes. The concert now under notice was no exception to this rule. The variety and excellence of the talent at the disposal of the committee ought to have insured an overflowing house, but its proceeds would have been applied to the support of sick and disabled musicians, therefore the proceeds were small.\(^ {157} \)

---
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The program involved a variety of performances, including one by Eisfeld’s quartet with pianist, Henry Christian Timm. The *Musical Times* critic (perhaps J. S. Black; Saroni was no longer at the publication, but Richard Storrs Willis had not yet become the editor) tells us:

Mr. Eisfeld’s string quartet, with Mr. Timm for pianist, played some movements from the first Quintett by Spohr. However well these performers might acquit themselves in that large hall, and by comparison with the volume of sound produced by the orchestra, they must necessarily seem somewhat inefficient. In a smaller room they need not fear the comparison, but in Metropolitan Hall the parts are blurred rather than blended together, and the effect of indistinctness rather than unity is produced.\(^{158}\)

The Eisfeld quartet’s performances outside of their soirees were not limited to this occasion. The New York Daily Times advertised: “CLASSICAL QUARTETTE SOIREE — Arranged by P. K. Weizel, at the Brooklyn Female Academy,” to take place on Tuesday, March 9, 1852.\(^{159}\) In addition to vocal talent, and P. K. Weizel on piano, “Mr. Eisfeld’s Quartette Association” were listed performers. Tickets were priced at 50 cents.\(^{160}\) Apparently, a similar endeavor occurred the next month. The *Musical Times* reported: “A Classical Quartette Soirée was given at Brooklyn, last Tuesday [April 13, 1852] evening under the direction of Mr. Paul K. Weitzel at which Eisfeld and his talented compeers assisted.”\(^{161}\)

In their next appearance outside of their usual soirées, the Eisfeld quartet would perform without Eisfeld, but adding Scharfenberg on piano. The German singers and sisters Mina and Louisa Touny gave a concert on Saturday, November 27, 1852. The correspondent for *Dwight’s Journal of Music* stated: “Lachner’s Quartett, played by Messrs. Scharfenberg, Noll, Reyer, and

---
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Eichhorn, did not *speak* to me. ‘Twas a first hearing.”¹⁶² The Tourny sisters had just performed the vocal portion of Eisfeld’s quartet soiree on the prior October 30th.

Though this chapter has followed the arrival of the Saroni and Eisfeld concerts, hence the beginning of regular string chamber performances in New York City, the last section of this chapter has tried to show that string chamber works continued to be performed in “miscellaneous” concerts, mixed alongside other genres, as had previously been the norm. Further, we see that the Eisfeld quartet did not limit its performances to its own soirees. Most of all, the events described in this chapter have marked a new phase in string chamber music performance in New York. For the first time, concerts with an emphasis on string chamber music begin to regularly occur.

¹⁶² *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, 4 December 1852, 69.
Chapter IV: Bostwick and Eisfeld, November 1851-February 1852

The commencement of the 1850s had witnessed a new dawn in New York’s musical life: the establishment of regularly occurring concert series dedicated primarily to the performance of string chamber music. First, as we have seen, came the concerts organized by Hermann Saroni, and evolving out from them, the first quartet soirées of Theodor Eisfeld. With Eisfeld’s series underway, the performance of string chamber music now found two American allies: Emma Gillingham Bostwick and George Frederick Bristow. Bristow, who had composed his own string chamber works in the 1840s, would perform European chamber music on Bostwick’s soirées. Bostwick’s concerts tend to occupy a somewhat different sphere of the concert market, as will be shown. Meanwhile, Eisfeld’s soirées continued. This chapter will proceed in a chronological fashion through the twelve-month period of November 1851-February 1852, with moments of pause for analysis and comment.

Bostwick Soirées: November 18 & 25, 1851

American singer Emma Gillingham Bostwick, who with her older sister Louisa had given many successful concerts in New York during the 1820s, had for many years confined her vocal activities to church and parlor.¹ Much later in her life, she returned to the public concert scene with a small concert on January 20, 1851. Encouraged by her “(apparently prosperous) well-wishers,” late that year she announced a series of six performances at Niblo’s Saloon. The complex at Niblo’s consisted of a hotel,² theatre, and saloon. According to the Times & Messenger:

[...] while the theatre is nightly filled with an audience of 5,000 [sic], despite the weather, the saloon adjoining, having independent entrances, accommodates a dancing party of some

² Lawrence, Resonances, 606. Lawrence cites: Herald, 3 May 1849.
1,500, who sup below on a splendid fare and delicacies of the season in a style of decided elegance; […]”

The venue is depicted in an 1853 fire insurance map by William Perris (Figure 1). As can be seen, Niblo’s was positioned along Broadway, as were other prominent venues of string chamber music performances, to be further discussed in Chapter V.

Figure 1: Map of Niblo’s Saloon [1853]

Subscriptions to the Bostwick series were five dollars for two tickets, while single tickets for each concert were fifty cents. The performances occurred on October 28, November 4, 11, 18,

---
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25, and December 4, 1851.\textsuperscript{7} Reviewing her first concert, the \textit{Mirror} (October 30, 1851) remarked that the large audience represented the commercial wealth of the city: “Rarely have we seen so large a congregation of the ‘heavy’ down-town merchants.”\textsuperscript{8} Some, but not all, of the Bostwick soirées (there were twelve in total, in two series of six) included performances of string chamber works. We will focus only on those soirées that included music of this type.

Mrs. Bostwick was obviously the featured performer for these soirées; when string chamber music appeared on the program, it served, as in other previous examples, a secondary role beneath another musical genre. Her fourth concert, on November 18, was such an instance. According to the \textit{Musical Times}, the performance, like the three preceding ones, was crowded. “Messrs. Hill, Noll, Bristow, Braun, Pirsson, and Timm, performed two grand sextours by Bertini which were much admired.”\textsuperscript{9} This was, of course, but one portion of the concert. The \textit{Musical Times} (from which Saroni had just departed, but Willis would not join until February) stated: “The programme embraced a rich selection, introducing Mr. Kyle in a solo on the flute, and Master Wm. Saar, in two piano fantasias. Mrs. Bostwick sang as well and was applauded as much as ever; Mr. Mayer was suffering under a severe cold, which injured the effect of his fine voice very materially.”\textsuperscript{10} Additionally, an unknown artist performed a “solo on a piano stool,” not on the program, and received very hearty applause.\textsuperscript{11} I can only speculate, but my guess is that this was a percussion solo using a piano stool as the instrument, rather than anything prefiguring the twentieth-century avant-garde. George Frederick Bristow, listed above, was a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{7} Lawrence, \textit{Reverberations}, 193.
\item \textsuperscript{8} Lawrence, \textit{Reverberations}, 192.
\item \textsuperscript{9} \textit{Musical Times}, 22 November 1851, 43.
\item \textsuperscript{10} \textit{Musical Times}, 22 November 1851, 43.
\item \textsuperscript{11} \textit{Musical Times}, 22 November 1851, 43.
\end{itemize}
regular performer on the Bostwick soirées, whenever string chamber music was performed.

Additionally, Bostwick would soon perform one of Bristow’s songs.

Bostwick’s fifth soirée, on November 25, was well attended, despite the inclement weather of the first snowstorm of the season. According to the *Musical Times*: “Hitherto the attendance was limited only by the four walls, the pressure at times amounting to nearly a jam. On this occasion—a reasonable number staying away—the elegant Saloon of Niblo’s was but comfortably filled, yet, presenting a handsome representation of our select circles.”\(^{12}\) The concert was arranged in a similar potpourri of genres, featuring Bostwick’s vocal solos, as well as solos by Kyle (flute), Wels (piano), and at least two sextets. The *Musical Times* stated:

The Sextuors were not presented under the most favorable circumstances, owing to the unaccountable or unexplained absence of the first Violin.\(^ {13}\) This deficiency had to be made up at the last moment. Mr. Kyle, in the kindest manner supplied with his ‘Diatonic,’ the absence of the first violin in one sextuor, and Sig. La Manna, with equal politeness, offered his services for the other sextuor. These impromptu changes without the usual preparatory rehearsals, did not contribute to the unity of the ensemble, but as accidents may happen in any one’s family, we will wink at all deficiencies, and only praise the amiability of the gentlemen whose willing assistance enabled the performance to go on uninterruptedly.\(^ {14}\)

The review gives an account of Bostwick performing one of Bristow’s songs, “Spring time is coming” (published 1852)\(^ {15}\):

The next song, “Spring time is coming,” was written and composed expressly for these soirees. The words by J. Howard Wainwright, the music by George F. Bristow. The verses are smooth and musical, the ideas, though not very original, are prettily expressed. The music is well adapted to the words, familiar in its general character, and easy to execute. The audience gave the song their approval, and with hearty plaudits welcomed back the favorite cantatrice for its repetition.\(^ {16}\)

\(^ {12}\) *Musical Times*, 29 November 1851, 54.

\(^ {13}\) It is unclear if Bristow was the missing first violinist. Uri Corelli Hill and Joseph Noll also regularly appeared on the Bostwick soirées.

\(^ {14}\) *Musical Times*, 29 November 1851, 54.


\(^ {16}\) *Musical Times*, 29 November 1851, 54. The lack of any mention of Bristow’s presence, especially given the performance of his song, might imply that he was the missing violinist, but we cannot know with any certainty.
The Bostwick soirée on December 4, 1851 initiated each half with a chamber arrangement of a Beethoven orchestral work. The first half began with Beethoven’s Overture to “Men of Prometheus” arranged for septet, and performed by Giovanni Sconcia, Hill, Bristow, Eben, Hegelund, Pirsson, and Timm. The second half opened with Beethoven’s *Egmont* Overture, arranged for septet.\(^\text{17}\)

It is important to note several things about the audience in attendance. First, it appears that they were of the upper end of the socio-economic scale. Those with series subscriptions paid five dollars for them: quite a sum. Furthermore, they were described as being “a handsome representation of our select circles.”\(^\text{18}\) Lawrence stated that the audience represented the commercial wealth of New York, a congregation of the downtown merchants.\(^\text{19}\) From this, it would appear that the audience was from the established, successful realm of New York’s society. It seems unlikely that they were recent immigrants, but rather more likely from the elite circles who had been longer resident in the city.\(^\text{20}\)

**Eisfeld Soirée: November 29, 1851**

In addition to the Bostwick soirées, the quartet performances by Theodor Eisfeld’s group, introduced in the last chapter, continued to take place in New York. The *Musical Times*, on November 15, 1851, announced the next series of performances by the Eisfeld ensemble:

> We are glad to perceive that Mr. Theodore Eisfeld proposes to commence next Saturday evening, Nov. 29, another series of those quartette soirées which were so admired last winter.

---

17 *New York Daily Times*, 4 December 1851, 3.
18 *Musical Times*, 29 November 1851, 54.
19 Lawrence, *Reverberations*, 192.
20 “Before the Civil War there was no real economic elite in Kleindeutschland [the German area of New York]. The businessmen who would later claim social and political hegemony over the German-American community were still only part of the middle classes and were devoted to making their fortunes.” Stanley Nadel, *Little Germany: Ethnicity, Religion, and Class in New York City, 1845-80* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 83.
The programme for the proposed series is unusually rich, and Mr. Eisfeld deserves what he will doubtless obtain, a subscription list worthy of the music and of the performers.\(^{21}\)

_Parker’s Journal_ announced:

THEO. EISFELD’S QUARTETT SOIREEES.—We are glad to learn that those delightful evenings spent last winter in the company of the master spirits of the art of music are to be renewed this season. Mr. Eisfeld had promised us six soirées at intervals of about four weeks from each other, the first to be given on Saturday evening, November 29\(^{th}\), at the Apollo Rooms. The quartet will be formed by Eisfeld, Noll, Reyer and Eichorn, the same artists who played last winter. In addition to these, Timm, Scharfenberg, Hoffman and others will assist with the weight of their well known talents, in carrying out this attempt to extend the knowledge of classical music amongst us. All who have any proper recollection of the pure pleasure derived from these performances last season, will scarcely hesitate to avail themselves of the coming opportunity to renew their past enjoyment; and we sincerely hope that a large number of those amongst us who profess to love good music, will put themselves in the way of hearing the works of Haydn, Spohr, Mozart, Beethoven, Onslow and Mendelssohn, performed by artists equal to the undertaking.\(^{22}\)

The writer clearly shows a preference for these performances, favoring the “pure pleasure” of the concerts, and hoping to “extend the knowledge” of classical music among New Yorkers. An advertisement appeared in the next two issues of the _Musical Times_:\(^{23}\)

**THEO. EISFELD’S FIRST CLASSICAL QUARTETTE SOIREE,**

Will take place at the Apollo rooms, 410 Broadway, on Saturday evening, November 29\(^{th}\). Principal Instrumental pieces by HAYDN, SPOHR, BEETHOVEN. Performers: Mr. J. BEUTLER, Mr. H. C. TIMM, Messrs. NOLL, REYER, EICHORNE, & THEODORE EISFELD. Tickets one dollar. To commence at 8 o’clock.\(^{23}\)

On the day of the performance, _Parker’s Journal_ stated:

Whoever wishes to go to bed to-night a wiser and a better man, will go to the Apollo, and be introduced by Mr. Eisfeld into the Society of Mozart, Beethoven, Spohr and Haydn. If his sleep be not refreshing after such intercourse, if he do not wake up in the morning with a better heart and clearer mind than usual, it will be, because he stopped somewhere’s [sic] between the Apollo and his own bed-chamber.\(^{24}\)

\(^{21}\) _Musical Times_, 15 November 1851, 29.

\(^{22}\) _Parker’s Journal_, 22 November 1851, 585-6.

\(^{23}\) _Musical Times_, 22 November 1851, advertisement page; 29 November 1851, advertisement page.

\(^{24}\) _Parker’s Journal_, 29 November 1851, 895.
It is quite interesting to note the virtues ascribed to the music of these Austro-German composers. Listening to Mozart, Beethoven, Spohr, and Haydn not only grants one the pleasures of hearing string quartets: it endows the recipient with a “better heart and clearer mind,” leaving them a “wiser and a better” person. The music is associated with educational and moral uplift. The claim of such beneficial qualities only aids the process of sacralizing the Austro-German string quartet.

In reviews of the performance, contrasting views were given about the audience. *Parker’s Journal* stated: “Considering that the feature of these entertainments is the exhibition of classical music, it is worthy of remark that the audience was large, and we need not add appreciative.”

However, the *Musical Times* was disappointed with the attendance:

The Apollo Rooms were nearly filled on Saturday evening, at the first Quartette Soiree of the second season. There was still room, however, for a larger audience, and we are surprised that in so large a city as New York, where opportunities for hearing music of the kind and excellence offered by Mr. Eisfeld, are so rarely presented, that the house is not crowded. Why is it? If the general state of musical knowledge in the city is not sufficiently advanced, there are certainly professors and amateurs enough to whom such occasions must prove a rare treat.

From the two accounts, it appears that the audience was large, and the venue nearly filled. But yet, we are told that the house was not crowded, and there was still room for a larger audience. The discrepancy between the accounts appears to be not over the size of the large but less-than-capacity audience, but rather, what size of the audience says about the state of string quartet reception in the city. The *Musical Times* critic found the audience size unsatisfactory, while the *Parker’s Journal* critic expressed no such view. In many ways, this comes down to the conflicts in New Yorkers’ self-assessment of musical “progress” at the time, an issue mentioned in

---

25 *Parker’s Journal*, 6 December 1851, 606.
26 *Musical Times*, 6 December 1851, 70.
Chapter I. During this growth period of “art” music in the city, New York is either described in positive terms as having made so much “progress,” or negatively, for not yet having “advanced” far enough. The fact that both opinions are expressed likely indicates a period of flux, in which there is some validity to both views.

The performance featured two string quartets. One by Haydn was described as “No. 1 in G major,” and “Quartette in G major (Op. 77).” Both descriptions are at least partially accurate. Haydn composed two quartets in Op. 77: No. 1 in G Major, and No. 2 in F Major. The former was likely the one performed at this concert. Beethoven’s Op. 18, No. 6 in B flat was the other quartet. The Haydn, “full of the simplicity, beauty and truthfulness,” was “well contrasted with the deeper and more scientific composition of Beethoven,” said the Musical Times. Concerning the two works, Parker’s Journal flowed forth:

Of the merits of these works, we need not speak; they have been judged and approved, by the whole musical world. No cavil of ours can shake their fame, nor would any praise of ours add to their renown. Whilst admitting their high position, we may, however, express our personal preference, and say that we like Haydn’s Quartett, the one first played, better than that of Beethoven, with the performance of which the very pleasant soireé [sic] closed. Of course, we quarrel with none who differ from us in this respect. It is merely a question of different tastes. One likes venison, another roast beef. Both are palatable [sic], both nutritious. But it certainly would be very absurd to quarrel with any other palate for not adopting the same line of feeding as our own. To our relish, there was a freshness and beauty about this Quartett of Haydn’s, old but not antiquated, that smacked strongly of the kindly and genial old man’s real nature. The slow movement was particularly beautiful, and admirably well played.

Here, the critic compares music to food; Haydn is venison, and Beethoven is roast beef. Both happen to be “nutritious,” suggesting the idea of music as nourishment for the human body or soul.
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27 Parker’s Journal, 6 December 1851, 606.
28 Musical Times, 6 December 1851, 70.
30 Musical Times, 6 December 1851, 70.
31 Parker’s Journal, 6 December 1851, 606.
Between the quartets, the ensemble, with Timm at piano, performed “Spohr’s beautiful Quintett in C minor, op. 53, for piano and stringed instruments.”

Parker’s Journal said of the work:

This composition is, in truth, a concerto for the piano, with an accompaniment for stringed instruments. And how beautifully Timm played it! It is very doubtful whether the pianist lives, who can play it better than Timm did on Saturday night. We esteem it one of the great privileges of our position as journalists to pay a passing tribute to the worth of so well-tried a favorite. Oh! Most excellent of Germans! and most accomplished among pianists, how has thy steady and unobtrusive merit, outlived the many magnificent humbugs, who have flared athwart the musical horizon in the gory capitals of perambulating bill posters, or in the golden paragraphs of the Hessians of the press, whose praise is bought by the yard. We think we see thee now, as, unlike some others who rush upon the instrument with fists and elbows, as though it were a wild beast to be beaten into submission, thou, with timid, almost shy demeanor, approachest the piano, like a distrustful lover stealing up to a wayward mistress, and coaxest it into perfect submission to thy will. Long life to thee! thou man of gentle heart and true artists’ soul! May they fingers never forget their cunning whilst we have ears to listen, or the inspirations of genius have need of an interpreter.

Much has been said to this point about the sacralization of musical genres, and the canonization of particular composers. It is important to note the religious nature of the vocabulary used in this source. To sacralize something is to make it sacred. Canonization is the process by which one becomes a saint in the Catholic church. But to this point, I have seen no other example so devoutly reverent to a performer. To evoke this religious feeling, the Parker’s Journal critic uses antiquated terms from a bygone era of the English language. He refers to Timm using words like “thy,” “thee,” and “thou;” very similar to the language used in the King James Bible. Timm the divine doth “approachest” the piano, and “coaxest” it to his will, unlike other mere mortals. This rhetorical display aims to establish Timm as a deity among pianists.

This is hyperbole by any standard, but even more so when considering that Timm is not a well-remembered pianist today. He was likely one of the best pianists in New York at the time,
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32 Parker’s Journal, 6 December 1851, 606.
33 Parker’s Journal, 6 December 1851, 606.
but his legacy did not live far beyond him. Timm (1811-1892) and Franz Liszt (1811-1886), occupied a very similar span of history, but the former’s obscurity compared to the latter might call into question the degree of veneration from the *Parker’s Journal* critic.

Beutler, a vocalist, “filled up the intervals will Beethoven’s *Adelaide* and a *Tyrolienne.*” After a few comments about Beutler’s performance, the *Musical Times* concluded: “The concert was however, as we said, an excellent one, and we trust that Mr. Eisfeld’s second Soiree may be crowded, for we know he is doing much for the progress of musical taste by them.”

**Eisfeld Soirée: December 27, 1851**

The second Eisfeld soirée of the season took place on Saturday, December 27, at the Apollo Rooms. Scharfenberg, and vocalist Philip Mayer joined the quartet of Noll, Reyer, Eichhorn, and Eisfeld. The *Albion* spoke of a growing taste for classical music in New York:

> Among the most interesting performances of the New York winter season, are the quartettes of Mr. Eisfeld. This is now the second year that they have been given, and the interest felt in them is an increasing [one] and promises to be a lasting one. The attendance is already such that recourse has been had to a larger locality. A new impulse was given them at the last performance by the presence of Jenny Lind, who thus gave her personal testimony to their merit and interest. Every friend of art, indeed, must be interested in this new musical enterprise and its originator, and must wish all success to a gentleman who is evidently desirous to do something, not for his own pocket, but for *art itself*, and that is a dignified and worthy way. The origin of this ‘Quartette’ is somewhat like that of the ‘Philharmonic:’ the same quiet and unostentatious beginnings have been peculiar to each, and, as the Philharmonic has grown at last to be a permanent and influential institution among us, so we trust this Quartette will be perseveringly sustained, till a similar result is achieved.

It continues, making a rare mention of private, social music-making in the home, in this case, at the hands of the women of the household:
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35 *Musical Times*, 6 December 1851, 70.
36 *Musical Times*, 27 December 1851, advertisement page.
37 *Albion*, 3 January 1852, 8.
The time was, when a symphony of Beethoven or Mozart, or the quartettes and other concerted pieces of the great masters, would have fallen dead upon the sensibilities of an audience. Now, we have enthusiastic and eager listeners whenever such compositions are afforded us, and in our drawing rooms and private circles we hear from the accomplished fingers of our own countrywomen the classic productions of Beethoven, Spohr, and Mendelssohn, whose masterly conceptions are worthily interpreted to us. All honour to the few men who have acted, and still act, as true musical educators in the community, and whose names we feel it no impropriety to mention, such men as Scharfenberg, Timm, and Eisfeld, and equal honour to the three institutions through which they have wrought thus far upon the public taste, the “Philharmonic,” ‘Harmonic,’ and ‘Quartette’ associations.\(^{38}\)

The description of “the accomplished fingers of our own countrywomen,” performing Beethoven, Spohr, and Mendelssohn, “in our drawing rooms and private circles,” invites discussion into the aspect of domestic music making, primarily involving the piano, as a recreational activity. About this practice, R. Allen Lott writes:

Many […] pianos were purchased for the use of young women, who were expected to learn at least the fundamentals of piano playing as one of the “accomplishments” (like dancing, drawing, and needlework), and the study of piano and other instruments was consistently offered in female seminaries and finishing schools.\(^{39}\) Although musical education for women was widespread, it was primarily designed to prepare them for domestic music making so they could attract suitors and be good wives and hostesses. It was generally thought improper for a woman to become skilled enough to pursue a concert career. Because music was often considered “merely an accomplishment,” a piano method of 1834 complained about the resulting view that music could “be taken hold of in the most superficial manner.”\(^{40}\)

Yet, this description likely underrepresents the number of accomplished female pianists in the United States. Thomas Christensen writes about orchestral and chamber works, transcribed for four-hand piano duet, and published for home consumption:

In a ritual that was repeated thousands upon thousands of times every evening in parlors and drawing rooms throughout Europe and North America, pianists of every capability sat down

---

\(^{38}\) *Albion*, 3 January 1852, 8.


together on their piano benches […] and struggled through duet transcriptions of orchestral and chamber music, whether a Haydn symphony or a string quartet by Schubert, a waltz by Strauss or a popular opera potpourri. The one element perhaps truly worth of note in all these evenings of Hausmusik—and one easily overlooked today—is that these many amateur pianists effected the replication and reception of orchestral and vocal music through the medium of the four-hand piano transcription.\footnote{Thomas Christensen, “Four-Hand Piano Transcription and Geographies of Nineteenth-Century Musical Reception,” \textit{Journal of the American Musicological Society} 52, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 256.}

Christensen continues:

No other medium was arguably so important to nineteenth-century musicians for the dissemination and iterability of concert repertory. Assuming a role that would be played by the radio and phonograph in the twentieth century, the duet arrangement offered any two amateur pianists an opportunity to hear in their own home a wide variety of symphony, chamber, and choral works beyond what they might have access to in live performance. […] The modest duet transcription, we soon discover, was not such an innocent vehicle of dissemination. We will find it played a surprisingly destabilizing role by blurring any number of traditional musical polarities: those between symphonic and chamber repertories, professional and amateur music cultures, active and passive music acculturation, and even repertories gendered as masculine and feminine. […] By bringing music intended for the public sphere of the orchestral hall or opera house into the domestic space of the parlor, the four-hand piano transcription profoundly altered the generic identity and consequent reception of these repertories for nineteenth-century musicians.\footnote{Thomas Christensen, “Four-Hand Piano Transcription and Geographies of Nineteenth-Century Musical Reception,” 256.}

The piano-playing of women “in our drawing rooms and private circles,” was one of the primary musical activities enjoyed in American households during this period. It is often overlooked as well; these occasions do not appear advertised or reviewed in newspapers, nor were there concert programs to provide evidence of this activity. But the \textit{Albion} review gives a valuable account of such music-making in the home. Further, recall its description of: “[…] the accomplished fingers of our own countrywomen [playing] the classic productions of Beethoven, Spohr, and Mendelssohn, whose masterly conceptions are worthily interpreted to us.” This account better aligns with Christensen’s description of challenging works played in the domestic sphere, more than the frequent portrayal of piano playing as a dispassionate “accomplishment.”
Returning to the Eisfeld soirée, the *Musical Times* review speaks of a similar growing taste for music. It attributes some credit to the Italian Opera, but then explains how the string quartet is a “higher” genre than the former:

The second Soiree of the second season of these delightful re-unions took place on Saturday evening last, December 27. The existence of such an entertainment in our midst, and the numerous attendance thereat, are among the most unerring and gratifying proofs of a correct and growing musical taste. The Italian Opera has done much, doubtless, to contribute to this end. The opera is a more popular exhibition, embracing, as it does, the entire range of scenic representation combined with greater attraction of a high order of vocal music; the pleasure, therefore, derived from operatic performances, appeals to a larger number of persons, and to a more indiscriminative audience, inasmuch as the knowledge of music is not an indispensable requisite to the enjoyment derivable therefrom. With quartetts [sic] it is far otherwise. In this species, the highest order of musical composition, all the great authors, Haydn, Beethoven, Mozart, Spohr, &c., have made their greatest efforts, and the greatest exhibition of their genius. The ability to appreciate such compositions requires, therefore, a considerable musical education on the part of the hearer. When we looked around us on the evening of the Soiree, we were greatly gratified to find so many persons present, and still more gratified at the fact, which we knew, that so many amateurs, male and female, were able to appreciate the refined and refining entertainment.  

The above passage demonstrates further sacralization of the string quartet genre, as well as canonization of specific composers. It is also sacralization via canonization, to a degree. Haydn, Beethoven, Mozart, and Spohr are acknowledged as “the great authors,” and possessors of “genius.” The string quartet is called the “greatest exhibition” of such genius, the object of their “greatest efforts,” and is deemed to be the “highest order of musical composition.” While not promoting the canonization of a particular single quartet, the listed composers’ aggregate contributions to the genre are highly praised. Further, the increasing attendance at the Eisfeld soirées indicates a “correct and growing musical taste.” But beyond this, the passage establishes an exclusionary culture around the string quartet. The ability to appreciate string quartets “requires” a “considerable musical education.” Opera, in contrast, “appeals to a larger number of persons, and to a more indiscriminative audience, inasmuch as the knowledge of music is not an
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indispensably requisite to the enjoyment derivable therefrom.” The string quartet, therefore, is portrayed as the domain of the few, musically educated and knowledgeable, and a genre that an ordinary person would be incapable of enjoying.

Eisfeld’s concert program consisted of two quartets, a trio, and two songs. In lieu of a review, the *Journal of the Fine Arts and Musical World* (successor to the *Journal of the Fine Arts*, which had prior been called the *Message Bird*) indicated that the concert had taken place, and that the following program was presented:

**QUARTETTE NO. 2, D minor, [for String Instruments,] - - - - - - - - - - - - - MOZART.**
1. Allegro Moderato. 2. Andante.

MESSRS. NOLL, REYER, EICHHORN, AND T. EISFELDT.

**DER SEE—Romance for bass voice, - - - NIEDERMeyer.**
MR. PH. MAYER.

**GRAND TRIO—Op. 97, B flat major, - - BEETHOVEN.**
[For Piano, Violin, & Violoncello,]
1. Allegro moderato. 2. Scherzo Allegro.
3. Andante Cantabile. 4. Allegro Moderato e Presto.

BY MR. WM. SCHARFENBERG AND MESSRS. NOLL AND EICHHORN.

**DER LEU[E/U]STE BESUCH—German Song, - - THALBERG.**
MR. PH. MAYER.

**GRAND QUARTETTE CONCERTANTE—Op. 12, E flat, - - - - - - - - - - - - - MEDELSSOHN.**
[For String Instruments,]

MESSRS. NOLL, REYER, EICHHORN, & THEO. EISFELDT.44

The opening piece was a Mozart quartet, “No. 2,” in D minor, probably K. 421.45 According to the *Musical Times*:
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44 *Journal of the Fine Arts and Musical World*, 1 January 1852, 146.
The performance of this quartett [sic] was throughout admirable. The various shades of feeling, the several marks of forte, crescendo, diminuendo, the occasional sforzandos, and most of all the pianos, were accurately observed and correctly given. We confess, frankly, never to have heard the pianos more perfectly done. Indeed, the whole performance indicated a careful and accurate study of the composition, and great zeal in the execution. The tempo of the various movements was, to our idea, as near as possible to the [inte]ntion of the author, and certainly in keeping [wit]h the natural characteristics of the music.\footnote{K. 421 was originally published in Vienna in 1785 as “op. 10, no. 2.” See: Cliff Eisen, et al., "Mozart," in Grove Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/40258pg3 (accessed November 17, 2012). Additionally, the first three movements of the quartet as listed match the movement descriptions in the Köchel catalog. The last movement of K. 421 (listed as “Allegretto ma non troppo” in Köchel) is a set of variations, which is consistent with the “con Variaziona” in the movement title printed above. See: Ludwig Ritter von Köchel, Cronologisch-thematisches Verzeichnis sämtlicher Tonwerke Wolfgang Amade Mozart’s (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2006), 339-40.}

This account implies that the critic was familiar with the quartet, having heard it before: “We confess, frankly, never to have heard the pianos more perfectly done.” If the quartet was K. 421, the critic might have heard it performed at the concert organized by Hermann S. Saroni on December 1, 1849 (see Chapter III). A Mozart quartet in D minor was performed on that concert as well, and it was more likely to have been K. 421 than K. 173, of Mozart’s two quartets in that key.

The Albion found the Mozart:

so fascinating that we could scarcely get him out of our ears the rest of the evening. A peculiarity of this beautiful composer is, that his themes (which he always works so admirably) completely possess one with their beauty: they are so un-laboured, so natural, and so captivating to the heart, that we cling to them like very sweet friends, whom we see for the first time, and who are to us ‘loves at first sight.’ The second movement of the quartet seemed particularly to appeal to the audience, and was called for a second time. One of the most enjoyable features of the whole performance[,] we thought, was the nice care which was taken by the players with respect to the light and shade—the musical colouring. We had some veritable piano playing, which we so rarely hear, the instruments being repressed to what one may really consider piano and pianissimo. The most that is usually attained is a moderate mezzo. A single question only arose in our minds during the first piece;--was or was not the violincello [sic] a trifle too low for the other instruments? We might have been mistaken, but there appeared to us occasionally, to be a slight disparity in the tuning. We remarked it most perhaps in the imitations of the four instruments upon the figure do, mi, sol, do (the command chord), with which we think the movement closes.\footnote{Musical Times, 3 January 1852, 134.} \footnote{Albion, 3 January 1852, 8.}
The *Musical Times* found Noll to be “totally inadequate to the transcription of Mozart.” “In the *Andante*, for instance, of the D minor, a few bars after the second double bar, where the harmony progresses from C minor to A flat major, there are eight bars of melody, of the most melting character. These Mr. Noll played with absolute correctness both of intonation and time, but totally deficient in appreciation and rendering of the exquisite pathos of the music. We give this as a specific illustration of our meaning.”\(^{48}\) Fortunately, this “specific illustration” allows us to identify the work as K. 421. The melodic passage described begins in the first violin at measure 36 (counting repeated measures only once) of the second movement.

Beethoven’s Piano Trio in B-flat Major, Op. 97 “Archduke” (1810-11) was also performed. The *Musical Times* referred to it as the “Rodolph Trio,” as it was dedicated to the Archduke Rudolph, who was the most devoted of Beethoven’s patrons.\(^{49}\) It wrote: “The grand *Rodolph Trio*, by Beethoven, for piano, violin, and violoncellos, was also admirably given. Mr. Sharfenberg played this celebrated and difficult piece with all his usual delicacy and elegance of tones and taste. In this piece also, the various *nuances* of time, force, and feeling, were admirably and accurately given.”\(^{50}\) The *Albion* was somewhat more critical of the piece. “Beethoven’s *Trio* is not one of his striking compositions; still is the *Scherzo* there is some interesting counterpoint, and the principal theme of the *Allegro* is truly Beethovian [sic]. Mr. Scharfenberg carried tastefully his part on the piano, though we should have liked perhaps a little more *vim*—a stronger *sfz.* upon the accented note in the first theme.”\(^{51}\) The paper also discussed the quartet by Mendelssohn:

---

\(^{48}\) *Musical Times*, 3 January 1852, 134.


\(^{50}\) *Musical Times*, 3 January 1852, 134.

\(^{51}\) *Albion*, 3 January 1852, 8.
Mendelssohn’s Quartette was delicious. The ‘Canzonetta’ particularly, (which was encored) we found very fresh, racy, and characteristic. It is rather remarkable, however, how strong an impression Mendelssohn’s composition, the ‘Midsummer’s-night-dream,’ seems to have made upon his own mind. The reminiscences of the insect hum in the opening overture must have struck every one in listening to this Quartette. The same reminiscences we hear elsewhere, where a similar violin effect is also applied. Apart from this we think Mendelssohn has very little mannerism. Spohr, indeed, is very much more of a self-plagarist, his mannerisms having become almost stereotyped.52

The Mendelssohn quartet performed was the String Quartet in E-flat Major, Op. 12 (1829).

The middle section of the second movement, “Canzonetta,” features quick, spiccato writing that bears much similarity to the A Midsummer Night’s Dream Overture (1826). That the overture and quartet were composed only three years apart52 might explain some similarity between them.

The Musical Times also commented on the Mendelssohn:

The Quartette Concertante of Mendelssohn did not afford us as much pleasure, either as a composition or a performance, as either of the other pieces. It has all the mannerism of its great author, but in its general effect, is monotonous, confused, and deficient in melody.— The performance of it was correspondingly rude, indelicate, hurried, unfinished. The position of this quartette was the worst possible, coming after the lovely and flowing melody of Mozart and the ponderous majesty of Beethoven. The necessary comparison could not but be unfavorable to the composer, as it was unfortunate for the listeners. The concert should have begun with Mendelssohn and ended with Mozart, reserving the bonne bouche for the last. Even as it was, the crudities of the last piece could not entirely efface the delicate and melting strains of Mozart, which lingered in the memory and the heart, even after the grandeur of Beethoven. Mozart alone can follow Beethoven, and Beethoven alone can follow Mozart.54

While calling Mendelssohn a “great author,” the critic clearly sees him as inferior to the other two composers. Mozart and Beethoven are considered relatively equal, it seems; both can follow one another, in the critic’s view. But disagreement with Mendelssohn being programmed after the other two composers’ works seems based on a judgment of his allegedly lesser status.

After a critique of Scharfenberg’s performance, the Musical Times aimed to justify their “severe criticism” as a necessity to encourage a level of “perfection” in the performances:

52 Albyn, 3 January 1852, 8.
54 Musical Times, 3 January 1852, 134.
It may be objected that all this is severe criticism. Such we admit it to be. But we should feel ourselves recreant to our duty, if we were to conceal our real sentiments. The entire entertainment is of the very highest order that has ever been presented to a New York audience, and we feel not only authorized, but bound, to make our criticism of a corresponding character, not through a fault-finding, querulous disposition, but that these delightful entertainments, admirable as they are, may be brought nearer to the perfection at which they aim. As a most gratifying proof of the discernment and appreciation of the audience, we may mention that the Andante of the D minor was encored, as well as the Canzonette of the Mendelssohn quartette. This latter, although very beautiful, smacks terribly of the similar movement in the Midsummer Night’s Dream.55

Again, a critic mistakenly accuses the quartet of being derivative of the A Midsummer Night’s Dream Overture, though the quartet was composed earlier. The Albion closed, “In conclusion, we strongly commend the performances of Mr. Eisfeld to all true lovers of music, and such as desire to foster pure, classical taste in the community. The next concert we shall duly announce to our readers.”56

Bostwick Soirées: December 26, 1851; January 9, 1852

Emma Bostwick’s great success in her previous performances encouraged her to launch a second series of six musical soirées.57 The first of these took place on Friday, December 26, 1851 at Niblo’s Saloon.58 It was “very well attended by a select and discriminating audience,”59 according to one source, but another called the attendance: “very good, though there was not such a crowd as is usually congregated on her nights.”60 The Musical Times reported: “The soiree [sic] commenced with the ‘Scherzo and Finale’ of Bertini’s sextour No. 2 in Eb, which was well performed by Messrs. Hoffman, Bristow, Hill, Noll, Hegelund, and Pirsson. In place of

55 Musical Times, 3 January 1852, 134.
56 Albion, 3 January 1852, 8.
57 Lawrence, Reverberations, 1850-1856, 193.
58 New York Daily Times, 26 December 1851, 3.
59 Journal of the Fine Arts and Musical World, 1 January 1852, 145.
60 Musical Times, 3 January 1852, 139.
Fesca’s ‘sextuor’ announced for the commencement of the second part, another of Bertini’s was substituted. Such changes should be avoided when possible.61 These selections punctuated a program featuring various works. There were numerous vocal selections performed by Bostwick and contralto Pico-Vietti. Hoffman also performed, and Timm served as accompanist throughout the evening.

The Bertini sextet was probably composed by Henri Bertini (1798-1876). A French pianist and composer, he studied with his father and his half-brother, Auguste Bertini,62 a pupil of Clementi.63 Bertini published “a nonet, six sextets for the piano and strings, and many smaller chamber works.”64 He additionally wrote three unpublished nonets.

Bostwick’s next soirée took place on Friday, January 9, 1852. After describing the effect that severe weather can have on an audience’s concert experience, the review in the Musical Times stated: “We say thus much, only to point out the splendid exception to the general rule which this concert (the second of the series) furnished. Mrs. Bostwick may congratulate herself that so many of her friends do not fear storm less, but love music more,—for on Friday evening of last week, Niblo’s Saloon was comfortably filled by an audience who seemed determined to be pleased, spite of the weather.”65 The Musical World and Journal of the Fine Arts (having reversed the order of its title) described a “large and fashionable audience,” adding that: “She

61 Musical Times, 3 January 1852, 139.
65 Musical Times, 17 January 1852, 171.
has added many ardant [sic] admirers to her original list, which was by no means small."

Bristow, Hill, Noll, Hegelund, and Timm performed Spohr’s “Quintette in c minor” “with great care and delicacy of expression. The skill of each of the artists is so well established, that it is but necessary to say that long practice together only, could effect an improvement upon their performance.” Another review agreed: “The Quintets of Messrs. Bristow, Hill, Eben, Hegelund and Timm, were played in their usual clever style; but, with more rehearsal they would have done better.” The Spohr quintet was probably the Op. 53 arrangement of the Op. 52 quintet for piano and winds (both 1821) that we have often seen performed throughout this study.

As usual, the string chamber performance was but one of many delights on the Bostwick smorgasbord of programming. Bostwick sang numerous pieces, including William Vincent Wallace’s “The Gipsy [sic] Queen,” in which she was accompanied by the composer. Mr. Eben accompanied Bostwick on one piece, and also performed a piano solo based on airs from *Norma*. Additionally, John Pychowski performed two solo works on the piano.

**Eisfeld Soirée: January 31, 1852**

The next Eisfeld soiree was advertised in the *Musical Times*:

```
THEO. EISFELD’S
CLASSICAL QUARTETTE SOIREE.
THE THIRD OF THE SECOND SEASON, will take place at the APOLLO ROOMS, 410 Broadway, on SATURDAY, Jan. 31, 1852. The following talented performers have been engaged: MRS. HENRY C. WATSON, vocalist; MR. RICHARD HOFFMAN, pianist; Messrs. NOLL, REYER, EICHHORN, AND EISFELD. See small bills.
```

66 *Musical World and Journal of the Fine Arts*, 2 February 1852, 153. It also adds: “It is something quite uncommon, with us, for a resident native artist to carry on a series of concerts with the decided success that has attended those of Mrs. Bostwick, this season.”

67 *Musical Times*, 17 January 1852, 171.


69 *Musical Times*, 17 January 1852, 171.

70 *Musical Times*, 31 January 1852, 205.
Differing accounts exist as to the audience turnout. The *Albion* stated, “EISFELD’S SOIREE.—The largest attendance as yet was that of last Saturday evening.”\(^{71}\) In contrast, the *Musical Times* described poor weather as a deterrent, remarking:

The audience was somewhat smaller than at the last concert, for some were deterred by the weather, but those who were there, took little note of that, and when the driving hail beat rapidly against the windows, in strange accompaniment to the perfect pianissimo of the quartette, it gave a new zest to the performance and heightened the enjoyment by contrast.\(^{72}\)

The review listed the program:

**PROGRAMME**

**QUARTETTE.**—No. 6, C major. (for string insts.)
1. Introduzione et Allegro.  
2. Andante cantabile.  
4. Allegro molto.  

**LOVE’S MESSENGER.**—Bolero  
-  
-  
-  
A. FESCA.  
Mrs. Henry C. Watson.

**TRIO CONCERTANTE.**—A minor (first time.)  
(For Piano, Violin, and Violincello.)  
1. Allegro moderato.  
2. Andante.  
4. Finale Allegro.  
By Mr. Richard Hoffmann and Messrs. Noll & Eichhorn.

“MANY YEARS AGO”—Romance. M.S.  
-  
-  
-  
Mrs. Henry C. Watson.

**QUARTETTE.**—No. 57, major, (for string insts.)  
-  
-  
-  
HAYDN.  
1. Allegro con spirito.  
2. Adagio religioso.  
4. Allegro ma non troppo.  
Messrs. Noll, Reyer, Eichhorn and Theo. Eisfeld.\(^{73}\)

Mozart composed three complete string quartets in C major: K. 157, K. 170, and K. 465

“Dissonance.”\(^{74}\) Of the Mozart, the *Albion* stated, “Mozart’s celebrated Quartette in C major was first performed, a composition which has excited great attention, and about certain harmonies of

\(^{71}\) *Albion*, 7 February 1852, 68.  
\(^{72}\) *Musical Times*, 7 February 1852, 214.  
\(^{73}\) *Musical Times*, 7 February 1852, 214.  
\(^{74}\) Cliff Eisen, et al., "Mozart," in *Grove Music Online*,  
which even a book has been written, by Weber.” The K. 465 “Dissonance” quartet (1785) is so titled because of the unusual harmonies in its introductory section. It is part of a set of six quartets that Mozart dedicated to Haydn, described in his dedication of September 1, 1785 as “the fruits of a long and laborious endeavour.” K. 465 was the Mozart’s last quartet of composed before the dedication date, and was originally labeled, Op. 10, No. 6. Because of the description of the great attention that the quartet had excited due to its harmonies, as well as its earlier association with the label, No. 6, the K. 465 “Dissonance” was most likely the quartet performed. Furthermore, of the C major quartets, the K. 465 movement titles best match those listed in the concert program.

The Albion, in its review of the piece, took serious issue with the tempo taken by the performers:

The music justifies the attention and criticism of the world, for it is a masterpiece of beauty and grace. But we feel a little inclined to quarrel with the instrumentalists, about the tempo. The modern performance of the classic masterpieces is absolutely too fast. Poor compositions may bear to be played at a gallop; but there is so much to hear, and so much to learn, and so much to enjoy, in works like those of Mozart, that it is musically wicked to race incoherently through them. The allegro of the present day is not the allegro of the past day. The old masters, we feel confident, never dreamed of such a locomotive time as now obtains us. If such be absolutely necessary to the effect of modern compositions, it does not follow that the same is true of older works.

Then, the review continues, likening the quartet to fine wine:

We were rather struck with the remark of a musical friend near us on this point, after the performance of the Mozart Quartette. “Music like this,” said he, “is to be enjoyed as one would enjoy a glass of the most delicate wine; first it must be held up for its fragrance, its bouquet—then it must be sipped—then gurgled—and then deliberately swallowed!” If this be requisite for the merely sensuous relish of it, how much more is a certain deliberation essential for the intellectual enjoyment—the perception of all those beauties of form, of

75 Albion, 7 February 1852, 68.
78 Albion, 7 February 1852, 68.
counterpoint, and of harmony, which so abound in masters like Mozart and Haydn!\footnote{Albion, 7 February 1852, 68.}

This analogy between wine and string quartets is somewhat unusual. The comment was probably made to state preference for a slower tempo. However, in doing so, it also evoked some sense of reverence for the genre, in the same way that one respects a certain wine by drinking it in such a ritual as described. Effectively, the passage attempted to elevate the string quartet to the status of a “fine” wine.

The “Trio Concertante” was by a lesser-known composer named Adolf Henselt (1814-1889), a German composer and pianist. His Piano Trio in A Minor, Op. 24, was his only work in the form. First published in Hamburg in 1851,\footnote{Richard Beattie Davis, "Henselt, Adolf," in Grove Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/12818 (accessed April 24, 2012).} it was a very new piece for New York in 1852. The piece was “flowing and well-composed,” said the Albion.\footnote{Albion, 7 February 1852, 68.} The Musical Times called the piece, “a very beautiful composition and well performed. The musical public are indebted to Schuberth & Co., for publishing this piece.”\footnote{Musical Times, 7 February 1852, 214.}

Of the Haydn, the Musical Times remarked, in a very non-analytical manner, and seemingly content with such:

Of the Quartette compositions, that which most attracted us was Haydn’s Quartette, marked No. 57 (it should have been 19.) It commenced with a light and graceful fugue, on a very simple subject, and seemed to us like—reader, did you ever find yourself the subject of changing emotions, which in their rapid transit left behind only a vague sweetness, something that could be felt, but not analyzed—if you have, you will know the feelings of the writer relative to this Quartette. He might give you a learned disquisition upon keys, modulation, force, &c., and record numerous changes of feeling caused by the simple gaiety of the allegro, the boisterous mirth of the minuetto, and the solemn harmony of the adagio—but of these we are not now conscious. Deep delight there was, but we do not care to seek its sources.\footnote{Musical Times, 7 February 1852, 214.}
It further added: “The execution of the Quartettes and Trio was satisfactory, loud applause greeted the end of every movement, and the *adagio* in the last Quartette was encored.”\(^{84}\) The Haydn quartet, for which no key other than “major” was listed, and for which both the numbers 57 (program) and 19 (*Musical Times*) were ascribed, was most likely Op. 76, No. 1 in G Major. *Grove* makes no mention of the numbers 57 or 19 being tied to it.\(^{85}\) However, the quartet is titled number 75 in the Hoboken catalog,\(^{86}\) which also lists many early editions of the Op. 76 quartets which label this piece as number 75.\(^{87}\) Perhaps a mistake was made by a performer or someone else in confusing 75 with 57. However, Op. 76, No. 1 has identical movement titles to those listed in the program, excluding the term “religioso” after “Adagio.” And the first movement begins with a fugato section in G major, resembling the “light and graceful fugue, on a very simple subject” mentioned in the review.\(^{88}\)

**Bostwick Soirée: February 10, 1852**

The next and last Bostwick soirée was advertised in the *Musical Times*:

The last of these popular Soirees will be given at NIBLO’S CONCERT SALOON, TUESDAY EVENING, February 11\(^{\text{th}}\). The best available artists are engaged, and no effort is spared to render these Soirees the most pleasing entertainments of the season. Single tickets 50 cents. Seats may be secured on the day and the day previous to each concert, at the store of Wm. HALL and SON, No. 239 Broadway.\(^{89}\)

An advertisement in the *New York Daily Times* appeared listing the correct date, February 10, and also included a printed program:

\(^{84}\) *Musical Times*, 7 February 1852, 214.  
\(^{88}\) *Musical Times*, 7 February 1852, 214.  
\(^{89}\) *Musical Times*, 7 February 1852, advertisement page.
PROGRAMME.

PART I.

Sextuor—Op 8. First movement ............................................ Fresca [sic]
       Messrs. King, Bristow, Hill, Eben, Ahrend and Pirsson.
Tainore [or Tamore?] Aria—from “Othello” ............................... Rossini
       Herr Klein.
Cavatina—“Robert toi que j’aime,” Robert le Diable, .......................... Meyerbeer
       Mrs. EMMA GILLINGHAM BOSTWICK.
Solo—Piano-forte. Morceau de Concert ................................. Dreysoch
       Herr John Pychowski.
Ballad—“I would I were a boy again,” ................................. Romer
       Mr. Henry Squires.
Casta Diva—“Norma,” ....................................................... Bellini
       Mrs. EMMA GILLINGHAM BOSTWICK.
       PART II.
Sextuor—Op 79. First movement ................................. Bertini
       Messrs. King, Bristow, Hill, Eben, Ahrend and Pirsson.
Song—“Happy Birdling.” With Flute obligato ............................ Wallace
       Mrs. BOSTWICK and Mr. EBEN.
       { a. Sonata Pathetique, Op. 13, first move-
       { ment .................. Beethoven
       { b. Fantasie Dramatique .... Listz [sic]
       Herr John Pychowski.

The performer will endeavor to show the contrast between the Old and New Schools in
composition.

Song—“The mountain maid..’ [sic]. ................................. Sinclair
       Mrs. E. GILLINGHAM BOSTWICK.
Ballad—“John Anderson, my Jo.” ................................. Burns
       Mr. Henry Squires,
Ballad—“ ‘Twas within a mile of Edinburg town.”
       Mrs. E. GILLINGHAM BOSTWICK.90

The Albion described an audience of “friends,” and likened the Bostwick soirées to a private
social event:

It is a pleasant feature in our New York musical life, that so universally respected and
esteemed a lady as Mrs. Bostwick can collect around her a thronging audience of friends, to
listen night after night to her agreeable musical entertainment. These occasions have so
resembled a private social gathering, that they might more properly be termed, perhaps, “Mrs.
Bostwick’s musical reception evenings.” Were there written, instead of printed programmes,
and no tickets received at the door, they might with justice so be considered; and the private
house[—]like arrangement of rooms at Niblo’s, would add to the illusion.91

90 New York Daily Times, 10 February 1852, 3.
Seating at the concert may have been arranged to evoke the feeling of a private event, rather than support a large audience turnout. An advertisement stated: “No more tickets will be issued than the room can conveniently hold.” Christina Bashford has written on similar motive in seating arrangements in London string quartet concerts in the mid-nineteenth century. She states:

The need to create an atmosphere of intimacy inevitably loomed large at chamber-mus

concerts, as the performance space clearly needed to be appropriate, acoustically, to the music performed. Large halls, by definition, were not ideal, as those at the back could neither hear nor see satisfactorily. Concert-givers whose large subscription lists required them to use large halls met the challenge in imaginative ways. […] Much thought was thus devoted to getting the seating right, the emphasis being on enabling the listener to hear the detail of the music, and recreating the appropriate intimacy of the drawing room – an important indication that listening was considered the all-important goal.

The Musical Times reported that the audience was large, in spite of the weather.

Some of the instrumentalists performed a sextet by Fesca, and another sextet by Bertini. The Albion stated: “We had a flowing and animated ‘Sextuor’ from Fesca, in which some of the notes of the stringed instruments fell—as Mozart said—“under the desk,” but in which Mr. King played an admirable piano.” Mr. W. A. King, with Messrs. Bristow, Hill, Eben, Ahrend, and Pirsson, performed a sextuor by Fesca and one by Bertini, with great precision, but these pieces being deemed merely introductory ones, and not half listened to, they received comparatively little applause.

Here, we have further evidence of George F. Bristow’s activity as a chamber musician. The Albion and Bertini were probably programmed in a similar arrangement to that shown before: one or two movements of the piece are performed at the beginning of each half of the soirée. That the

---

91 Albion, 14 February 1852, 80.
92 New York Daily Times, 10 February 1852, 3.
94 Musical Times, 14 February 1852, 235.
95 Albion, 14 February 1852, 80.
96 Musical Times, 14 February 1852, 235.
string chamber works were “merely introductory,” and “not half listened to,” receiving “comparatively little applause,” indicates the perceived unimportance of these pieces in the Bostwick soirées, relative to the vocal and instrumental performances that followed in each half.

As with all the Bostwick soirées, there were many other types of pieces performed, and these seemingly received more of the audience’s attention and appreciation. “Herr Klein,” a Hungarian tenor, performed an air from Otello, and after being encored, “substituted a very pleasing German song.” “Mrs. Bostwick sang ‘Robert, toi que j’aime’ and ‘Casta Diva’ well, but gave them with less perfection than the ‘Happy Birdling’ which was encored, of course. The effect of ‘the Mountain Maid’ was injured by very labored expression, given to a song which did not need it.”

Bostwick vs. Eisfeld in the New York Concert Marketplace

Thus far in the chapter, the Bostwick and Eisfeld soirées have been presented mostly in alternating order. The narrative has been structured this way in order to better simulate the experience of a New York concert-attending audience. These performances occurred in roughly the same span of time, and were likely competing for success in the city’s musical marketplace.

Here is a list of the Eisfeld and Bostwick soirées covered at this point in the chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Performer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 1851</td>
<td>Bostwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 25, 1851</td>
<td>Bostwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29, 1851</td>
<td>Eisfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4, 1851</td>
<td>Bostwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 26, 1851</td>
<td>Bostwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 27, 1851</td>
<td>Eisfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 1852</td>
<td>Bostwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31, 1852</td>
<td>Eisfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10, 1852</td>
<td>Bostwick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97 *Musical Times*, 14 February 1852, 235.
The Eisfeld and Bostwick concerts took place in fairly quick succession, on one occasion with as little as one day separating them. To be successful in a competitive environment, it is often essential for a business venture to find a unique niche in the marketplace, and its own area to monopolize, while ceding other sections of the market to its competitors. It seems that the Eisfeld and Bostwick soirées both achieved this, and it is necessary to highlight areas of contrast between the two operations.

Neither the Eisfeld nor Bostwick soirées consisted entirely of string chamber music. The multifarious programming structure of Bostwick’s soirées has been discussed. But even the Eisfeld soirées contained vocal performances, along with the chamber music. The major difference is the manner in which each emphasized the string chamber music in its concerts. First, it is worth restating that Bostwick gave two series of six soirées each: the first series spanning between October 28 and December 4, 1851; the second series began on December 26, 1851. Out of a total of twelve soirées in these series, I have found evidence of string chamber works for five performances, or six, if we count the septet arrangements of Beethoven works. String chamber works were not performed at every Bostwick soirée. As an example, the penultimate Bostwick concert (11th of 12) occurred on Friday, January 30, 1852. Instead of string chamber works, each half opened with a piano duo performed by Henry Christian Timm and Richard Hoffman.98

Further, even in those soirées that included such works, the chamber music seems to have played a secondary role. In some accounts, Bertini sextets served as introductory pieces to open each half of the performance. The Bostwick soirée of December 26, 1851, “commenced with the ‘Scherzo and Finale’ of Bertini’s sextour No. 2,” and another by Bertini commenced the second

The Bostwick soirée of February 11, 1852 included sextets by Bertini and Fesca, “but these pieces being deemed merely introductory ones, and not half listened to, they received comparatively little applause.”\textsuperscript{99} Clearly, the emphasis of the Bostwick soirées were the vocal performances of Mrs. Bostwick, and the additional vocal and instrumental works that took up the later, non-“introductory” portions of each half.

In contrast, string chamber works were the central focus of the Eisfeld soirées. In fact, that the concerts were called Classical Quartett Soirées would serve as sufficient evidence of string chamber music’s dominance of the program. But further, the concerts typically featured three string chamber works, with two sections of vocal pieces interspersed between. The secondary role of the vocal selections can be seen by the \textit{Musical Times}’ comments that the vocalist Beutler, “filled up the intervals”\textsuperscript{101} between the string chamber works at the Eisfeld soirée on November 29, 1851.

With the exception of Spohr’s Quintet in C Minor at the January 9, 1852 Bostwick soirée, the string chamber works performed were generally those of Bertini (French) and Fesca (German). The latter two composers are largely not remembered today. The Eisfeld soirées of the season, to this point, consisted of, in order: Haydn, Spohr, Beethoven; Mozart, Beethoven, Mendelssohn; and Mozart, Henselt, Haydn. First, we should notice that all of these composers were of Austro-German origin. Secondly, the canonized composers are well represented, with Adolf Henselt being the obvious outlier. But out of nine works, six of those performed were compositions of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. Eisfeld’s programming to this point excluded any string

\textsuperscript{99} \textit{Musical Times}, 3 January 1852, 139.
\textsuperscript{100} \textit{Musical Times}, 14 February 1852, 235.
\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Musical Times}, 6 December 1851, 70.
chamber works not of Austro-German origin, and eight of the nine pieces performed were by composers who are now members of the canon of “classical” music.

Further differences can be seen in descriptions of the audiences. As previously stated, the Bostwick attendees were likely of the upper classes, with accounts describing a congregation of the downtown merchants, and depicting the audience as a handsome representation of the city’s select circles. Descriptions of later Bostwick soirées described a gathering of friends. A review of the February 11, 1852 soirée, declared that the occasions “resembled a private social gathering,” and described a “thronging audience of friends.” I can only speculate, but I imagine that Bostwick’s soirées eventually lost some of their prestige, becoming less visited by the city’s elite, and better attended by Ms. Bostwick’s friends and associates, and perhaps a few musical aficionados.

Eisfeld’s audiences may have been wealthier than Bostwick’s later audiences; the advertised ticket price to the November 29, 1851 Eisfeld soirée was one dollar, while tickets to the February 10, 1852 Bostwick soirée cost half as much. However, descriptions of Eisfeld’s audiences referred less to their wealth or social status, and more of their ability to appreciate chamber music. The November 29 audience was “large, and we need not add appreciative.” Of the December 27, 1851 Eisfeld soirée, the Musical Times remarked, “When we looked around us on the evening of the Soiree, we were greatly gratified to find so many persons present, and still more gratified at the fact, which we knew, that so many amateurs, male and female, were able to appreciate the refined and refining entertainment.” At the same performance, the

102 Albion, 14 February 1852, 80.
103 Musical Times, 22 November 1851, advertisement page; 29 November 1851, advertisement page.
104 Musical Times, 7 February 1852, advertisement page.
105 Parker’s Journal, 6 December 1851, 606.
106 Musical Times, 3 January 1852, 134.
encore of two movements of Mozart and Haydn quartets, served as “a most gratifying proof of the discernment and appreciation of the audience…” Despite competing in a likely small market for classical music audiences, the Bostwick and Eisfeld soirées differed sizably, and seemed to attract audiences of diverging characteristics.

107 Musical Times, 3 January 1852, 134.
Chapter V: Continuation of the Eisfeld Soirées, March-November 1852

In February 1852, the soirées of Emma Gillingham Bostwick concluded. However, the chamber concerts of the Eisfeld Quartet continued for a number of years. This chapter will present and discuss Eisfeld’s performances through the end of 1852.

Eisfeld Soirée: March 6, 1852

The next Eisfeld soirée was announced in the *Musical Times*: “Mr. Eisfeld gives us another of his charming Quartettes this (Saturday) evening, March 6th. Let no lover of the best music miss this opportunity of hearing it.”¹ The *Albion* began its review:

On Saturday evening last, at the Apollo Rooms, was given the 4th of the second season of these charming entertainments so well deserving of their title; in which the dilettanti and connoisseur[s] in pure musical science have full opportunity of enjoying those cultivated and fine perceptions of harmony, light, shade, and counterpoint presented in compositions limited to the smallest number of instruments requisite to make up the full score; and as these appreciations are rather the gift of the few than common to the mass, we think the patronage which Mr. Eisfeld already receives [provides] a very fair amount of encouragement, and the earnest [indication] of a still further improvement in public taste.²

The program was listed in the *Musical Times*:

QUARTETTE.—No. 3, B flat, (for stringed instr.)

3. Adagio cantabile. 4. Allegro vivace.


SONGS:

a) Rimembranza, - - - - - - BEETHOVEN
b) The Posthorn, - - - - - - FR. SCHUBETH. [Sic]

Mr. Em. KLEIN

QUARTETTE.—E flat (for Piano & stringed instruments.)


¹ *Musical Times*, 6 March 1852, 277.
² *Albion*, 13 March 1852, 128.
“THE STANDARD WATCH.”—Song. - - - - LINDPAINTNER.
Mr. Em. KLEIN.

QUARTETTE.—(No. 4, C minor.) - - - - BEETHOVEN.
1. Allegro ma non troppo. 2. Andante scherzando.

GRAND FUGA.—From Op. 50, No. 3 - - - - BEETHOVEN.
Messrs. Noll, Reyer, Eichhorn & Theo. Eisfeld.3

The Mozart quartet, labeled “No. 3 in B flat,” was most likely K. 458 “Hunt” (1784). It is in B-flat major, and bears movement titles almost identical to those listed in the program. Furthermore, it was published in Vienna in 1785 as “op. 10, no. 3,”4 which might explain why it is was termed “No. 3” in the program.

Of the Mozart performance, Richard Storrs Willis (now editor of the Musical Times) inquired:

“Was it the state of atmosphere, or from some other case, that the instruments evinced such disparity of tone in the early part of the first quartette? It was not perceptible afterward.”5 A similar remark was made in the Albion: “We should say that the violincello, especially at the commencement of the concert of last Saturday, was scarcely equal to the rest of the quatuor; there was occasionally a something which recalled to our mind a remark of our acute and learned predecessor on a former occasion, as to ‘whether there was or was not, some disparity in the tuning;’ but the feeling wore away by degrees…”6

Concerning the piece itself, Willis stated:

The compositions of Mozart contrast strangely, but certainly not unfavorably, with other masters of the German-school. His style is so much more Italian than theirs; Italian, we mean, in point of melodiousness. No composer is richer in melodies than Mozart. Even his preparations—as they are technically called—or the transitions from one department of a composition to another, are almost melodies themselves. With other composers they may be

3 Musical Times, 13 March 1852, 292.
5 Musical Times, 13 March 1852, 292.
6 Albion, 13 March 1852, 128.
interesting, as displaying skill, like Beethoven’s “preparations” for instance, but the attractive melodiousness is wanting. Mozart, in his compositions, throws away his melodies, like flowers with both hands. For this reason he is more appreciable, by the common ear, than any other classical writer.\(^7\)

It is interesting that nationality has been attached to musical attributes, such as “melodiousness” and accessibility to the untrained ear. If an “Italian sound” is more capable of being enjoyed by normal listeners, then an Austro-German sound would probably be seen as being less accessible. It is implied that other “German-school” composers are not skilled in writing melodies as Italians. Perhaps the critic viewed German music as being based too much on what his contemporaries often called “science,” a label that could encompass many characteristics, but perhaps form and development, counterpoint, complexity of harmonic structure are features that might be embraced by it. In many ways, this nationalist line of thinking resembles the *Musical Times’* earlier remarks that the Italian opera required less musical education to enjoy than did the string quartet.

Ferdinand Ries (1784-1838) composed three quartets for piano, violin, viola, and cello: Op. 13, Op. 17, and Op. 129.\(^8\) Op. 17 is the only of these in E-flat major, so this must have been the piece performed. About the work, the *Musical Times* said:

> Of the quartette by Ries, the *Allegro* most attracted us, which was ably composed. The Adagio was heavy, and seemed too much like an attempted imitation of Beethoven, to satisfy us altogether. Ries was a pupil of Beethoven; the only pupil, we think, he ever had, who pursued an extended course of study with him. He did not justify altogether, the hopes that were entertained for his future eminence, although he proved a thorough-bred, and accomplished artist.\(^9\)

The claim that the Adagio seemed “too much like an attempted imitation of Beethoven,” may have some merit. Cecil Hill, in Ries’ *Grove* entry, states: “Beethoven is reported to have made

---

\(^7\) *Musical Times*, 13 March 1852, 292.


\(^9\) *Musical Times*, 13 March 1852, 292.
the most damaging remark about him (‘he imitates me too much’), which, though probably apocryphal, is only partly fair.”

According to Richard Storrs Willis, Wollenhaupt’s piano-playing in the Ries “evinced great finish, and a careful study of the part. We liked the warmth, and earnestness, and close attention, with which he played. Would he allow us to suggest to him, that his seat at the instrument—the general *pose* of his body—might be improved somewhat! There is so much in an *external* impression upon people in this world!” Hermann Adolph Wollenhaupt (1827-1863), a German pianist, entered the United States in 1845. According to *Grove*, he: “appeared as pianist on various occasions with the New York Philharmonic Orchestra [Philharmonic Society] and in other concerts, and attained a distinguished career as a pianist, teacher, and composer.”

The Beethoven quartet “No. 4” was the Op. 18, No. 4, in C Minor (published 1801). The “Grand Fuga,” from, “Op. 50, No. 3;” was probably the fourth movement of String Quartet in C Major, Op. 59, No. 3 “Rasumovsky” (1806). Despite the similarity of names, the piece almost certainly would not have been the *Grosse Fuge*, Op. 133. Beethoven’s late quartets were not yet very appreciated, and had yet to be welcomed into the repertoire. In its April 17, 1852 issue, *Dwight’s Journal of Music* reported of a recent revival performance of Beethoven’s late quartets in Paris, and gives much detail about reception of those works at the time:

Beethoven’s Last Quartets.—These productions of the giant’s saddest days of almost total deafness, which have borne a sort of reputation of inscrutable profundity or of outright madness, according to men’s various degrees of faith in genius, have lately had a fair trial in Paris, in the *Cercle musical et litteraire*, directed by M. Malibran, and composed of artists unwilling to waste their *virtuosity* upon music without virtue. With what result, so far as one genial critic was concerned, may be seen by the following, which we translate from the *Gazette Musicale*:

---

11 *Musical Times*, 13 March 1852, 292.
“The six last quatuors of Beethoven have remained, since the disappearance of that great man from this musical world in 1827, in a state of incomprehensible mystery. Some said, and they still say: ‘When the author of the Pastoral Symphony, so limpid in its melody and so clear in its harmony, composed in his last quatuors, Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, he was deaf and almost crazy with the grief of having lost the sense most precious to every musician.’ . . . . Certain it is, that on comparing the style of these last quatuors, with those earlier ones, so full of well turned melody, so clear, so logical by unity of thought, one finds himself quite lost and puzzled by this continual adjournment of the final cadence; by this seemingly unnecessary variety of measure; this spasmodic rhythm, which seems the result of a brain, a thought sick with the fever of innovation.”

According to the *Musical Times*, the Beethoven quartet was the “gem of the evening:”

The play of instruments in that tremulant, descending figure of one of the latter movements, was effective, fantastic, and Beethovian, to the last degree. The character of the entire piece was decidedly *weird*. The performers did their part skillfully throughout, with the exception perhaps of the first violin, Mr. Noll, in whose playing there was—in the course of the evening—an occasional blemish.14

The *Albion* said:

When warmed into the spirit of the fugated passages in the minuetto in Beethoven’s beautiful quartette in C minor, and the concluding “Grande Fuga”—indeed we may say throughout—Messrs. Noll, Reyer, and Eichhorn, with the able leader of the party, showed themselves fully equal to represent this most refined and exquisite portion of the great German school of instrumental music [...].15

This passage is an example of the association of counterpoint with German style. The “fugated passages” represented the “great German school” of music. This stands in contrast to contemporaries’ view of “melodiousness” having an Italian character.

**Eisfeld Soirée: April 3, 1852**

The next Eisfeld soirée was advertised to occur at the Apollo Rooms on Saturday, April 3, 1852. Mrs. Laura A. Jones, Miss Julia Wheelock, and Miss Maria Leach were to perform, as well

---

13 *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, 17 April 1852, 14.
14 *Musical Times*, 13 March 1852, 292.
15 *Albion*, 13 March 1852, 128.
as H. C. Timm, and the quartet of J. Noll, H. Reyer, L. Eichhorn, and Theodore Eisfeld. Jones, an American vocalist, had appeared on the first Eisfeld soirée (February 15, 1851), discussed in the previous chapter. Julia Wheelock was Jones’ niece. Leach was an English mezzo-soprano who is first mentioned by Lawrence in a December 1847 performance. In its review, Oliver Dyer, writing in the *Musical World and Journal of the Fine Arts* reported that the soirée was: “attended by an increased number of intelligent lovers of chaste and beautiful music. The room was comfortably filled and the following choice program was presented”:


*Messrs. NOLL, REYER, EICHHORN AND THEODORE EISFELD.***

**DUETTO—“I would that my love.”** .................... Mendelssohn.
  *Mrs. LAURA A. JONES and Miss WHEELOCK.*

**QUINTETTE—Op. 130 (for Piano and Stringed Instruments) .................... SPOHR.**
1. Allegro moderato.  2. Scherzo moderato.
3. Adagio.  4. Finale, vivace.

*By Mr. HENRY C. TIMM and Messrs. NOLL, REYER, EICHHORN and THEODORE EISFELD.*

**TRIO—from the Opera “Zemire and Azor.”** .................... SPOHR.

*Mrs. LAURA A. JONES, Miss WHEELOCK and Miss M. LEACH.*

**QUARTETTE--No. 63 D major** .................... Haydn.

---

16 *Musical Times*, 3 April 1852, 350.
19 Lawrence, *Resonances*, 488. Leach’s brother, Stephen Leach, was also a vocalist in New York. See Lawrence, *Resonances*, 539.
20 Lawrence, *Reverberations*, 240.
Messrs. NOLL, REYER, EICHHORN and THEODORE EISFELD.²¹

Of the Beethoven, the *Musical Times* commented: “The gem of the evening was the first piece, which is generally known as the ‘Harp Quartette,’ one of the most difficult which Beethoven has left us; its performance was entirely successful.”²² Boston-based *Dwight’s Journal of Music* borrowed from “Howadji of the [New York] Tribune,” who had said, “We liked best the performance of Beethoven’s Quartet. The instruments went as one; they sang like a dreaming organ—if organs do dream, or if in dreaming they sing.”²³ Beethoven’s string quartet, Op. 74 “Harp,” is the penultimate of Beethoven’s middle-period quartets, followed only by Op. 95. To this point, it was the latest of Beethoven’s quartets performed by the Eisfeld ensemble, and possibly, as yet publically performed in New York.

*Dwight’s Journal of Music* had a New York correspondent who used the pseudonym, “Hafiz.”

The original quote in *Dwight’s*, referring to the review was:

We were hoping the good genius would inspire our “Hafiz” to write us somewhat about those EISFELD’S QUARTET SOIREES; but how can an Eastern poet sing through such East winds as ours?—so we must even borrow from his friend and ours, “Howadji” of the Tribune, […]²⁴

“Hafiz,” as pointed out by Lawrence,²⁵ was actually George William Curtis. Despite *Dwight’s* implication of “Hafiz” and “Howadji” being different people, Curtis was probably the writer behind both nicknames. Two of his recent books, *Niles Notes of a Howdji*²⁶ and *The Howadji in Syria*²⁷ bore the name. Curtis also wrote for the *New York Daily Tribune*. I have been unable to

---

²² *Musical Times*, 10 April 1852, 357.
²³ *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, 24 April 1852, 22.
²⁴ *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, 24 April 1852, 22.
²⁵ Lawrence, *Reverberations*, 235.
²⁶ Lawrence, *Reverberations*, 137 (footnote 9).
²⁷ Lawrence, *Reverberations*, 235.
find a review in the *Daily Tribune*, so perhaps Dwight was simply acknowledging that “Howadji” worked for that paper.

Of the “Harp” quartet and its composer, Oliver Dyer (in *Musical World and Journal of the Fine Arts*) launched into a lengthy incantation of Beethovenian worship:

Inexplicable Beethoven! Dim and mysterious even to thyself, how shall any mortal dare to interpret thee? Yet feedest thou hope with thy very indefiniteness, and playest with chaos in a manner godlike. Thy haloed head, like one of “Titian’s, full of dumb eloquence,” is “seen to soar” above the unsymmetrical cloudinesses [sic] beneath, and with a flash of thine eye and a stroke of thy wand lo! fairy form in the living light appear. Then, far away thou fliest; while we from earthly bowers can only gaze in silent sadness at thine unclouded self, “Serene in heaven.”

[…] Whate’er [sic] thy teaching, Seer, we thank thee! We half suspect thou’rt [sic] breaking our faith in man,—but, then, thou bringest us nearer God.²⁸

Among the excessive hyperbole and deification of Beethoven in this passage, several elements are worth pointing out. First and obviously, the use of antiquated language invokes a sense of religiousness through its resemblance of early biblical editions. Next, as “dim and mysterious,” Beethoven is deemed to be beyond the interpretation of “any mortal,” almost implying that Beethoven was immortal, even though deceased at this time. Beethoven, according to the critic, plays with chaos “in a manner godlike;” possessed a “haloed head;” and soars above the clouds so that earthly watchers see him in heaven. Further, St. Ludwig “bringest us nearer God.” The sacralization of Beethoven’s music may have had no greater advocate than Oliver Dyer.

According to *Grove*, there is no Op. 13 piano quintet by Spohr.²⁹ The Spohr piece performed was most likely, in my opinion, the Piano Quintet in D Major, Op. 130 (1845), assuming the omission of the “0” in the program (although, the Op. 53 quintet (1821) could be another possibility, if the “1” had been a typographical error for “5.”) The *Albion* found the Spohr

²⁸ Musical World and Journal of the Fine Arts, 15 April 1852, 246.
quintette, “decidedly the piece which seemed to tell the best during the evening. Besides being a combination of several very perfect and beautiful movements, it afforded a capital opportunity of contrasting the peculiar properties of the violins and piano.”

It continued:

The accompaniment and responding of the latter to the violins was managed with much spirit and effect by Mr. Timm. Louis Spohr may have blundered now and then in his imitations of the ancients; or rather in trying to unite their modes with the modern and his own, for which, however, he has paid penalty enough in the severe handling his productions have received from some who perhaps have but little understood the genius of either; but we believe he is amongst the number, far from a majority, who have rendered real service to the science.

It further stated:

The straining after effect and affectation, which will scarce ever permit the natural progression of a harmony or resolution of a discord, but teases us with suspension after suspension—endurable only in the opera, where music must be continued during long drawn scenes of passion and sentiment, and where the eye can repose upon a visible representation when the ear is fatigued—Spohr has avoided. In other words he has done much to regenerate the too often violated principles of musical phrasing. Bald and abrupt as he may be at times, and seeming to lose himself now and then, as in the antique pause upon the dominant of the relative minor, we must remember that most composers have their foibles: that even Haydn weakens himself by a too frequent recurrence of his favourite passages of contrary motion, and that Beethoven, in giving the reins to his imagination, sometimes puts that of his hearers upon the rack. But Spohr deserves well of the musical world; his intentions in throwing himself out of the popular styles and the footsteps of his predecessors have been good; and we will venture to foretell a greater respect for his name hereafter, than even that which exists at present.

These comments are quite interesting, particularly the assertion that Spohr’s name will gain greater appreciation as time goes on. This claim exists in the context of a comparison to Haydn and Beethoven. Certainly, Spohr is remembered today as a composer, but one who is generally perceived to be in the tier below Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven.

Of Timm’s performance at the piano during the Spohr quintet, George William Curtis (“Howadji”) said:

---

30 Albion, 10 April 1852, 176.
31 Albion, 10 April 1852, 176.
32 Albion, 10 April 1852, 176.
President TIMM, of the Philharmonic, assisted them. We had not heard him in public for a long time. But custom cannot stale the pleasure of his smooth, neat, clear and graceful performance. The notes do not sparkle from his touch, but they drip translucent from his fingers. His style has a transparent character, like the watery richness of musical glasses. It is fine, not forcible, —sweet, not magnificent. His Excellency’s fingers are almost dandies, so point-device they are, with such white-kidded daintiness they trip along the keys. For President TIMM, among musicians, amateurs and the public, there is but one party, and its name is legion—the party of his friends.  

33

The Haydn quartet “No. 63” in D major was most likely the Op. 64, No. 5, the “Lark” (1790). Grove also labels it as “No. 53,” and HIII 63. The Hoboken “63” label is the only one to make sense: there are no Opus 63 quartets, and quartet No. 63 is the Op. 76, No. 4 in B-flat Major “Sunrise” (1797).  

34 Additionally, the Hoboken catalog lists several earlier editions referring to this quartet as number 63.  

35 After stating their preference for the Beethoven quartet, Curtis added: “A musical friend near us preferred the Haydn Quartet, and we could not quarrel. In fact, like certain other artists, the gentlemen of these Quartets, are always good. Their degrees are upward from that. Sometimes they may be better, often best, but never less than good.”  

36 Oliver Dyer (Musical World and Journal of the Fine Arts), near the end of his review, states the following about Eisfeld’s soirée and the music played there:

We trust Mr. Eisfeld is reaping a comfortable reward for his worthy efforts,—though a generous and intelligent appreciation by the right kind of people is often better to the soul of an artist than very many pennies. We cannot but hope that, ere long, some of the thousands of dollars which are now prospectively squandered upon the Italian Opera (concerning the immoral tendency of which there cannot be much doubt among sane and religious minds) will hereafter be appropriated by fathers and sons towards the cultivation of this delightful chamber music. Chamber music, that is, home music, is cultivated by those who love home and all its hallowed influences the best, and who seek seldom for pleasure where there is to [sic] much of a spectacle.  

33 Dwight’s Journal of Music, 24 April 1852, 22.  
34 James Webster and Georg Feder, “Haydn, Joseph,” in Grove Music Online,  
36 Dwight’s Journal of Music, 24 April 1852, 22.  
37 Musical World and Journal of the Fine Arts, 15 April 1852, 247.
There are three points to discuss from this. First is the downplaying of the commercial as an element of sacralization. While wishing Eisfeld a comfortable reward (presumably financially), the reviewer claims that “generous and intelligent appreciation by the right kind of people” is frequently better to the “soul of an artist” than financial success. Next, the critic comments that Italian opera is immoral. We have seen several times a tendency from newspaper reviewers to favor German “scientific” music over Italian, but here, a connection is made between nationality and morality. “Sane and religious minds” cannot much doubt the “immoral tendency” of the Italian Opera. Further, he ties immorality to commercialism; money is not of much concern to Eisfeld, but thousands of dollars are spent on “spectacle” at the Italian Opera. Finally, chamber music is identified as music of the home, and this has further moral implications. Chamber music, “is cultivated by those who love home and all its hallowed influences the best,” presumably good God-fearing men and women of family life.

Eisfeld Soirée: May 8, 1852

*Dwight’s Journal of Music* announced the upcoming “EISFELDT’S LAST CLASSICAL SOIREE” as probably to be on May 8th at the Apollo Rooms. The program was announced to include: “BEETHOVEN’S Septet, in the original form, for clarinet, bassoon, horn, violin, viola, ’cello and contrabasso; HAYDN’S celebrated Quartet in G; and either MENDELSSOHN’S second Trio, in C minor, or SCHUMANN’S Quintet, with Mr. Scharfenberg for pianist.”38 A *Musical Times* advertisement listed the participating roster: “Mrs. H. C. Watson, Mr. William

---

38 *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, 1 May 1852, 30.
Scharfenberg, Messrs. Kiefer, Ely Schmitz, Jacoby, Noll, Reyer, and Eichhorn, will assist Mr. Theodore Eisfeld.”

The program, listed in the *Musical Times*, consisted of:

### Part I.

**GRAND SEPTETTE [E flat] -** - - - - - BEETHOVEN.

1. Adagio ed Allegro con brio.
2. Adagio cantabile.
3. Tempo di minuetto.
4. Andante con Variazoni.
5. Scherzo molto e vivace.
6. Andante alla marcia e Presto.


### Part II.

**TRIO.**—[Op. 66] for Piano, Violin & Violoncello - - - MENDELSSOHN.

1. Allegro energico e con fuoco.
2. Andante esprisivo.
3. Scherzo
4. Finale, allegro appassionato.

By Mr. Wm. Scharfenberg, Messrs. Noll & Eichhorn.

“A BIRD SAT ON AN ALDER BOUCH.”—Song with Violin Solo, SPOHR.

Mrs. H. C. Watson & Mr. J. Noll.

**HYMNE RUSSE with Variations for Stringed Instruments, - - VIET. [sic]**


**ROMANCE.**

Mrs. H. C. Watson.

**QUARTETTE No. 57, G Major, [by request] - - - HAYDN.**

1. Allegro con spirito.
2. Menuetto [illegible]
3. Adagio religioso.
4. Allegro ma non troppo.


George William Curtis, writing as “Hafiz” for *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, made his first report on the Eisfeld soirées. He reviewed the May 8th concert, but first spoke of the series as a whole:

I have not written you of EISFELD’S delightful Quartet Soirées, but have only referred to them. They have been very excellent. […] Mr. Eisfeld commenced his chamber concerts last

---

39 *Musical Times*, 8 May 1852, advertisement page.
40 Probably Op. 76, No. 1, though the second and third movements have been switched in order. This piece was also performed on the soirée of January 31, 1852.
41 *Musical Times*, 15 May 1852, 15.
Winter at Hope Chapel. There are two halls of that name opposite the New York Hotel—Hope Chapel the greater, and Hope Chapel the less; the latter being a low, bare, dismal room under the other, and corresponding to a vestry. It was an odd place for such select concerts. But they succeeded admirably; the choice circle of “classics” and “pedants” was always gathered together, in Hope Chapel the less—or Hopeless Chapel as it more properly looks—and this season Mr. Eisfeld has taken the Apollo rooms, whose antecedents are musically good—for there were held the first Philharmonic Concerts.42

Remarking on the audience present, “Hafiz” used the terms “classics” and “pedants,” implying a learned, knowledgeable group. Similar descriptions had been given before, but he next provides perhaps the most valuable information yet:

He has culled for us the best of Beethoven’s, Haydn’s, Mozart’s, Spohr’s and Mendelssohn’s chamber compositions, and they have been played to an audience that truly enjoyed them. Of course it is not a ‘Native American’ audience, for all your neighbors are sure to speak German, and you mark the well-known characteristics of their features; and if you could only summon the Kellner, and order *ein brocken brod* and *ein glas bier*, you would be far away from the Apollo and lost in an anonymous *Lokal*.43

Thus it appears that many, if not most, of the Eisfeld soirée attendees were of German origin. It would make sense that these concerts of primarily Austro-German composers would find success with German immigrants, who had been arriving in droves, especially since 1848. The map below (p. 151) illustrates the outline of “Kleindeutschland,” the growing German area of lower Manhattan. Nadel states of the neighborhood:

It grew steadily outward from a focus in the Eleventh Ward on Manhattan’s East Side, and included most of the Tenth, Thirteenth, and Seventeenth wards as well […]. […] In 1845, […] it was a newly built-up area that was inhabited mainly by American-born workers and their families.44

He continues, describing the developing ethnic composition of each ward in Kleindeutschland:

By 1855, this now distinctly-German district contained more than four times as many German immigrants as it had in 1845. It was almost completely built up and its center of gravity had shifted north and west. The Thirteenth Ward had remained the least German (only about 33 percent) and had grown the least since 1845, that is, by only 18 percent. To the west, the

42 *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, 22 May 1852, 52.
43 *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, 22 May 1852, 52.
Tenth Ward had grown by 26 percent and was now 45 percent German. In the northeast, the Eleventh Ward was still the most German (now 53 percent) and had nearly doubled its population. The Seventeenth Ward was the last to be built up and its population had increased by 120 percent. Still only 43 percent German in 1855, the Seventeenth Ward was to become the core of Kleindeutschland in later years.\textsuperscript{45}

Figure 2 (see p. 151), reproduced from Nadel, shows the wards of lower Manhattan, with the Kleindeutschland area highlighted. As will later be shown, the main venues for performances of string chamber works (Apollo Rooms, Niblo’s Saloon, and Hope Chapel) were all located on Broadway, relatively close to the German neighborhoods.

Returning to the performance, the \textit{Albion} said of the conditions:

The heated condition of the atmosphere probably prevented as much of a rush as we should have otherwise expected at the farewell occasion, for the present, of enjoying a species of entertainment for which we shall have no immediate substitute. Still, the room though not crowded, was tolerably full, and the interest and enjoyment of the performances [w]as well, if not better, sustained than ever. The violins, however, thrown from the accustomed coolness of a humid and wintry spring to the sudden tension of a violent heat, would play pranks which must have been very annoying to the players. The apprehensions of a string suddenly snapping, in the midst of an intricate passage, is no pleasant one; and the reality occurred several times during the evening. Once, it became necessary to have Mrs. Watson’s song in the middle of a trio, which was thus interrupted.\textsuperscript{46}

The \textit{Albion} remarked of the Beethoven:

We therefore merely say, in allusion to this farewell quartette soirée, that Beethoven’s septette, in which the clarionet, horn, and bassoon lend their sweetness, and a moderate quantum of double bass lends additional fullness to the delicacy of the quatuor, seemed to be greatly relished. A delightful mixture it is: what combination could be more recherché?\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{45} Nadel, \textit{Little Germany}, 32.
\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Albion}, 15 May 1852, 232.
\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Albion}, 15 May 1852, 232.
The septet was Beethoven’s Septet in E flat for clarinet, horn, bassoon, violin, viola, violoncello, and double bass, Op. 20 (1799). The *Musical Times* remarked on Beethoven’s skill in the variation form:

---

Beethoven is one of the few composers whom we like to hear in variation (one of the movements in the Septette.) This, as a general thing, is—to us—the most ungrateful of all musical forms. So few can vary a theme skillfully and well! Perhaps the most skillful Variationist who ever lived was Reicha; and he ranks first in this department of composition, we believe, in the judgment of foreign cognoscenti. Next to Reicha comes Beethoven; whose ingenuity and power of newly-inventing a theme, overcame the stiffness and mechanical tedium of this style of composition. In the present case, we liked it as well as any of the movements—it was truly delicious.  

Curtis, in Dwight’s Journal of Music, commented:

The charm of the evening was Beethoven’s Septette,—whose rich, ripe, mellow character, held all the performers to sympathy of feeling not less than truth of tone. […] How masterly this Septette is! How full of the majestic faculty of genius in its prime. It varies through the different movements with a fertility of invention, and a singular clearness of expression; as if, I mean, the composer had found no difficulty in conveying his intention. There is nothing cloudy or gloomily grand, in it,—none of the misty Alpine peaks that rise defyingly along the usual range of his mountainous music. But the airs are so melodious, the movements so transparent, that it reminds you of the sunny ease of Mozart, or of his own Pastoral Symphony, although without any feeling of superficiality.

The comparison to Reicha seems unexpected. Reicha is a lesser-known composer today, but the critic considers Beethoven to be second to him in variation writing. Curtis, meanwhile, calls Beethoven a genius, and his septet, “masterly.”

Mendelssohn’s Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66 (1845) was the next chamber work performed. Curtis was somewhat critical of the composer’s music:

A Trio of Mendelssohn’s was played upon the piano by Scharfenberg, with violin and violoncello. It was interrupted by the snapping of a string in the violoncello. But, like most of Mendelssohn’s Concertos which I, at the moment, recall, it wanted the glow of genius, the permeating sense of music, rather than of science. The refinement, the feeling, the ripeness, the skill,—these I always feel in Mendelssohn, and often as in the Lieder ohne Worte, the overtures and parts of the oratorios, a beauty which is quite inexpressible. Yet, if I read upon the bill a Concerto of his, I am not kindled with expectation, but rather with curiosity. I know it will be good. But will it be irresistible? Will it bear me along with itself, or leave me, only longing to be borne, upon the bank? Don’t suspect me of the slightest treachery to Mendelssohn—but I do find a good deal of his music uninteresting.

49 Musical Times, 15 May 1852, 15.
50 Dwight’s Journal of Music, 22 May 1852, 52.
51 Dwight’s Journal of Music, 22 May 1852, 52.
Willis commented further:

Mendelssohn’s Trio was erudite and elaborate, but, in our apprehension, chaotic and unclear: and one cannot but harbor the suspicion that it was this, even in the mind of the composer himself. Perhaps there was some intention in it to represent a mind in [illegible]—if so, it was all right; but we should have liked a subsequent solution, and some clear and satisfying termination. One of the [illegible], afforded Mr. Scharfenberg very [illegible] work for the fingers, particularly so, from the tremendous tempo in which it was taken. We never knew Mr. Scharfenberg’s touch quite so fleet and light.\(^{52}\)

The *New-York Daily Tribune* praised Scharfenberg’s performance in the Mendelssohn: “We have never heard Mr. Scharfenberg do better. The force, the precision, the just sentiment and the delicate appreciation were not lost upon the audience.”\(^{53}\)

Again, a review of a Mendelssohn’s work is critical, as they have often been. As the Mendelssohn work was still somewhat recent in its composition, it is possible that the critics were often unsure of how to receive it, as with many of the composer’s works. This idea is expressed by Curtis’ statement in *Dwight’s*: “I know it will be good. But will it be irresistible?” It seems to show a level of respect of Mendelssohn, but the critic is reluctant to place the composer at the same canonized level as Beethoven.

The Hymne Russe, with variations, by Vaclav Veit (1806-1864) may have been based on the Russian national anthem at that time. Aleksey Fyodorovich L’vov composed the hymn *Bozhe, tsarya khrani* (“God Save the Tsar”) with words by Zhukovsky, in 1833, in response to the Czar’s request to compose a national anthem.\(^{54}\) The *Musical Times* referred to the “Hymne russe” as the best “national song,” which suggests the likelihood of *Bozhe, tsarya khrani* as the piece:

What a beautiful theme is that of the *Hymne russe*,--incomparably the best national song in the world! The variations by Veit, evinced no very great inventive power, (the central variation, in which the theme is carried below an overlying accompaniment, being the best)

---

\(^{52}\) *Musical Times*, 15 May 1852, 15-16.


but the whole composition has a modest, unassuming, and eminently pleasing character. Veit, who composed the variations on the Russian hymn, is no longer well remembered. He was a Czech composer who, according to Grove: “pioneered the 19th-century Czech development of chamber music (his quartets were popular in Prague concerts and soirées, and were familiar to Smetana), and his Symphony in E minor (Op.49) was one of the most important works in the genre by a Czech composer before Dvořák.” Curtis said of the piece:

They played the Russian Hymn with Veit’s variations, and it was religiously done. I have never heard a more perfect performance than the delivery of the melody. It was entirely simple, but it was pleading and pathetic beyond words. In music of a Northern inspiration there is a strange wildness,—a masculine grief, but utterly hopeless, as of old Norse Kings. You remember Landseer’s Reindeer standing upon the shore and looking across the cold dark water to the snowy silence of the mountains. There is no hint of the Summer or of the softness in the picture, but its pathos is fascinating and profound. It is the same that there is in this Russian Hymn, and in the northern songs of Jenny Lind—which are as far from the clap-trap as Vedrai Carino.

The last chamber work performed was a quartet in G major, “No. 57,” by Haydn. Haydn’s Quartet No. 57 [HIII 72; Op. 74, No. 1] is in C major. His quartet HIII 57 [No. 42; Op. 54, No. 2] is also in C major. This is likely the same quartet “No. 57” performed earlier in the year, at Eisfeld’s January 31, 1852 soirée (Op. 76, No. 1), given the identical movement titles, though the second and third movements appear to have been switched in order. Curtis, writing for Dwight’s Journal of Music, stated of it:

Last of all we had Haydn’s Quartet in G major, which well ended this delightful series of concerts. The Adagio Religioso, so tranquil, so solemn, so sweet, was given with that feeling and fidelity of which you would be sure with these gentlemen. You can no longer pride yourself, in Boston, upon monopolizing the finest music in the finest kind. Your withers are wrung. With the Philharmonic and Eisfeld, we yield the field to none.
Willis (*Musical Times*) contributed:

Father Haydn—the healthful, serene, and fascinating old patriarch, closed worthily the programme, and the performances of the season. The *adagio religioso* of his Quartette, moved one well-nigh to tears with its exquisite pathos. But few spirits of this world, have ever lived in so uniformly serene a heaven as did Haydn!\(^{60}\)

The father-like description of Haydn contrasts with the frequent portrayal of Mozart as youthful. Nineteenth-century depictions of Haydn as a father figure, such as “Papa Haydn” or “father of the symphony,” carried multiple meanings. James Garratt writes:

On one level, the idea of Haydn as a father figure reflects how perceptions of his character and music were shaped by his fame in the later years of his life. Yet it also served to emphasize that his significance for music history lay in his earlier achievements. Even before his death, terms normally associated with figures from the distant past were applied to Haydn. Descriptions of Haydn as an “old master” or “forefather” played a key role in the construction of the canon of modern instrumental music, and in establishing the view that the rise of the symphony was a uniquely German achievement.\(^{61}\)

But nineteenth-century writings about Haydn frequently portray him as classical, yet antiquated and distant from the current time. The word “Heiterkeit” was frequently used in describing the composer. Garratt writes:

On one level, therefore, the use of this term in relation to Haydn bolstered his claim to classical status. On another, it relegated him to an age of innocence, fencing him off from the modern world. This strategy, along with the tendency to treat him as the first and least significant component of the Haydn-Mozart-Beethoven triad […].\(^{62}\)

Garratt states that one nineteenth-century critic’s: “bifurcated approach to Haydn – which affirmed his canonic status while distancing him from modern concerns – was common throughout the second quarter of the nineteenth century.”\(^{63}\) Returning to Willis’s review in the *Musical Times*, we can see that there again also lies a religious element in describing this music.

\(^{60}\) *Musical Times*, 15 May 1852, 16.


Much as the music is sacralized, or made sacred, Haydn is declared to live in “so uniformly serene a heaven” as “but few spirits of this world” ever have.

Oliver Dyer (*Musical World and Journal of the Fine Arts*) went on at length about the programming of vocal music to fill in between the string chamber works. The songs, in this case, were sung by Mrs. H. C. Watson:

About the most genteel burlesque we have lately witnessed, is the introduction of second or third rate vocalism at “classical” instrumental concerts. It is about of a piece with filling up the interstices of a social evening party with elastic sponge cake and elegantly diluted lemonade. Pray, be a little more thoughtful, good musicians! Secure a flute, clarionet [sic], trumpet or horn solo; but do not require a woman, and through her, vocal music, to receive such undisguised contempt. Now, the fair vocalists and their friends, we should judge, would save themselves considerable chagrin, if they reflect for a moment that a certain idea prevails,—and it does not come from Italy, France, or England, but is purely, essentially German,—viz.: that fiddles were made before human voices—*i. e.*, instrumental music is the lady of the parlor, and vocal music is she (Cinderella?) of the kitchen. At least, the remark is true of a very large class of German minds.—It is not true of the best German musical intellects, as can easily be proved; but is more especially true of that large class who are ever inclined to place mechanism before mind.64

As mentioned previously, Eisfeld’s soirées regularly included vocal performances in between the string chamber pieces, though the latter were clearly emphasized in the selections. Here, the reviewer criticizes this practice, arguing that gaps should be filled by instrumental solos, rather than vocal. He also speaks to the subject of gender, stating: “do not require a woman, and through her, vocal music, to receive such undisguised contempt.” This begs the question as to which aspect invited greater contempt: vocal selections on a concert of instrumental music, or a female performer on a concert otherwise consisting of men?

The critic proposes that vocalists would save themselves much chagrin if they acknowledge that a certain “German” idea exists, that in essence, instrumental music is superior to vocal. “Instrumental music is the lady of the parlor, and vocal music is she (Cinderella?) of the

---

kitchen,” to use the critic’s words. This idea, held by “a very large class of German minds,”
combined with the “undisguised contempt” for the vocal performances, may be a further
indication of a predominantly German audience at the soirées.

The *Daily Tribune* concluded with the following comments about the series:

Even our praises do poor justice to the value of those soirées of chamber music, for which
New-York is indebted to Mr. Eisfeld. Any man who perceives that they are the first public
introduction of an utterly new style of music, and a style in which all the great masters
excelled, will understand the extent of our obligation. They commenced last year in Hope
Chapel, and their character was at once so much appreciated, that this year Mr. Eisfeld found
no difficulty in filling the Apollo rooms. We take leave of him for the present season with the
assurance that the lovers of fine music appreciate his efforts and rejoice in their success, and
with eagerness anticipate the third series of Eisfeld’s soirées.65

**Eisfeld Soirée: October 30, 1852**

The upcoming 1852-53 season of Eisfeld’s soirées was announced in *The Musical World and
New York Musical Times* (a merger of Dyer’s *Musical World and Journal of the Fine Arts* with
Willis’ *Musical Times*66) on October 9, 1852. It also provides the most detailed pricing
information yet in surviving sources:

- The pleasantest announcement of the season thus far, (in other musical matters) is that
  contained in a programme which we have seen of Mr. Theodore Eisfeld. THE
  INSTRUCTIVE AND DELICIOUS QUARTETTS OF LAST SEASON ARE TO BE
  CONTINUED. We have already given Mr. Eisfeld so much honest praise for these
  performances, that we hardly know how to say more. Next to the Philharmonic concerts,
  these soirées are the greatest musical luxury of our New York winter;—a remark to which
  we make no exception of concerts or concert stars.—The subscription lists for these soirées,
  (of which there are to be six in the course of the season) are now opened in all the musical
  establishments in the city. The terms are the following:—
    One Admission to the Six Soirées...........$5 00
    Three Admissions to the Six Soirés........10 00
    Single Admission....................................1 00
  The following artists have promised to participate in the performances:—

---

66 Lawrence, *Reverberations*, 253.
VOCALISTS—Mrs. Edward Loder, Mrs. Laura A. Jones, Mrs. H. C. Watson, Madame Seidenburg.

A single admission ticket was a dollar; this was the same price that was advertised for the November 29, 1851 soirée. There was, however, significant financial savings to be found by purchasing a subscription to the series. A single admission to the entire series cost five dollars, a one-dollar discount from purchasing six single admission tickets. A three-ticket series subscription was all-the-more beneficial. This subscription cost ten dollars: an eight-dollar discount from the equivalent cost of purchasing eighteen single admission tickets.

The Albion stated that its announcement of the Eisfeld season:

will be enough in itself to those who know what perfect enjoyment is held out in these truly classic entertainments—quieter perhaps, but full a[n]d complete as any. Those who wish to become acquainted with the most refined and elegant portion of the whole instrumental school must remember that there are only six of these soirées in the season. 68

The Musical World and New York Musical Times, jointly edited by Oliver Dyer and Richard Storrs Willis, claimed, “The programme for the opening concert, is admirable—as Eisfeld’s programmes always are;—and it only remains for the musical ‘upper-three thousand’ to fill Niblo’s Saloon, and ‘assist’ at its performance.” 69

Dwight’s (reprinting the Home Journal) noted: The soirée “drew a large and delighted audience,” on a “dismal, stormy night. […] The auditors were arranged in semi-circles round the stage, like a family party.” 70 Here, it appears again that efforts were made with the seating plan to simulate the domestic experience of watching and listening to chamber music in a home. It

67 Musical World and New York Musical Times, 9 October 1852, 92.
68 Albion, 30 October 1852, 524.
69 Musical World and New York Musical Times, 30 October 1852, 137.
70 Dwight’s Journal of Music, 6 November 1852, 39.
also said: “An idea may be obtained of the growing favor of Mr. Eisfeld’s labors in this line, when we state that nearly every seat in the room was occupied, while the main entrance was crowded with a goodly bevy of gentlemen, enjoying their standees, and content with a perfect hearing, but an imperfect seeing, of the tout ensemble.”71 The string chamber works performed were Beethoven’s Quartet in A Major, Op. 18, No. 5 (pub. 1801); Schumann’s Piano Quintet in E-flat Major, Op. 44 (1842); and a Mozart string quartet in E-flat major. The Mozart was titled “QUARTETTE IN E FLAT, NO 4” by the Musical World and New York Musical Times.72 Because of this, I believe that Mozart’s K. 428 in E flat (1783) was most likely the piece performed, as it was originally published in Vienna as “op. 10, no. 4” in 1785.73

The Beethoven work was, in the words of either Dyer or Willis:

a wild, grotesque emanation of the grand maestro, yet bearing brilliant and questionless evidence of his peculiar genius. The figures of strange melody are entirely Beethoven’s, while the harmony of the quartette was the more welcome to our ear on account of its resemblance to the happiest efforts of Haydn and Mozart. The treatment of his subjects is plainly traceable in the earlier works of this immortal musician, and indeed it rather adds to, than detracts from, his fame. The players rendered it well, except that Mr. Noll was a little too enthusiastic, and occasionally a shade above pitch.74

The critic considered the harmony, resembling Haydn and Mozart, to be “more welcome to our ear” while the figures of “strange” melody were “entirely Beethoven’s.” The review clearly shows a preference for earlier classical works. Perhaps the recent performances of Op. 59, No. 1, and Op. 74 were too testing for his preferences.

The Albion, referring to the Beethoven, did little else but complain that the: “snapping strings showed that the instruments as well as the audience, were sensible of the sudden alteration of

72 Musical World and New York Musical Times, 13 November 1852, 162.
temperature, and that the hot breath of summer had been unexpectedly wafted back upon us after
we had been made to feel that its season was fairly past.” It suggested:

if the violins however, previous to being brought into an atmosphere unusually heated, were
exposed for some time (say three to four hours) to a temperature calculated as nearly as
possible to that which is expected in the concert room, or perhaps even to one a little higher,
we think the chance of the breakage of the strings and perplexing alterations in the tuning
would be materially lessened. It would certainly do no harm to try this, if it has not been
already done.75

This is another reminder of the difficulties that weather would cause for string performers at
this time. Obviously, 1852 is long before modern heating and air-conditioning technology, and in
the face of unexpectedly warm weather, the temperature inside a performance venue would have
been almost impossible to control. This, combined with the performers’ use of gut strings, which
are more susceptible to temperature and humidity fluctuations than the synthetic-core strings
predominately used today, resulted in a much greater degree of instrument malfunctions than
would likely occur at present.

The Musical World and New York Musical Times remarked on Schumann’s quintet:

The opening movement (allegro brillante) of this quintette has a principal t
heme which
reminds one of Mendelssohn. The whole movement, in fact, is equal to any of Mendelssohn’s
most elaborate efforts; while the Scherzo, Andante, and Finale furnish unquestionable
evidence of the ardor with which this composer has studied Beethoven. This may be seen, not
so much in the Scherzo, as in the March (andante) following, and in the Finale. The March is
pervaded by a truly serene dignity united to a manly tenderness. It is lofty, but it is humane, as
well. It is made up of a bold, independent movement, advancing with a god-like gait, and a
confiding little theme, that creeps in, at happy intervals, to tell of the loving, glowing heart
beneath. The Finale, literally interpreted, clearly tells of stepping out into the world, and
braving antagonisms, come from what quarter they may. It is thoroughly Beethovenish.76

The Schumann, a significant step into Romanticism, evidently drew comparison to Beethoven;
perhaps both were seen as fitting a “progressive” agenda. Schumann’s quintet was only a decade
old, and the composer was living at the time. The critic almost ascribes moral virtue to the work,

75 Albion, 6 November 1852, 536.
76 Musical World and New York Musical Times, 13 November 1852, 162.
such as the courage to brave antagonism. Once more, there is some religious language, the music advancing “with a god-like gait.” As mentioned earlier, the performance of Schumann’s works in New York would increase substantially during the 1850s.  

Of the Mozart, it was stated:

How natural, child-like, and yet how truly symmetrical is Mozart’s music! After listening to Beethoven and his successors, there is danger that an unbalanced mind may lose his regard for Haydn and Mozart. But surely, no candid, truthful mind can do this, any sooner than he would despise the fragrance of a sweet flower, or the loving look and guileless heart of a child. This Quartette in E flat is full of the transparent frankness and intuitive grace which characterize Mozart, and as we sat listening, we deemed it a fitting piece to bring us back to the unfettered freedom and gaiety of home. We had reached home, and in blessed vision, had already taken a peep at the bright fire and group of happy faces which daily gladden us, when—snap! a string broken.—O enthusiastic Noll! Where, where is our sunny picture?  

Again, we have an association of the “child-like” with Mozart, in contrast to Haydn’s association with an aged, fatherly figure. Mozart is characterized by “transparent frankness and intuitive grace.” Beethoven and his “successors” may cause an “unbalanced mind” in the listener, but one cannot lose regard for Haydn and Mozart any sooner than they would “despise the fragrance of a sweet flower, or the loving look and guileless heart of a child.” Beethoven, or perhaps Romanticism more generally, is associated with borderline insanity, while the earlier composers seem to represent a simpler, calmer sort of joy. 

The “vocal assistants” of the concert were Mina and Louisa Tourny, the sisters and “blooming maidens from Germany,” who had “recently arrived in this country.” Not quite a month later, on November 27, the Tourny sisters gave a concert at which Eisfeld Quartet members Noll, Reyer, Eichhorn, would join Scharfenberg to play a Lachner piano quartet.
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Eisfeld Soirée: November 20, 1852

The second Eisfeld soirée of the 1852-53 season was announced with the following program:

I—QUARTETTE—No. 2, Op. 18, G major (for Stringed Instruments)……………………Beethoven
   1. Allegro
   2. Adagio cantabile,
   3. Scherzo Allegro
   4. Allegro molto quasi Presto.
   Messrs. NOLL, REYER, EICHHORN & TH. EISFELD.
II—The celebrated “Spirit Song”……………………………………………………………………Haydn
   Mrs. H. C. Watson
III—GRAND TRIO. Op. 46. (for Piano, Violin and Violoncello.)…………………A. Feska [sic]
   1. Andante & Allegro molto
   2. Romanze.
   4. Allegro moderato.
   Messrs. CHS. MUELLER, J. NOLL & L. EICHHORN.
IV—“Love’s Messengers,” (by request)………………………………………………………A. Feska [sic]
   Mrs. H. C. Watson
V—QUARTETTE.—No. 58. D minor (for Stringed Instruments)…………………………Haydn
   1. Allegro moderato.
   2. Andante quasi Allegretto.
   3. Menuetto Allegro non troppo.
   Messrs. NOLL, REYER, EICHHORN & TH. EISFELD.\(^82\)

The *Musical World and New York Musical Times* encouraged attendance as a means of educating oneself:

> We again urge the claims of these *Soirées* upon our musical public. They are decidedly superior to anything of the kind ever given in this city; and, aside from their intrinsic merits and the pleasure derived from attending them, their *educational* character;—the salutory influence they exercise upon the tastes of those brought within the magic circle of their charms, peculiarly entitle them to the most liberal support of all who are interested in musical culture,—or who have a ‘living interest’ in the rising generation.\(^83\)

As it turned out, the soirée was attended, “as usual, by a numerous and brilliant assemblage, and it was evident that the interest in this class of beautiful music, is on the increase.”\(^84\) The *Albion* critic was “compelled to forgo, from unavoidable causes, the pleasure of attending Mr. Eisfeld’s classical soirées; but a judicious friend assures us that the quartette party was never

\(^{82}\) *Musical World and New York Musical Times*, 20 November 1852, 179.

\(^{83}\) *Musical World and New York Musical Times*, 20 November 1852, 179.

\(^{84}\) *Musical World and New York Musical Times*, 27 November 1852, 195.
more successful than on Saturday evening, as a perfect and truthful interpretation of the class of
music to which these occasions are devoted.”

Of the Beethoven quartet, the *Musical World* review commented:

There is a charm in even the whim of a great mind. Large and intense as may be the
enjoyment in listening to the full orchestral compositions of Beethoven, there is, in his lighter
works, a playfulness of fancy admirably in contrast with his serener moods, yet distinguished
by that marked individuality of style which is his alone. Haydn wins by his sunny thoughts
and cheerful treatment of themes; Mozart revels in the excess of his youthful enthusiasm, and
extracts a hopeful smile from life’s dreariest hours; but he who wrote ‘Adelaide’ [Beethoven]
plays alike with love and hate, smiles and tears, sun and darkness. What a God-like ‘method
is in his madness!’ Take the second movement of this quartette, and was ever before found a
song of heaven so strangely combined with a fitful, whistling wind of earth? And yet how
truly has he thus portrayed a hidden feeling in our nature! In moments of deepest reverence, a
splenetic and uncontrollable thought will often disturb the equanimity of the stoutest. The
quartette, (which was executed without a fault,) abounds in playful caprices; but the second
movement is a veritable gem.

Again, here we have a reiteration of many of the ideas we have seen associated with these
composers. Mozart is seen as having an excess of “youthful enthusiasm.” Beethoven’s “God-like
‘method is in his madness!’” Again, Beethoven is allied with the mad, or insane, while Haydn is
described as “sunny” and “cheerful.” Further, divinity is once again invoked, for Beethoven’s
method of madness is “God-like.”

The *Musical World* commented about the Fesca trio:

This was played by Noll, (violin) Eichhorn, (‘cello) and Charles Müller, (pianist) a new
candidate for public favor. The composition has many points of beauty, and many
tamenesses. There is a pleasant vein of original melody in Fesca, and this trio is not an
exception to the general remark. But, while all is smoothly, evenly done, there is evidence of
great haste in its construction. We were most pleased with the last movement, (No. 4). Mr. C.
Müller plays with ease and a certain don’t-care-for-the-audience sort of feeling. We suggest,
for his improvement, a word or two: a kinder feeling towards the audience, and a more clear
and singing attack of his instrument. His hand lies handsomely on the instrument, but his
finger does not expressively press the key in plain melody. Neither is his trill quite as well
defined as it might be.

---
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Of Mueller’s performance in the piece, the *Albion* stated:

A Mr. Mueller, the pianist, a stranger to us, is said to have shown great clearness of touch and execution, especially in such passages as those of the Scherzo of Feska’s [sic] very original ‘Grand Trio.’

It is interesting that both descriptions called the Fesca trio “original,” but that Fesca is largely forgotten today. There is also a difference of opinion as to Charles Müller’s playing. The *Albion* describes his “clearness of touch and execution,” while the *Musical World* claims that “his finger does not expressively press the key in plain melody,” and also criticized his trilling.

The Haydn quartet, judging from the movement titles, was probably what is today known as the String Quartet in D Minor, Op. 76, No. 2, “Fifths.” The quartet was composed in 1797, and published in 1799. Comments on the Haydn quartet proceeded in a canonizing manner, forever revering the composer’s name:

Here we have the father of this style of music again. Forever be his name revered among all sterling musicians! A calm satisfaction attends the listener who carefully follows Haydn in the intelligent management of his themes. It is gratifying to know that his instrumental music is becoming, each successive year, more thoroughly appreciated by us. The impetuous encore of the third movement of this quartette was significant.

With the November Eisfeld soirée, though the 1852-53 concert season continued, the scope of the study comes to an end with the close of the 1852 calendar year.

**Conclusions**

Although performances of string chamber music occurred in a variety of contexts, the most notable development during the period (1842-1852) was the emergence of two successful, sustained concert series of this genre, those of Saroni and Eisfeld. This process had begun with

---
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Uri Corelli Hill’s apparently unsuccessful attempt in 1843. *Saroni’s Musical Times* reignited this effort with its string chamber concerts of 1849-50, though these did not continue. This led Theodor Eisfeld, who performed in the Saroni concerts, to launch his own series in 1851. Eisfeld’s soirées would continue until 1859.\(^{91}\)

Throughout this study, the socioeconomic profile of concert audiences has been a continuing area of comment. Ticket prices near a dollar were economically exclusionary for many. As noted, a single admission ticket to the Eisfeld soirées was priced at a dollar. Though this per-admission price dropped in a subscription package, this probably did little to make the event less financially exclusive, given that that the buyer still bore the cost of purchasing an entire subscription up front. Furthermore, the distribution of wealth in the city was heavily skewed. By 1845, the top one percent of New York City’s population owned half of its wealth, and the top four percent accounted for fully four-fifths of its wealth.\(^{92}\)

Recall one particular description of the audience at an Eisfeld soirée. Curtis, writing as “Hafiz” for *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, wrote: “Of course it is not a ‘Native American’ audience, for all your neighbors are sure to speak German, and you mark the well-known characteristics of their features; and if you could only summon the Kellner, and order *ein brocken brod* and *ein glas bier*, you would be far away from the Apollo and lost in an anonymous *Lokal*.”\(^{93}\)

To be fair, *Dwight’s* was certainly criticized for a pro-German bias. A complaint sent to him appeared in his journal:

> When you first announced your intention of editing a musical journal, I put my name down as a subscriber. I was pleased that so able hands should have taken up the work, but I must confess, I doubted the result. I feared that an absurd devotion to *German* metaphysics would

---

93 *Dwight’s Journal of Music*, 22 May 1852, 52.
close one ear of the musical critic when German harmony was put in the question. I can hardly read your journal now, growing worse and worse as it is every day. From page 1 to page 192 what is there besides about 50 pages of advertisements? German music, German composers, German artists.⁹⁴

Yet, I believe that the Germanic description of Eisfeld’s audience has merit. First, it would be one thing for a pro-German bias to influence one’s writing, but it would be entirely another to manufacture a German audience as existing where it did not. Beyond this, it makes sense that there would be German-dominated audiences for New York’s chamber music concerts, given the demographic context of the time. The success and sustainment of string chamber performances coincides with the massive immigration from the Austro-German states. In contrast, U. C. Hill’s 1843 attempt, which preceded the massive German immigration, appears unsuccessful. Evidence suggests that it did not sell to capacity, nor was the effort ever repeated.

German immigration began to accelerate around 1845, surging near 1849, and peaking around 1854. As shown in Figure 3 (see p. 167), borrowed from Nadel, 101,000 German immigrants entered the United States between 1840 and 1844. From 1845 to 1859, 285,000 entered, while from 1850 to 1854, 654,000 Germans immigrated into this country.⁹⁵ Saroni’s concerts occurred in 1849-50, leading to Eisfeld’s soirées, taking place from 1851-1859. That the success of string chamber series, largely of works by Austro-German composers, should occur at the same time that German immigration reached unprecedented levels, seems like more than mere coincidence.

---

⁹⁴ Dwight’s Journal of Music, 9 October 1852, 5.
⁹⁵ Stanley Nadel, Little Germany, 21 (Figure 1).
The map on the next page (Figure 4; see p. 168) was displayed earlier, reproduced from Nadel (as Figure 2; see p. 151). Here the location of key performance venues has been added. These venues appear in William Perris’ *Maps of the city of New York* (1852-54), available online through the New York Public Library. The locations have been placed as accurately as possible on the Kleindeutschland map shown in Nadel. As can be seen, all the venues are in relative proximity to the German district.

---

96 Stanley Nadel, *Little Germany*, 21 (Figure 1).
97 See footnote 98.
Figure 4: Map of Lower Manhattan with Kleindeutschland and Key Venues Shown

For venue locations, see: “Perris, W., Maps of the city of New York, 1852-4,” New York Public Library, accessed August 22, 2013, http://www.nypl.org/locations/schwarzman/map-division/fire-insurance-topographic-zoning-property-maps-nyc. As listed previously, the Apollo Rooms were located at 410 Broadway. A Perris map shows it on the east side of Broadway, in the block south of Canal St. See: “Plate 29: Map bounded by Canal Street, Centre Street, Leonard Street, West Broadway,” New York Public Library, accessed August 22, 2013, http://digitalgallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/id?1269975. Niblo’s Saloon is shown on the northeast corner of the intersection of Broadway and Prince St. See: “Plate 32: Map bounded by Houston Street, Crosby Street, Prince Street, Marion Street, Spring Street, Laurens Street,” New York Public Library, accessed August 22, 2013, http://digitalgallery.nypl.org/nypldigital/id?1269977. (Prince was one block south of Houston St.) Hope Chapel is shown at approximately 720 Broadway, across from New York Hotel as previously described, lying on the east side of Broadway at its intersection with Washington Place. See: “Plate 61: Map bounded by East 9th Street, Fourth
Yet questions remain about Eisfeld’s audiences. The descriptions of chamber music audiences as both upper-class and German might seem somewhat at odds with each other. The farmers and artisans who fled Germany because of hunger and economic pressure seem an unlikely audience for Eisfeld’s soirées. According to Nadel, German immigrants, “fond as they were of fine music, many preferred a good dance tune to a symphony.” Nadel gives us more information on New York’s German professional class:

German New York had had a small professional class even before Kleindeutschland began to take form in the 1840s, but it expanded rapidly in the 1840s and 1850s. Unlike the many lawyers who were forced to turn to saloonkeeping and other business pursuits, doctors, pharmacists, opticians, ministers, journalists, and teachers were able to continue at their old professions in America. Indeed, German physicians were so numerous in New York that it was estimated in the mid-1850s that one-third of the city’s doctors were German born and trained. Many of these German doctors […] were well-known political refugees, as were a fair portion of the other German professionals who found their way to New York.

Nadel continues:

In the 1850s these professionally trained and articulate men formed an elite in Kleindeutschland. They took the lead in numerous voluntary associations of all sorts, social, political, and charitable. Between their leadership of the voluntary associations and their near-monopoly of the press, they dominated public discourse. Public issues were issues that concerned them, and issues that did not tended to be invisible.

I believe that these “elite” Germans, fleeing their homeland for political reasons, rather than economic, were the demographic that largely made up Eisfeld’s audiences.

99 Nadel, Little Germany, 104.
102 Nadel, Little Germany, 82-83.
103 Nadel, Little Germany, 83.
The rise of German-led string chamber music performances was a phenomenon beginning with Saroni’s first concert in December 1849. Oddly enough, the beginning of these chamber performances approximately coincides with the cessation of George Frederick Bristow’s efforts in composing string chamber music. His Quartetto, Op. 2 was completed in December 1849. A tension between Bristow and this ascending German impulse in New York’s musical scene will be discussed in Chapter VI. Yet, Bristow’s story is of great interest. As an American composer writing in an Austro-German idiom, in a cultural milieu increasingly influenced by Austro-German musicians, he would eventually argue for more performances of works by American composers, seemingly neglected by a German-dominated musical scene.
Chapter VI: Bristow as Chamber Music Performer and Composer,
with a Contextual Discussion of Quartetto, Op.1

Bristow’s Early Years and Musical Development

George Frederick Bristow was born in Brooklyn, NY on December 19, 1825.1 He was the son of two British immigrants, William Richard (1803-1867) and Anna (Tapp) Bristow. William Bristow was a professional musician, as his son would later become. According to Rogers, Bristow’s parents: “migrated from their native Kent County, England some time prior to July 4, 1823,”2 and after this point, “William Bristow appeared in many concerts and became a leader in Brooklyn’s musical life.”3 He further adds: “Notices of early concerts in which William Bristow participated indicate that the family probably lived in Brooklyn continuously from 1823 until 1834. From city directories, it is definitely known that they lived there during the years 1825 through 1826, and in New York during 1834 and 1835.”4 George Frederick began his musical education with his father, “who taught him to play the piano and organ starting at the age of five.”5

Katherine Preston states that Bristow began early violin study with his father, and continued with: “C. W. Meyrer (a founding member of the Philharmonic Society of New-York, forerunner of the modern New York Philharmonic Orchestra)[…].”6 Bristow also studied violin with the

---

2 Delmer D. Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City as Reflected in the Career of George Frederick Bristow,” (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1967), 58.
3 Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City,” 59.
4 Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City,” 67.
5 Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City,” 67.
cellist William Musgriff. In his autobiographical sketch (in which Bristow refers to himself in the third-person), Bristow never mentions Musgriff by name, only referring to him as a friend or mentor: “This friend the Violoncello player was his mentor, no matter what was said, about music this friend’s opinion was taken for law and gospel.” Bristow mentions “Kreutzer’s Studies for the Violin” as being the subject of his first lesson with Musgriff. He also studied violin with Ole Bull, but the Norwegian virtuoso did not come to the United States until 1843, and Bristow was performing as a violinist long before Bull’s arrival.

Published concert advertisements give evidence of Bristow, father and son, performing together. The following is from an advertised benefit concert:

A Grand Sacred Concert will be given in St. Patrick’s Cathedral, on Sunday evening, January 2, 1842, under the direction of Mr. Wm. R. Bristow, organist of the Cathedral for the Benefit of the Half Orphan Asylum.

The following eminent Vocal and Instrumental Performers have, in the kindest manner, volunteered their valuable aid:

**Principal Vocalists,**

Mrs. Sweeney, Mr. Horncastle,
Mr. Munson, Mr. Myer,
Mr. Morales, Mr. Reif.

**Instrumental Performers,**

Leader of the Orchestra, Mr. A. Jamieson

Mr. W. R. Bristow will preside at the organ.

Violins—Messrs. G. F. Bristow,

“ “ Ayliffe,
“ “ Dodsworth,
“ “ Sour, and others.


Violoncello—Musgriff.

Contra Basso—Messrs. Loder and Pierson.

---


The Bristows appeared in a similar benefit concert in April of the same year:

A GRAND SACRED CONCERT,
WILL BE GIVEN IN ST. PATRICK’S CATHEDRAL,
On Sunday Evening, April 17th, 1842,
Under the direction of Mr. WILLIAM R. BRISTOW, Organist of the Cathedral, for the Benefit of the Sufferers by the late extensive Conflagration.
The following eminent [sic] Vocal and Instrumental Performers have, in the kindest manner, tendered their valuable aid:

[...]

INSTRUMENTAL PERFORMERS.
Leader of the Orchestra, G. F. Bristow. Mr. William R. Bristow will preside at the Organ.¹²

According to Rogers: “Bristow began his professional career as a violinist at the age of 13 with the Olympic Theatre orchestra, a group of six that performed in popular musical comedies.”¹³ As Bristow described: “The plays were of the Burlesque, and Extravaganza kind, witty, with many local hits, and occasionally an Opera, or pieces with operatic selections […]”¹⁴

It is clear the Bristow soon became a competent violinist, and his improvement and engagement as a player would ultimately result in his exposure to new forms of repertoire. Beginning in its second season (1843-44), George Frederick Bristow joined the New York Philharmonic Society as a violinist. This point marks Bristow’s ascendance to being one of the city’s more accomplished violinists, now playing with New York’s finest musicians, performing European orchestral literature which likely bore little resemblance to what was played at the Olympic Theatre. Of the transition, and its effect on Bristow’s musical experience, Rogers writes the following:

For Bristow to begin performing in the Olympic theatre orchestra just short of the age of thirteen was certainly unusual enough; but he must have advanced remarkably in five years, since in 1843 he was able to join the first violin section of the single permanent symphonic group in the United States. The importance of this event to Bristow can hardly be over-

¹² New World, 16 April 1842, 257.
¹⁴ Bristow, The Life of a Musician, 7.
estimated for it brought him into contact with most of the better musicians and the best music in New York. His long standing position in the Philharmonic, and the many symphonic compositions that followed this new post, attest to the marked influence that the situation had upon him.\textsuperscript{15}

Preston also writes of the Philharmonic repertoire, and its effect on the young composer:

Bristow would remain a musician in the Philharmonic (with one brief hiatus) until his retirement some thirty-six years later. But his first ten seasons with the orchestra (1843-44 through 1852-53) had him performing at least forty-four public concerts and introduced him to a large repertory of European orchestral works that, as we shall see, would clearly influence the compositional voice that at the age of nineteen he was already beginning to develop.\textsuperscript{16}

It is clear that upon joining the Philharmonic, Bristow had ascended to the premier ensemble in the city, and had the beneficial experience of playing with the finest instrumentalists resident in New York. Further, consistent exposure to European symphonic repertoire seems to have been an important formative influence on him. For detail, we can turn to statistics on the performed repertoire at the New York Philharmonic Society concerts (not including public rehearsals) from the beginning of Bristow’s involvement through the end of 1849, which marked the cessation of his string chamber music composing. By my count, this is the number of performances of works (including repeated works) by the most frequently represented composers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendelssohn</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spohr</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donizetti</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a list of all complete symphonies performed at the New York Philharmonic Society concerts during the same timespan. The symphony is highlighted here because it probably would

\textsuperscript{15} Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City,” 70-71.
\textsuperscript{16} Katherine Preston, “American Orchestral Music at the Middle of the Nineteenth Century,” xx.
\textsuperscript{17} Henry Edward Krehbiel, \textit{The Philharmonic Society of New York} (New York: Novello, Ewer & co., 1892), 96-104.
have been the most influential genre on string quartet writing, being in a four-movement sonata schema.

Beethoven: Symphony No. 3
March 1, 1845
April 17, 1847
March 17, 1849

Beethoven: Symphony No. 4
November 24, 1849

Beethoven: Symphony No. 5
May 18, 1844
January 17, 1846
March 4, 1848

Beethoven: Symphony No. 6
April 25, 1846
January 9, 1847

Beethoven: Symphony No. 7
November 18, 1843
April 19, 1845
March 6, 1847

Beethoven: Symphony No. 8
November 16, 1844

Beethoven: Symphony No. 9
May 20, 1846

Gade: Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 5
December 02, 1848

Haydn: Symphony No. 3 in G Major
January 11, 1845

Kalliwoda: Symphony No. 1
March 7, 1846

Lachner: Sinfonia Passionata (Prize Symphony)
May 12, 1849

Mendelssohn: Symphony 3 “Scottish”
November 22, 1845
January 15, 1848

Mozart: Symphony No. 39 E-flat Minor, K. 543
January 9, 1847

Mozart: Symphony 40 G Minor, K.550
April 25, 1846

Mozart: Symphony 41 “Jupiter”
January 13, 1843

Spohr: Symphony 1 in E-flat Major, Op. 20
April 29, 1848

Spohr: Symphony No. 2, Op. 49
March 16, 1844

Spohr: Symphony No. 4, Op. 86
November 21, 1846
November 27, 1847

Spohr: Double Symphony for Two Orchestras, Op. 121
January 27, 1849\textsuperscript{18}

From the data above, it is clear that Bristow’s membership in the Philharmonic exposed him to a much different type of repertoire than he had experienced in the Olympic Theater orchestra. The primary pieces were predominantly of Austro-German origin, including works by Beethoven, Mozart, Spohr, Mendelssohn, and Weber.

\textsuperscript{18} “Performance History Search,” New York Philharmonic, accessed July 30, 2013, http://nyphil.org/history/performance-history. The list is a measure of complete symphonies, which excludes performances of single movements, overtures, operatic selections, and other types of works.
Bristow’s Activity as a Collaborative and Solo Performer

This paper has already detailed much of Bristow’s participation in public performances of string chamber music. In Chapter II, Bristow was mentioned as a performer in a Henri Bertini sextet in two Euterpean Society concerts of 1846 and 1847. He appeared there as a pianist in 1846, and probably as a violinist the following year. The same chapter also listed Bristow collaborating with George Loder and Alfred Boucher in 1846, performing William Sterndale Bennett’s Trio in A major, Op. 26 (1839), and an unidentified trio by Johann Hummel. In Chapter III, Bristow appeared at an 1851 concert of William Vincent Wallace, performing in a double quartet of Spohr, most likely Op. 136 in G minor (1847). The participating musicians were: Wallace, Griebel, Bristow, Herwig (violins), Schuberth, Tyte (violas), Boucher, and Hegelund (violoncello). His involvement with the soirées of Emma Gillingham Bostwick in 1851-2 were a subject of recurring discussion in Chapter IV. There he performed in sextets by Bertini and Fesca, a Spohr quintet, and septet arrangements of Beethoven orchestral works. Most of these examples likely qualify as “high-serious” chamber works, favoring the sonata form. (Beethoven septet arrangements are excluded from this category, as they were not composed as chamber works.)

Bristow’s documented performances of Bertini sextets include the Euterpean Society concerts on February 4, 1846, and January 20, 1847. More were played at the Bostwick soirées of November 18, 1851; December 26, 1851 (“the ‘Scherzo and Finale’ of Bertini’s sextour No. 2 in Eb”); and February 10, 1852 (“Sextuor—Op 79. First movement”). Grove states that Bertini

---

19 The Anglo American of 30 January 1847, 358, lists the Bertini sextet performers as: “Timm, Hill, Bristow, Johnson, Boucher, and Pirrson.” We know Timm to be a pianist, Boucher to be a cellist, and Pirrson to be a bassist. From the order listed, it is probable that Bristow played second violin, and Johnson, viola.
composed six sextets for piano and strings, but does not provide a work list. However, four of these sextets are available at the website of the International Music Score Library Project: Piano Sextet No. 2, Op. 85; Piano Sextet No. 3, Op. 90; Piano Sextet No. 4, Op. 114; and Piano Sextet No. 5, Op 124. These are each in four movements, following the sonata schema. Though they are collaborative chamber works, the piano bears slightly more prominence than the strings.

Bertini was a pianist, so perhaps he carried bias for the instrument, or perhaps he felt more comfortable writing for it, than for strings.

On Wednesday, September 16, 1846, Bristow performed William Sterndale Bennett’s Trio in A major, Op. 26 (1839), and an unidentified trio by Hummel, with George Loder and Alfred Boucher (see pp. 54-55). Bennett (1816-1875) was a British composer, and Grove states that: “He ranks as the most distinguished English composer of the Romantic school.” Bennett’s Op. 26 trio is his only work in the genre. Geoffrey Bush states that in the trio: “the partnership between piano and stringed instruments is perfectly handled. […] But its execution is classical—never two notes where one will do. This gives the work a deceptively simple appearance which has sometimes led to its being undervalued, though it was a favourite of the composer and his contemporaries.” The Hummel trio was probably one of his seven piano trios that were published between 1803 and 1822.

---

Bristow was one of four violinists to perform a double quartet by Spohr at the concert of William Vincent Wallace on Tuesday, April 22, 1851 (see p. 102). It was likely Spohr’s last work (of four) in the genre, Op. 136 in G minor (1847). The work is in four movements, following the sonata schema. It is chamber music in the “Goethe” sense; all eight voices are equally weighted, and collaborate together as a true chamber composition. The same is true of Spohr’s Op. 53 piano quintet arrangement in C minor, performed at the Bostwick soirée on Friday, January 9, 1852 by Bristow, Hill, Noll, Hegelund, and Timm. At the Bostwick Soirée on February 10, 1852, Bristow participated in a performance of the first movement of Alexander Fesca’s sextet, Op. 8. Grove states that Fesca: “was a prolific composer of songs, chamber and piano music which often lack originality. His best works include the Piano Sextet op.8, though he is remembered chiefly for his songs.”

To summarize, the chamber works in this section are likely “chamber music” in the collaborative, sonata-based sense, as it has been repeatedly defined in this dissertation. Yet most of Bristow’s public performances of string chamber works were of those from composers most would consider outside the modern canon: Bertini, Bennett, and Fesca. Hummel and Spohr are better-known, of course, but still not of the level of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, or Mendelssohn. As will later be discussed, Bristow’s Quartetto, Op. 1 shows the influence of Mendelssohn and Beethoven, yet record of Bristow publically performing chamber works by these composers is essentially nonexistent. The Eisfeld concerts, which Bristow did not play in, were a better source for such literature; likewise the Philharmonic Society provided access to orchestral repertoire by these composers. But Bristow’s exposure to string chamber works by Beethoven

26 Although it is possible that he might have attended the concerts.
and Mendelssohn likely would have occurred outside of the public sphere, a subject further discussed later.

In contrast, Bristow also played “duo concertante” pieces for violin and piano, works that were probably in a more virtuosic style, and more likely to be a theme and variations or other form than to follow a sonata structure. Preston states: “As a violinist in chamber ensembles, he performed […] violin and piano duos (by Henri Herz, Charles Phillipe Lafont, George Osborne, and Charles-Auguste de Bériot) with the pianist George Henry Curtis in 1850…”

When Preston refers to Bristow’s performance in this type of violin and piano duo as a “chamber ensemble,” it is important to remember that these works were probably not sonata-based, “high serious” chamber music works of the type that this dissertation emphasizes.

The 1850 collaboration with George Henry Curtis probably refers to the concert of David D. Griswold (vocalist) on Thursday, April 4, 1850. A friend of Hermann Saroni (who was absent) submitted a report of the performance that listed Bristow and Curtis performing the duos, “La Fiancée,” and a Duo Concertante from William Tell. The Message Bird described selections including: “a Duo for violin and piano by Herz and Lafont. Another, (a standing dish, but always acceptable), by Osborne and De Beriot, upon themes from ‘William Tell.’” From their entries in Grove, every indication is that Lafont and Herz’s “La Fiancée” would not have fit this dissertation’s definition of “high-serious” chamber music.

---

27 Preston, “American Orchestral Music at the Middle of the Nineteenth Century,” xxi.
28 Saroni’s Musical Times, 13 April 1850, 340.
29 Message Bird, 15 April 1850, 298.
30 “As a composer, Lafont was of little importance: his seven violin concertos lack musical distinction, and his numerous fantasias and airs variés on operatic themes do not rise above the mediocre level of fashionable virtuoso music. Thanks to his pianist-collaborators, particularly Moscheles, higher musical standards are displayed in his duos concertants.” See: Boris Schwarz, "Lafont, Charles Philippe," in Grove Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/15815 (accessed February 13, 2013). “His [Herz’s] compositions consist largely of variations and fantasies on themes by other composers, but they also include eight piano concertos, various dances, salon pieces and exercises, amounting to some 225 works with opus
Another area of Bristow’s public performance life is his experience as a soloist with orchestral accompaniment. Bristow’s appearance as a featured soloist, particularly with the Philharmonic Society, confirms his status as one of the city’s top resident violinists, and as an accomplished pianist as well. Bristow’s skill as a violinist quite possibly helped him to write string chamber music that was idiomatic, yet often technically challenging. Preston (citing Lawrence) summarizes Bristow’s activity as a featured soloist with orchestra. He performed Hummel’s Piano Concerto in A-flat in May 1847 and March 1851, Johann Kalliwoda’s Grand Duo for Two Violins and Orchestra in March 1848, and Ludwig Maurer’s Concertante for Four Violins and Orchestra in April and May 1850. All performances were with the Philharmonic Society, except for the first performance of the Hummel.31

Here we see more of Bristow’s activity as one of the city’s leading violinists, appearing as a co-soloist with the Philharmonic Society. On Saturday, March 4, 1848, Bristow and August Fries performed the Grand Duo for two violins and orchestra, Op. 109, by Johann Kalliwoda.32 The violin duo appeared as a substitute for a vocalist who was sick. The Albion stated of Bristow and Fries’ “effectively played” performance: “Their tone is not full nor powerful, but their execution is brilliant and neat, and they played with great accuracy. They played the Duo without rehearsal, therefore much allowance must be made. The composition is very showy and is remarkably effective. It was warmly applauded.”33

In a Philharmonic Society concert on Saturday, April 20, 1850, Bristow was one of four violinists who performed a “Concertante” for four violins by the German violinist and composer

31 Preston, “American Orchestral Music at the Middle of the Nineteenth Century,” xxi.
33 Albion, 11 March 1848, 132.
Ludwig Maurer (1789-1878). According to Grove, Maurer’s compositions include: “a formerly well-known Sinfonia concertante op.55 for four violins,” so this is likely the piece performed. Along with Bristow, the other violinists were James Perkins (whose May 13 concert was discussed in Chapter III), as well as Noll and Reyer of the Eisfeld quartet founded in the following year. Saroni’s Musical Times gave the following account:

The concertante for four Violins formed quite a feature of the evening’s entertainment. It was performed by Messrs. Noll, Bristow, Ryer [sic] and Perkins. To point out a superiority in either of the performers is actually impossible. They all did their share, and did it well. […] We should hardly have thought it possible that a concerto for four violins could offer so much variety. It seems as if Maurer brought into requisition everything known of violin playing, Arpeggio, Staccato, portamente, &c. &c., all were regarded, and well represented too. We had occasion to notice the effect of different violinists using the same bowing. It seems actually to double the effect of the instruments, and our readers who have perhaps made the same observation, can imagine some of the German Orchestras, the violinists of which have all been taught by one and the same master.35

It is interesting that the use of a uniform bowing by violinists was rare enough to invite commentary from the critic. It also served as an opportunity to invoke the German touring orchestras as a model of this practice. But the overall impression that these reviews give of Bristow’s skill as a violinist is a positive one. He and Fries lacked a “full and powerful tone,” according to the Albion review, which otherwise praised their execution and accuracy. But it is even more telling of Bristow’s skill that he seemingly held his own with Noll and Reyer (of the Eisfeld quartet) in their performance of Maurer’s Sinfonia Concertante. The Saroni’s critic commented: “To point out a superiority in either of the performers is actually impossible. They all did their share, and did it well.” For Bristow to be appearing in a soloist role with the Philharmonic, and to be an apparent success, gives greater evidence of his expertise on the violin.

35 Saroni’s Musical Times, 27 April 1850, 363.
Bristow’s public appearances as a piano soloist are somewhat less adulatory. Bristow’s first performance of Hummel’s Piano Concerto in A-flat major, Op. 133 (1827), occurred at the “Annual Concert” of George Loder, held Thursday, May 27, 1847 at the Apollo Saloon.\textsuperscript{36} The \textit{Anglo American} gave warm praise of his playing.\textsuperscript{37} His next performance of the piece on Saturday, March 1, 1851, was not as generously received. This appearance was on a concert of the Philharmonic Society, conducted by Eisfeld. The \textit{Albion} commented: “A concerto for the piano, with orchestral accompaniment, by Hummel, was also played by G. F. Bristow. […] the performance itself was not quite of the Philharmonic stamp. Mr. Bristow plays, no doubt, a better violin than piano.”\textsuperscript{38}

To summarize: Bristow’s activity as a performer show his skill as a violinist to be among the best of New York’s resident musicians. Even his less-than-praised piano playing was still deserving enough to merit his appearance as a soloist with the Philharmonic Society. His expertise as a violinist surely served to influence his string quartet writing. While at times difficult and slightly awkward, his writing for the violin is largely idiomatic, and shows an understanding of the instrument’s capabilities.

\textbf{Bristow the Composer: Reception of Early Symphonic Compositions}

Bristow studied “orchestration and composition with the organist, pianist, and trombonist Henry Christian Timm (1811-92),” according to Preston.\textsuperscript{39} Rogers states: “Timm is reported to have taught Bristow harmony and he must have contributed significantly to the young man’s

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Albion}, 22 May 1847, advertisement page.
\textsuperscript{37} “Mr. G. Bristow’s performance of the Hummel in A flat, was very well indeed, as well as we expected in this promising young man, […] Mr. Bristow, if he had a fair opportunity, would become, we think, one of the first artists of his day […].” \textit{Anglo American}, 5 June 1847, 165.
\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Albion}, 8 March 1851, 116.
\textsuperscript{39} Preston, “American Orchestral Music at the Middle of the Nineteenth Century,” xviii.
musical style because many of Bristow’s harmonic progressions illustrate a certain daring and skill.\(^{40}\) Timm, as previously mentioned, was of German origin. According to Grove, Timm was a student of A.G. Methfessel and Jacob Schmitt,\(^{41}\) though the dictionary does not mention if he studied piano, composition, or a combination, with these teachers. Bristow’s next composition teacher was the English composer George Alexander Macfarren (1813-87). Macfarren, states Nicholas Temperley: “[…] modeled his style on Mozart and, more noticeably, Beethoven.”\(^{42}\) Macfarren wrote five string quartets; a quintet in g minor for violin, viola, cello, double bass, and piano (1843-4); and a sonata in E minor for violin and piano (1887).\(^{43}\) Preston states that Macfarren: “was in New York from late 1847 through much of 1848 with his wife Natalia Macfarren (née Clarina Thalia Andrea), a singer, teacher of singing, and prolific translator of opera libretti.”\(^{44}\) The Albion mentions Macfarren’s participation in the November 4, 1847 concert of Henri Herz and Camillo Sivori (discussed in Chapter II): “Mr. Macfarren’s Overture of Chevy Chase [1836] was conducted by the composer at the Concert of Thursday evening.”\(^{45}\) Bristow’s study with these individuals would be considered informal by today’s standards. Exact timespans

\(^{40}\) Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City,” 67-68.
\(^{44}\) Preston, “American Orchestral Music at the Middle of the Nineteenth Century,” xviii. Preston’s footnote (no. 9): “[…] Rogers cites sources that document Bristow’s studies with Macfarren, but then questions them, asserting that ‘the English composer, editor and teacher remained in England all his life’ (see Rogers diss., 68). According to Henry Charles Banister, however, Macfarren—whose eyesight was failing in the 1840s—’was induced in 1847 to proceed to [New York]’ in order to be treated by an oculist there. He remained in the city for some eighteen months. See George Alexander Macfarren: His Life, Works, and Influence (London: George Bell and Sons, 1891), 171-72 and 182. There is further corroborating evidence from New York sources. Macfarren’s wife (‘from the London concerts’) made her debut performance at the Park Theatre in Lucrezia Borgia on 30 October 1847 and ‘Mr. and Mrs. George Alexander Macfarren’ advertised in the New York Herald on 3 October 1848 that they were giving lessons in composition, harmony, and singing. See George C. D. Odell, Annals of the New York Stage, vol. 5 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1927-49), 325; and Lawrence I, 558-59.”
\(^{45}\) Albion, 6 November 1847, 540.
for his association with these teachers are not known, but Bristow’s lessons would have occurred on a private basis, as opposed to through enrollment in a conservatory or university.

Preston provides brief overview of Bristow’s early compositional output:

The musical environment in which George Bristow came to maturity during the 1840s and early 1850s, as a result, provided him with a foundation on which he could build, once he made the significant leap from performer to skilled and productive composer. Some thirty-two extant works, in fact, predate the 1853 Jullien Symphony; a majority of these are for piano (nine), chamber ensemble (seven), or orchestra (seven).46 […] Bristow’s early emphasis on works for piano, violin (all but one of his chamber works include violin), and orchestra is understandable in view of the young musician’s performing activities during this formative period. He experienced a burst of creativity in the period 1849 to 1852, when he wrote seventeen of the thirty-two pre-Jullien Symphony compositions. Almost one-third of these pieces—including three chamber and three orchestral works—were completed in 1849, when the composer was twenty-three.47

As there is no extant evidence of public performances of Bristow’s string chamber works during his time, and thus no indicators of their reception, the responses to his early orchestral compositions provide a better platform through which to judge his output during this period of his life. Reviews of his orchestral works give us some idea of how Bristow’s contemporaries viewed his skills as a composer at the point when he was writing his chamber music. His Overture in Eb, Op. 3 received its premiere with the Philharmonic Society, with Bristow conducting the piece, on Saturday, January 9, 1847. He composed it in 1845, the same year he wrote Duo No. 2 and Duo No. 3 for violin and viola. From the press reviews of his overture, it appears that Bristow was considered to be a promising young composer.

The reception in two reviews was quite positive, overall. The Albion commented:

A new overture, composed and conducted by Mr. George F. Bristow was performed for the first time. The composer is quite a young man, and this is, we believe, his first instrumental work.48 All things considered, the outline is very creditable to him, and proves, we think, that

46 Preston, “American Orchestral Music at the Middle of the Nineteenth Century,” xxii. Ends with her footnote 28: “According to Rogers diss., there are thirty pre-1853 works, but Fried, ‘Orchestral Music of Bristow,’ cites and 1851 orchestral work (La Serenade Nocturne) that is not included in Rogers’s list because there is no known copy. Rogers was also unaware of the Celebrated Zip Coon set of variations […]]. See Rogers, 189-90 and 198, and Fried, 17.”
47 Preston, “American Orchestral Music at the Middle of the Nineteenth Century,” xxii.
he possesses much talent, and promises much in future compositions. It is too noisily instrumented, and is wanting in individuality; but there are some charming points and good efforts.49

The Anglo American called Bristow: “a very promising, and very young member of the profession.” It stated that his overture showed: “that he had studied with great success the quality and principle of each instrument in the orchestra […].” It described of the overture’s reception: “It was very loudly and deservedly applauded, and the modest young man took his honours in a very becoming manner.”50

The positive reviews of his overture would soon be contrasted by Saroni’s criticism of his next publically performed orchestral work, Bristow’s Symphony in E-flat, Op. 10 (1848). It was given at a public rehearsal of the Philharmonic Society on Saturday, May 25, 1850. This piece was composed in the year prior to Bristow’s last three string chamber works, the violin sonata and two string quartets. In the article announcing the premiere, Saroni commented at length about the Philharmonic’s recent neglect of American compositions:

It is clear, that the founders of this [Philharmonic] society had it in view, not only to cultivate the musical taste of the community, but to arouse and stimulate the latent creative powers of native or resident musicians, by placing in their hands the means to have their works performed. During the first few years of the society’s existence this bylaw was fulfilled to the very letter. […] But from some cause of other, a crotchet came into the head of the government, in the form of a strange misgiving. They thought, that since their duty was to cultivate the taste of the community, they could not permit anything but the compositions of great masters to be performed at their concerts, […] they refused to perform any domestic compositions at their concerts, nay, refused to play them even for the instruction of the composers at their rehearsals. It is needless to comment upon the narrow-mindedness of such proceedings.51

Yet despite this line of argument, Saroni’s review of the performance completely eviscerated Bristow’s symphony:

48 It was Bristow’s first orchestral work, but not his first instrumental work.
49 Albion, 16 January 1847, 36.
50 Anglo American, 16 January 1847, 309.
51 Saroni’s Musical Times, 25 May 1850, 411.
Mr. Bristow, as an American, had for him the whole sympathy of the audience. The musicians, too, evinced more interest on this occasion, than we have ever seen them exhibit. Mr. Bristow, “the Child of the Regiment,” as it were, has pursued his musical studies under very peculiar circumstances. He was willing to learn of everybody, and everybody was willing to teach him. We remember an overture of his composition, which was played at one of the Philharmonic concerts, two years ago. The principal fault we had to find with it, was a lack of originality, and we are sorry to say, that this Symphony is little better in this respect. It might well be compared to a musical chessboard, with a field for each composer from the time of Haydn to Mendelssohn Bartholdy. But there is an additional fault in this Symphony; it is the utter want of connection between the different ideas. Almost every sixteen bars, the composer seems to have come to a dead halt. He begins a new melody, and goes again over the same grand, suddenly drops the theme, and begins a new one, which has not the remotest connection with the former, and then it goes on through the entire symphony.52

While analysis of the symphonies is outside the scope of this study, Saroni’s criticism seems particularly strong and possibly unwarranted, given that the assessment is certainly not true of Bristow’s Op. 1 quartet, and particularly not in the sonata-form first and last movements. In the first movement, the transition section from the first theme group to the second theme group incorporates heavy usage of the first theme, and this is also true of the development section as well. In the finale, the development consists in large part of material from the second theme, and with some borrowing from the first theme as well. This was not, of course, a new innovation by Bristow, but rather, a regular feature of the development that occurs in sonata form. Saroni stated that in the symphony, new themes were adopted every sixteen bars, where the prior theme comes “to a dead halt.” He further claims that this continues throughout the symphony. But such a description is at odds with the sonata form. Saroni’s article further describes the symphony as largely derivative of other composers’ works:

And not alone, that the ideas are reminiscences of “old familiar strains,” but the instrumentation, too, is generally in close imitation of the original. Another mistake is, that the four movements, which by-the-by are too long by half, are all in major, thus shedding a monotony over the whole composition, which is anything but pleasant. The best part is probably the beginning of the second part in the first Allegro. It has a faint glimmer of originality, and is well carried through. We should advise Mr. Bristow to be content with

52 Saroni’s Musical Times, 1 June 1850, 422.
compositions of less extent. If former masters have began their career by writing symphonies, they did so at the time when that form was not developed by the master hand of a Mozart, Beethoven, &c., &c.  

Shortly after, Bristow cancelled his subscription to the publication in a letter, printed by Saroni:  

To H. S. Saroni,  
Sir: As your paper in my opinion is anything but interesting, I wish to discontinue it, therefore you will oblige me infinitely by not sending it any more.  
Yours,  
GEO. T. [SIC] BRISTOW.  
P. S. I have a bill receipted for a year’s subscription, the remaining papers you can appropriate to any you may think fit.”

This was quite an odd move by Saroni. It would be understandable for Bristow to discontinue his subscription to the periodical after Saroni’s review of his symphony, but it makes little sense for Saroni to publish the fact that Bristow had done so. It seems as though Saroni welcomed Bristow’s disdain, and even wanted it to be publically exposed. Perhaps this suggests that Bristow was sensitive to criticism, and that Saroni’s comment had hit a nerve, to which Saroni wished to draw attention. Also, the fact that Saroni published what should have been a confidential subscription cancellation calls into question his professional integrity as an editor, and even his objectivity as a critic. At the very least, it suggests some type of personal politics at play through Saroni’s backbiting decision to publish Bristow’s letter.

What is more, Bristow’s symphony did receive a mostly positive review in the Message Bird, which said of the work:

While we cannot express our unqualified admiration of the andante, *with which this symphony opens*, yet the allegro, andante, minuet, and allegro vivace, which follow, we can approve more unhesitatingly. The andante, which ought to be considered the *second movement* of the symphony, is conceived and worked up in a style deliciously legato. Judging from some notturnos and other pianoforte compositions by Mr. Bristow, we think this andante more happily illustrates his unreserved and innate conceptions and peculiar temperament then any other portion of the symphony. There is a dreamy romance and placid beauty in the string,

---

53 Saroni’s Musical Times, 1 June 1850, 422.  
54 Saroni’s Musical Times, 8 June 1850, 436.
which attracts and soothes the listener, almost in spite of his will. At the same time we are not insensible to the vigorous effort made in the allegro vivace—the last movement. Parts of this are in strictest contrapuntal style: and it needs no wiseacre in musical matters to perceive that the young composer has devoted many an hour of severe thought and labor to this portion of his effort. The effect he has elicited in this climax is such as may be expected from the selection of a strong motive, treated in alternate strict and free styles.\(^{55}\)

The *Message Bird* shares none of the criticism that Saroni expressed. Nor are there allegations of the symphony being overly derivative of earlier European composers. The writer then appeals to the Philharmonic administration to do more to promote the creation of American musical works:

> We cannot but hope that the government of this, the first instrumental society in this country, will seek in future to extend the sphere of its usefulness, by a more direct and positive encouragement of the resident talent among us, and thereby lay the foundation for a school of music, which shall in time compare favorably with older and time-honored European models.\(^{56}\)

Bristow and the American composer William Henry Fry would soon join in this call. Fry and Bristow would engage in a furious outpouring of frustration over American composers’ treatment by critics as well as a perceived neglect from resident ensembles.

**Bristow: Advocate for Performance of American Compositions**

It may be that Bristow is best remembered today as an activist for the performance of American musical works, and perhaps known more for this than for his own compositions. Or as John Tasker Howard put it in 1931:

> It is not because they wrote great or fine music that [Anthony Philip] Heinrich, [William Henry] Fry, and Bristow are important. Some of their writings may even seem ridiculous. Their consciousness of nationality is what is important to the cause of American music, for they were early prophets. In their controversies they went to extremes, and laid themselves open to refutation by those who thought and spoke more calmly. Yet they fired the first cannon in a fight that has never ended.\(^{57}\)

---

\(^{55}\) *Message Bird*, 1 July 1850, 377.

\(^{56}\) *Message Bird*, 1 July 1850, 377.

\(^{57}\) Howard, *Our American Music*, 252.
The controversy of which Howard speaks was one that began between the critic Richard Storrs Willis and critic/composer William Henry Fry. Willis had written a poor review of Fry’s *Santa Claus* Symphony, which began a feud that lasted from early January through late April 1854, and incited the involvement of the Philharmonic Society board, John Sullivan Dwight, Bristow, and Uri Corelli Hill.

A more detailed summary is given by Joseph Horowitz:

[…] a brief *Santa Claus* review by Richard Storrs Willis in the *Musical World and Times* incited a sustained exchange in which the New York Philharmonic also became embroiled. The central topic, framed by Fry, was, “How are Americans to win their way in composition unless their compositions are played?” […] “I make common cause with Americans, born or naturalized, who are engaged in the world’s Art struggle[,] and against degrading deference to European dictation,” Fry trumpeted. He called himself “the apostle of a new lyrical faith, if anything, and not an almsman, receiving thankfully the broken meats from the tables of classic composers and rehashing them, instead of offering fresh, substantial viands.” Willis stuck to his guns, retorting that *Santa Claus* was no “symphony” but an unconstrained “fantasia.” “My dear Fry,” he wrote, “I admire your genius, but it is genius astray. . . . You are a splendid frigate at sea without a helm.” And, poking Fry’s wounds, Willis defended the New York Philharmonic: “You must come up to their high standard of Art if you, or anyone else, expect to be heard. The Temple of Art is an universal temple, and that you are an American is no reason that you should have free admission there.”

It is possible that in his comment, “if you, or anyone else, expect to be heard,” Willis might have been covertly referring to Bristow as “anyone else.” In any case, it is apparent that Willis felt that the Philharmonic was in no way obligated to perform the works of Americans based on their nationality. Bristow’s eventual participation in the debate seemed to have been inspired by Fry’s mention of the Philharmonic Society in one of his writings. Fry wrote to the *New York Musical World*:

I think that the American who writes for the mere dignity of musical art, without recompense deserves better treatment at the hands of his countrymen at least. This is more due from an American, as the Philharmonic Society of this city consecrated to fore[]gn music, is an incubus on Art, never having asked for or performed a single American instrumental composition during the eleven years of its existence, but which has greedily sought for and

---

eagerly thrust before the public every pretentious emanation from the brain of Europeans; which, too, never would play Mr. Bristow’s symphonies, […] 59

(In fact, we know this last statement to be untrue. The Philharmonic Society had performed Bristow’s Overture in Eb, Op. 3 (1845) in 1847, and played his Symphony in E-flat, Op. 10 (1848) at a public rehearsal in 1850.)

In partial correction, but more in general agreement and amplification, Bristow wrote the following in a letter published on March 4, 1854:

What Mr. Fry stated about the spirit and action of the New York Philharmonic Society, is perfectly accurate, except in one particular; and that relates to myself, and induces me to write this letter. As it is possible to miss a needle in a hay-stack, I am not surprised that Mr. Fry has missed the fact, that during the eleven years the Philharmonic Society has been in operation in this city, it played once, either by mistake or accident, one single American composition, an overture of mine. As one exception makes a rule stronger, so this single stray fact shows that the Philharmonic Society has been as anti-American as if it had been located in London during the revolutionary war, and composed of native born English Tories. Your anonymous correspondent who is not worthy of notice except that you endorse him, says that a symphony of mine, also, was rehearsed, and not played in public. So Uncle Toby says—“Our army swore terribly at Flanders”—but that army did not fight. It appears the Society’s eleven years of promoting American Art have embraced one whole performance of one whole American overture, one whole rehearsal of one whole American symphony, and the performance of an overture by an Englishman stopping here—Mr. Loder—(whom your beautiful correspondent would infer is an American) who, happening to be conductor of the Philharmonic here, had the influence to have it played. Now, in the name of the nine Muses, what is the Philharmonic Society—or Harmony lover’s Society—in this country? Is it to play exclusively the works of German masters, especially if they be dead, in order that our critics may translate their ready-made praises from German? Or, is it to stimulate original Art on the spot? Is there a Philharmonic Society in Germany for the encouragement solely of American music? . . . 60

Bristow continued:

It is very bad taste, to say the least, for men to bite the hands that feed them. If all their artistic affections are unalterably German, let them pack back to Germany and enjoy the police and bayonets and aristocratic kicks and cuffs of that land, where an artist is a serf to a nobleman, as the history of all their great composers shows. America has made the political revolution which illumines [sic] the world, while Germany is still beshrouded with a pall of feudal darkness. While America has been thus far able to do the chief things for the dignity of man, forsooth she must be denied the brains for original Art, and must stand like a beggar,

59 Musical World, 21 January 1854, 29.
60 Musical World and Times, 4 March 1854, 100. A nearly identical passage appears in Rogers’ dissertation, 85-86.
deferentially cap in hand, when she comes to compete with the ability of any dirty German village. Mr. Fry has taken the right ground. Against fearful odds, he has, as a classical composer, through you and your journal[,] challenged all Germany to meet him before the audiences of the Philharmonic and Mr. Jullien; and the challenge has not been accepted.\(^{61}\)

In the previous chapters, the process of canonization has been a subject of recurring interest throughout the analysis of primary material. This passage is especially valuable because it expresses the view that American composers were one of canonization’s victims, if that is an appropriate term. Certainly, as specific composers and works are deemed worth of canonic performance status, then it follows that many others are excluded from this status, and it is obvious that Bristow can tell on which side of this fence his works are categorized.

Bristow seems to be objecting to the exclusive nature of the canon on two fronts: first, that the canon expresses a heavy favoritism to composers of Austro-German origin, and second, that these composers are generally deceased. As a living American, it would seem difficult to compete with such a group. Though in fairness, Bristow’s chamber works were heavily influenced by these composers, and there is nothing that sounds distinctively “American” about them,\(^{62}\) nor was Bristow likely attempting to be so. After criticizing the perceived pro-German bias, Bristow made a number of remarks (“police and bayonets,” for example) alluding to his view of the political environment in Germany in 1854. But as Bristow criticized the exclusive performance of older works by aged composers, “especially if they be dead,” he suggested that the Philharmonic should strive to “stimulate original Art on the spot.” Bristow’s struggle was one still faced by composers today: to receive recognition during their own life, instead of hoping that the canon make room for their works long after they are gone.

---

\(^{61}\) *Musical World and Times*, 4 March 1854, 100. The same passage appears in Rogers’ dissertation, 86.

\(^{62}\) Preston writes of Bristow’s later works (1852 on): “In several of these works—even though his musical idiom followed European norms—Bristow increasingly explored American topics, possibly because of a heightened awareness of his identity as an American composer following the 1854 contretemps with Willis and Dwight.” See: Preston, “American Orchestral Music at the Middle of the Nineteenth Century,” xxiii.
Bristow’s String Chamber Music

There are five string chamber compositions by Bristow which fit the definition of “chamber music” used in this study: Duo No. 2 in G Minor for violin and viola (1845), Duo No. 3 in G Major for violin and viola (1845), Quartetto, Op. 1 in F Major (?1849), Quartetto, Op. 2 in G Minor (1849), and Violin Sonata in G Major, Op. 12 (?1849). Additionally, Bristow composed three other pieces for violin and piano which fall outside of this definition: Duetto concertante, Op.1 (1844) [revised as La cracovian, for violin and orchestra, Op.13, 1850]; Fantasie Zampa, Op.17 (1844); and “Friendship,” Op.25 (?1855).63 Rogers states of all these works (perhaps excluding “Friendship”), using a more inclusive definition of “chamber music” than this dissertation:

Among Bristow’s instrumental works, the most important in quality as well as quantity were those for chamber combinations, yet this fact is remarkable when one considers that public performances of chamber literature hardly existed in the United States. As a result, neither public nor private performances of Bristow’s chamber works have been recorded and the scarcity of an appreciative audience presumably contributed to the composer’s complete neglect of the chamber medium during his later periods.64 Rogers then added: “These works contain Bristow’s most advanced musical ideas and give the best measure of his growth during the early period, laying the foundation for significant symphonies, sacred compositions and large vocal-instrumental works during later periods.”65

Bristow’s Duos for violin and viola, Nos. 2 and No. 3, were both composed in 1845. The numbers would suggest that there had been a Duo No. 1, but there is no extant source for such a piece. Perhaps Bristow may have viewed his Duetto concertante, Op. 1, for violin and piano (1844) as the first duet, having been written in the previous year. Of the Duos, Rogers states:

Since works for this combination are relatively rare, and among nineteenth-century

---

64 Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City,” 143-144.
65 Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City,” 144.
American composers were virtually non-existent, almost any addition to the literature might be welcome yet, these Duos hold their own as respectable pieces of American chamber music of the 1840’s. They contained well-written passages and, in spite of the crudities that occasionally appear in awkward double stops or thick textures, each composition represented a considerable advance in the composer’s attempts to balance rhythmic, melodic, and harmonic materials within classical forms.66

Phelps, in the introduction to his handwritten edition of Bristow’s Duo. No. 2, is less generous to the composer: “This duo, which is extremely difficult and impractical for performance as originally written, probably could be given a better rendition by dividing each part between two players. Much of the time it appears to be conceived as a keyboard piece, rather than one essentially for strings.” 67 He further added: “The material in all movements is presented in episodic fashion. The composer betrays musical sensitivity, but also lack of discipline and technical training, particularly from the formal and developmental aspect. The entire composition appears to be too long.” 68

Phelps makes some legitimate points. Bristow made extensive use of double stops throughout the work. Much of the time, his desire to create a thicker texture results in double stops that are cumbersome and difficult to manage. One would assume that a composer at this point, writing duets for violin and viola, would have been influenced by Mozart’s K. 423 and K. 424 duos. Yet, the thicker texture achieved through double stops seems more similar to Kalliwoda or de Beriot’s duets. Before Bristow’s duos of 1845, several of Kalliwoda’s violin duets had been published: Grand Duo in C Minor, Op. 50 (1834); Deux Duos brillants et faciles, Op. 70 (1837); and Trois Duos progressifs, Op. 116 (1842).69 However, it is unknown if Bristow would have seen any of these works before composing his duets; perhaps their similar ideas developed independently. I

---

66 Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City,” 144-145.
67 Roger Paul Phelps, “The History and Practice of Chamber Music in the United States from Earliest Times up to 1875” (PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1951), 757.
68 Phelps, “The History and Practice of Chamber Music in the United States from Earliest Times up to 1875,” 758.
suspect that Bristow might have worked out much of the compositional process while using the piano as a means of generating harmonies. However, as an accomplished pianist and violinist, the feasibility of the work for its intended instruments is a subject that would never have left his mind. That said, it does often feel as if he is writing the technical demands of an etude within the medium of a chamber work.

Of Bristow’s sonata for violin and piano, Rogers writes: “The Sonata, Opus 12 contained a mature balance between formal control and idiomatic instrumental writing in which the pianist’s role was equal to that of the violinist’s. The melodic and harmonic materials were treated with less bravura but with more meaningful direction.”70 James Alfred Starr devotes several pages of his dissertation to the Bristow Sonata.71 Of the relationships between the violin and piano in this work, Starr writes:

The violin is conceived primarily as a melodic or thematic instrument in this sonata, the piano sharing the thematic role and providing most of the harmony and accompaniment. However, there is sufficient thematic interplay between instruments, passagework and sustained accompaniments in the violin part, and interdependence between violin and piano in terms of harmony or thematic unity to classify the work unquestionably as a duet or a sonata dependent on both instruments. In the first and third movements, thematic material is shared rather equally, while in the second movement the piano presents important thematic sections that never are repeated in the violin part.72

Starr further claims that the: “style of this sonata is very similar to the style of Mendelssohn.”73 He states: “As a whole, the violin part of the sonata shows formal, melodic, and rhythmic interest

---

70 Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City,” 144.
combined with technical but manageable challenge. The piano part is of equal interest musically but is more formidable in its technical demands.”

Starr’s comments are compelling, and the resemblance to Mendelssohn makes much sense considering that he was being soaked in Mendelssohn’s orchestral repertoire as a violinist in the Philharmonic Society. At the Philharmonic concert on November 24, 1849, Joseph Burke performed the Mendelssohn Violin Concerto, Op. 64. This performance may have occurred shortly after Bristow composed the sonata, but it is possible that he was already familiar with Mendelssohn’s concerto, as it was published and premiered in 1845.

It may be in Bristow’s quartets that his best writing occurred during his early years. Of these works, Rogers states:

However, Bristow’s increased technical skill in writing for string instruments was exhibited most adequately in his string quartets. The music was suitably idiomatic as well as technically enjoyable in form and content, particularly when compared to chamber works by other American composers of the era. The manner in which he worked out the melodic, harmonic and rhythmic ideas and the careful dynamic indications he wrote into the scores point to his constant consideration of the technical potentialities of each instrument. His concept of instrumental balance in the quartets was consistent with the classical style in which the first violin and violoncello played the prominent melodic roles while the second violin and viola generally provided harmonic filler.

While Rogers’ description of a violin and cello-dominated texture is often true in the Op. 1 quartet, it is less so during the first movement. The opening andante introduction, especially, is much more democratic, with a greater degree of interplay between the four parts. Also, the transition between the first and second theme groups in the exposition features prominent roles

---

76 Rogers, “Nineteenth Century Music in New York City,” 145.
for the viola and second violin (though only for the viola, when it is restated in the recapitulation).

At the end of the manuscript of Bristow’s first quartet, the final note of the cello part received some artistic embellishment. Within the cello’s low F half note, Bristow drew a human-like face, with a stick-figure body below, as well as the exclamation, “Hooray.” Phelps postulates that Bristow was relieved after completing the quartet: “Perhaps he doubted his ability to compose a quartet, and upon the completion of this feat his joy was transferred to the manuscript in the form of this exclamation.”

![Figure 5: Final note in cello part, Quartetto, Op. 1](image)

Bristow’s second quartet was dedicated “with much esteem” to “Dr. Ja’s Quin.” Dr. Quin was, for some time, the leader of the Euterpean Society. Recall from Chapter II that Bristow had performed on that organization’s annual concerts and balls. The *Broadway Journal* provides valuable commentary about Quin:

---

Doctor Quin, a highly talented and eminent physician, Homeopathic, has for many years been the life, soul, and almost body of the Euterpean Society. He is one of the very few amateurs of music whose enthusiasm is real, earnest and unaffected. His mind highly educated and refined, has carried him far beyond the trivialities which delight the ordinary amateur. Music has been to him, like his profession, a study. The old masters are as familiar to him as Latin, Greek, German, and French. He has studied their beauties and feels them knowingly. We have the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with him, and can therefore speak confidently about the subject. We cordially congratulate the Euterpean Society upon the possession of such a leader, and we feel assured that while he continues with them the cause for which the society was established will never want an able and earnest advocate.78

This leaves open a question about an association between the Euterpean Society and Bristow’s early chamber works. In Chapter II, the Euterpean Society was described as New York’s oldest musical society, established about 1799.79 Mainly composed of amateurs,80 it was fundamentally a social group, which met weekly or semi-weekly for private music making, and put on an annual concert and ball.81 Many of the Philharmonic Society’s founding musicians were members of the Euterpean Society, and remained so after joining the Philharmonic. Lawrence gives further detail about the society, stating that in 1856, the group “continued to hold their weekly musical meetings on Tuesday evenings, from October to April, at the Mercer House […]”.82 This is further evidence that the group met regularly and played music in private, as opposed to their public annual concert and ball.

It seems highly possible that Bristow likely composed his chamber works to be played by members of the Euterpean Society at their weekly meetings. Composers typically write music with the intention of it being performed somewhere, and with no mention of public performances

---

78 Broadway Journal, 8 February 1845, 91-92.
80 Ritter, Music in America, 220.
81 Lawrence, Resonances, see xxx (Rondo) and 31.
82 Vera Brodsky Lawrence, Strong On Music: The New York Music Scene in the Days of George Templeton Strong, 1836-1875, Volume II, Reverberations, 1850-1856 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 749 (foonote 82). Lawrence cites Musical World, 11 October 1856, 481. Unfortunately, this issue was omitted from the microfilm copy that I have consulted.
of Bristow’s string chamber works during this period, the Euterpean Society’s regular meetings would serve as a logical private setting for playing Bristow’s works. That Bristow’s second quartet was dedicated to Dr. Quin, leader of the Euterpean Society, would suggest some type of link.

It is of course, problematic to hypothesize about what type of musical activity went on in essentially private spheres, as incredibly little evidence survives of these gatherings. However, Christina Bashford, writing about domestic chamber music activity in nineteenth-century Britain, describes the increasing scholarly focus on musical activity in the private sphere:

Sometimes presumed impossible to study by dint of its very nature and the concomitant dearth of concrete evidence, musical practice in private domains is increasingly demanding our attention as historical musicology broadens its purview toward contextual examination of music in a range of times, places, and communities, and more specifically toward a new understanding of the amateur, the significance of domestic space, and the role of women therein.83

Unfortunately, no evidence of public or private performances of Bristow’s string chamber music during the years of this study has, so far, been uncovered. A few years later (1855), a new group that would eventually be called the New-York American Musical Association, was announced in a letter from “Justitia” (Charles Jerome Hopkins, according to Lawrence84) published in the Musical World. It strongly suggested the possibility of a performance of one of Bristow’s chamber works:

For example, how often has it been ironically asked, where are your American quartets, quintets, &c? We are glad we can answer such questions, and inform the inquirer where he can find not only quartets or quintets but overtures and symphonies for full score of orchestra; all the works of native Americans who have never been out of the country.85

The writer later states:

---

84 Lawrence, Reverberations, 749.
85 Musical World, 16 June 1855, 79.
We have already in our possession three instrumental pieces from the pens of Mr. [Charles] Homman, and Mr. George F. Bristow, the talented conductor of the New York Harmonic Society. And we have in prospect many other kinds of composition from different composers.\(^{86}\)

Yet, in the primary documentation of this group’s performances, occurring during 1856 (and possibly 1857), no mention of Bristow’s string chamber works appears. It appears that at least one of his compositions was intended to be performed. An announcement for a concert on Tuesday, December 30, 1856 states: “The pieces to be performed to-morrow [today] are composed by Messrs. G. H. Curtis, C. Homman, C. J. Hopkins, E. A. Paine, G.F. Bristow, W. H. Walter, C. Godone, and J. N. Pychowski—all new and American.”\(^{87}\) Additionally, an earlier article published on November 29 announced a series of four performances that season, and that each concert would include “a full chorus of thirty-five voices, an instrumental quartet, a vocal quartet, and some one or other eminent soloist, vocal or instrumental.”\(^{88}\) However, an advertisement appearing the day of the performance stated, less descriptively, only that “CHORAL, VOCAL QUARTET, AND INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC will form part of the programme [...].”\(^{89}\) If a review of the concert were ever published, such an account remains undiscovered, so it is impossible to know which Bristow work was performed.

According to the New York Philharmonic website, a much more recent performance of Bristow’s Quartetto, Op. 2 took place on December 2, 2002.\(^{90}\) Members of the New York Philharmonic, led by violinist Fiona Simon, performed the complete quartet at the Harold M. Proshansky Auditorium at City University of New York.

\(^{86}\) *Musical World*, 16 June 1855, 79.

\(^{87}\) *New York Daily Tribune*, 30 December 1856, 6.

\(^{88}\) *New York Musical World*, 29 November 1856, 651.

\(^{89}\) *New York Daily Tribune*, 30 December 1856, 2.

Bristow’s Quartetto, Op. 1 in Context

George Frederick Bristow’s Quartetto, Op. 1 was composed in 1849. This section aims to examine this work and relate it to the historical context of the time. A more detailed theoretical discussion is presented in the Appendix, along with an edition of the piece which I have created. Of Bristow’s chamber works, I chose to select a string quartet to study further in this way, not only because the genre invites comparison to numerous other classical and romantic works in this medium, but also because it best relates to the historical context discussed in this dissertation.

In choosing to write a sonata-form string quartet, Bristow, as an American composer, was inserting himself into foreign territory, so to say. The string quartet was a genre of Austro-German origin, and one in which the Viennese classical works of Haydn, Mozart, and early Beethoven had been the leading canonic examples in the years prior to Bristow’s Quartetto, Op. 1. On a macro level, the structure of Bristow’s four-movement quartet, on the whole, fits in very well with the movement plan of its Viennese ancestors:

Andante-Allegro Grazioso, F major, C meter
Adagio, D-flat major, $\frac{6}{8}$ meter
Minuetto-Trio, F major, 34 meter
Finale: Vivace, F major, $\frac{2}{4}$ meter

The up-tempo, sonata-form outer movements surround an adagio second movement, and a third-movement minuet and trio. All four movements are in major keys, the same tonal plan which prompted Saroni’s criticism of Bristow’s Symphony in E-flat, Op. 10 (1848). However, from the layout of the four-movement plan, it is clear that Bristow was consciously modeling his quartet on the best-known works of the Viennese classical tradition.

Earlier in this dissertation, we defined chamber music as works for small ensemble in which
there is no singularly principal instrument, but rather a shared, interactive network of collaborating roles, in which there is one player per musical part. Bristow’s Quartetto, Op. 1 is a definite model of this type of work. This is clear from near the outset of the piece. One such example is found at measure 10 in the introduction of the first movement (see Figure 6), in which all instruments are involved in trading around a short series of eighth notes. Here, there seems to be no principal instrument, but rather, a texture that requires significant interaction among the musicians.

![Figure 6: Bristow Quartetto, Op. 1; First movement, mm. 10-13](image)

Bristow’s use of harmony in this quartet is quite progressive for its time, and especially in comparison to Haydn and Mozart. Bristow shows a tendency to visit distantly related keys throughout the quartet. The introduction to the first movement begins in F major, but is in C-flat major is seen as soon as measure 14. The third movement, in F major, eventually modulates to F-sharp major. Bristow’s outline of tonal areas seems to best resemble the progressive agenda of Beethoven, in that regard.
Further influence of Beethoven is seen in the use of third relationships, particularly in the major third relationship of the second movement (D-flat major) to the rest of the work (F major). Whereas his predecessors in the Austro-German string quartet tradition generally used key relationships of fourths or fifths, Beethoven frequently used thirds in this capacity. As Paul Griffiths explains:

When that [sonata] style was new, in the 1750s and 1760s, the fifth was the only possible relationship between points of stability: events within a movement had to take place in the tonic or the dominant, anything else being transitory, and movements within a work had to be similarly related. Then the fourth became a new structural consonance, to be followed by the third, making possible in Beethoven’s op. 18 quartets a much more varied and richly expressed exposition than in any set of Haydn or Mozart.\(^{91}\)

Throughout several points in the first movement of the quartet (as discussed in the Appendix), Bristow visits tonal areas either a major or minor third away from tonic, showing a thorough understanding of Beethoven’s use of this third relationship in his quartets.

Bristow’s quartet bears some similarity to Mendelssohn’s works, particularly in its use of chromatic coloring. This can be seen in the opening section of the first movement. The bracketed sections of Figure 7 (p. 203) are examples of such chromaticism, as used in the Bristow quartet.

---

Mendelssohn’s Op. 12 quartet shows a comparable passage (see Figure 8) in the first violin, and especially the cello. In the latter, notice the cello chromatically descending from Eb to C in mm. 6-7.

Figure 8: Mendelssohn Quartet in E-flat Major, Op. 12; First movement, mm. 6-8

---

More chromaticism is found in the second movement of Mendelssohn’s Op. 13 quartet, although the descending pitches are often spaced apart, with other material between them. In Figures 9 and 10, for example, notice the second violin part (mm. 22-25), with the pitches of the chromatically-descending line in bold: D F E E D# B C D E D C# C D C B Bb A.

Figure 9: Mendelssohn Quartet in A Major, Op. 13; Second movement, mm. 20-23

Figure 10: Mendelssohn Quartet in A Major, Op. 13; Second movement, mm. 24-29

There are other comparable figures in Bristow’s Quartetto and Mendelssohn’s quartets. One

---

such example is seen in Figure 11, a passage from Mendelssohn’s Op. 44, No. 2 quartet. Notice the content of measures 80 and 82; there is an emphasized second beat, followed by three eighth-notes leading into the next measure.

A very similar passage appears in the Bristow quartet, as shown in Figures 12 and 13 (p. 206). In measures 95 and 97, an emphasized second beat, followed by three eighth notes serving in the same manner.


The distinction between Bristow’s accent and decrescendo markings is often ambiguous. This is discussed in the Appendix.
Further influence of Mendelssohn’s Op. 44 quartets can perhaps be seen in Bristow’s choice of a minuet third movement, instead of the more standard scherzo common at that time. Such a choice might normally suggest that Bristow was looking back to the earlier foundations of the genre. However, the two are not mutually exclusive options. According to Stephen E. Hefling: “traditional wisdom has long maintained that compared to his [Mendelssohn’s] earlier quartets,
Op. 44 represents a reactionary retreat to classicism.” Mendelssohn’s Op. 44, No. 1 also includes a minuet instead of a scherzo. However, if Bristow’s choice of a minuet was anachronistic, the harmonic content is contrastingly quite progressive. In comparison to the rest of the quartet, the trio of the third movement is rather simplistic. It might be here that the truest acknowledgement of earlier classical works is found.

While Bristow later became known for his American advocacy, it is clear that European influence is prevalent at this point. There is nothing “American-sounding” about the quartet, and there is no indication that a national style was on the composer’s mind. Yet, while the quartet shows the influence of European predecessors, it is not a carbon copy of any such composer. In fact, through his innovative harmonic plans, Bristow adds much of his individuality to the genre.

In terms of the European models, it is further important to realize that while certain canonized composers (Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven) would have been inherently influential to Bristow, the canon was not fixed at the time. The canon that we know today was still under formation, and the collection of extant Classical and early Romantic works during Bristow’s time would undergo a great deal of reevaluation before the canon would take its current form. Some composers with membership in today’s canon, such as Schubert, might not have been influential to Bristow, or (more likely) would have even been entirely unfamiliar to him. In contrast, other composers who are more overlooked today (Onslow, Bertini, or Spohr) who were important at the time might have exerted significant influence on Bristow. Since most of Bristow’s chamber music activity likely occurred in the private sphere and not in New York chamber concerts, it is difficult to estimate what his overall exposure to European chamber works would have been, and further, to what degree other performers in New York may have exerted influence on his experience. (We

---

are often left with more questions than answers.) While Bristow later rebelled against German control of the Philharmonic Society in his published letter, one can only guess as to the degree of his involvement with the Eisfeld soirée musicians outside of the Philharmonic. Did he play chamber music with them in private? Might Bristow have attended the Eisfeld soirées as an audience member? Would he too, have been exposed to their progressive programming? That Bristow cancelled his subscription to Saroni’s Musical Times indicates that he was formerly a subscriber. Might he have seen some of the early chamber concerts promoted by the publication?

As an American-born composer attempting compose works in a European genre, and doing so during this transformative period of New York’s musical life, Bristow was as well positioned as one could be to produce quality string chamber works. He was one of the city’s better violinists, performing canonic orchestral repertoire in the Philharmonic. And through the Philharmonic, he would have known the city’s newest European musicians, and possibly have been exposed to their progressive musical predilections. Also, he likely played string chamber music in the private sphere, particularly in the Euterpean Society. Hence, Bristow’s activities in New York’s musical life allowed him to integrate the works known to him into his own understanding of string chamber music, and produce works that are representative of an American’s experience in this European idiom.
Conclusion

This dissertation has attempted to convey the story of string chamber music performances in New York City from 1842 to 1852. To review, the beginning of this period saw public performances of chamber works largely on “miscellaneous” concerts, featuring a variety of different genres, both instrumental and vocal. Often, the chamber works were considered of lesser importance than solo works. In some cases of concerts given by a string solo artist, the main musician would not even participate in the chamber works that were serving in this role. The 1843 attempt of Uri Coreli Hill to initiate a series of string chamber concerts, apparently unaided by vocal performances, appears to have been unsuccessful and not favorably received by New York’s concertgoers.

Beginning in 1849, chamber music’s status would eventually elevate. In the concerts organized by Hermann Saroni, and leading to the quartet soirées of Theodor Eisfeld, string chamber works would soon become the primary focus of such concerts, although vocal selections continued to be programmed. The influence of German musical predilections is apparent in the later years of this period, mostly due to the large-scale emigration of Germans to the United States, with New York generally being the port of arrival. German musicians, such as Eisfeld and his quartet, performed mostly Austro-German works for what an account describes as a mostly German audience, whose preference of Austro-German music came with them across the Atlantic and transplanted their musical culture into New York City. Throughout the dissertation, primary source reviews reveal critics’ efforts toward the sacralization of “classical” music over other styles, as well as efforts to canonize certain composers and works, usually of Austro-German origin.
Much of the recent secondary literature on American music has largely ignored the study of string chamber music performance in New York during this period. Joseph Horowitz’s *Classical Music in America: A History* (2007), which covers New York and Boston, makes virtually no mention of string chamber music activity during this period. When I began this project, the second edition (2013) of *The Grove Dictionary of American Music* had not yet been published. But even after its release, the article on New York devotes only one and a half sentences to string chamber music during these years. On the subject of sacralization, Lawrence Levine’s *Highbrow Lowbrow* (1988) shows many examples of this force in practice later in the nineteenth century. However, as I have shown, this process was already underway much earlier, at least as it pertains to string chamber music. This dissertation aims to have filled a gap in the existing literature, and to have opened up an important topic that has been curiously rarely discussed.

Finally, my project has entwined George Frederick Bristow’s activity as a chamber musician, orchestral performer, soloist, and chamber music composer throughout the foregoing discussion. I have attempted to define Bristow’s string chamber works, particularly Quartetto, Op. 1, as a product of his musical environment at the time. Certainly, Bristow’s endeavor to add his own individuality to a European genre is a noteworthy achievement. He was one of the earliest American-born composers to attempt to make a New World mark on this Old World canvas. Moreover, a knowledge of Bristow’s experience, as part of the larger New York musical environment at the time, helps to deepen our understanding of the development of classical music culture in the United States.
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Appendix: George Frederick Bristow’s *Quartetto, Op. 1*

Composed by George Frederick Bristow
Edited by Robert J. E. Hopkins

**Introduction**

Bristow composed this quartet in 1849, and it survives in manuscript parts. The surviving version resembles an incomplete draft, in that there are missing dynamics and ambiguous articulation markings, at times. Consequently, a fair amount of editorial intervention was required in many areas, denoted in brackets. Cautionary accidentals (serving not to alter the pitch, but functioning as a convenient reminder) are surrounded by parentheses. Throughout the edition, the marking [?] appears in areas where the reader is encouraged to consult the notes pertaining to that measure.

Throughout the manuscript, Bristow’s markings for accent and decrescendo are often indistinguishable. In this edition, great effort has been made to discern which marking better fits the material in question. However, Bristow’s accent/decrescendo might often be best viewed as a combination of both, similar to a sforzando. This figure is especially prominent during the more lyrical areas of the first movement. In such cases, the editor recommends that the figure be viewed as a call for slight emphasis, followed by quick return to the normal dynamic.

There is no surviving manuscript score. This edition of the score was created from the manuscript instrumental parts. Please continue to page 217 for a discussion of the quartet. Additionally, see page 200 of Chapter VI for further contextual discussion of the work.
Bristow’s Quartetto, Op. 1: A Discussion

This piece was composed in 1849. This edition aims to make possible a level of study and analysis that would be difficult to achieve from the manuscript parts alone. It also might encourage musicians to perform the work. The quartet consists of four movements:

Andante-Allegro Grazioso, F major, Common time (simple quadruple meter), 228 measures
Adagio, D-flat major, $\frac{6}{8}$ meter (compound duple), 50 measures
Minuetto-Trio, F major, $\frac{3}{4}$ meter (simple triple), 211 measures
Finale: Vivace, F major, $\frac{2}{4}$ meter (simple duple), 506 measures

The first movement begins with a 28-measure Andante introduction, marked by its chromatic coloring and multiple suspensions, and harmonic complexity. Overall, it seems as though Bristow’s intention was to spend as little time as possible on tonic chords, creating a sense of harmonic ambiguity. The introduction begins in F major, although this is somewhat obscured by the quick harmonic rhythm, in the first two measures. This chart shows the chord progressions for this section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Beat:</th>
<th>Chord:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$V^4_3$ / $V$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$V$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$\text{vii}^4_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$I^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$V^3_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$I$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>$V^4_3$ / vi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 2</th>
<th>Beat:</th>
<th>Chord:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\text{vi}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$I^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$I^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$V^4_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Harmonic structure of measures 1-2, first movement.

As can be seen, the harmonies change almost twice per beat, or on every eighth note. The first half of measure 2 is an exception to this, however beats 1 and 2 begin with a suspension in the first violin, further serving to avoid any feeling of harmonic settlement. Another suspension occurs at measure 3, where the A-natural (first violin) from the previous I chord is suspended.
above a IV chord (b-flat major), creating a dissonance between the B-flat root and the upper A-
natural. This A descends to a G on beat three (creating a minor-minor seventh ii\(^6\)), while the B-
flat in the cello rises to B-natural creating a V\(^6\)/V (BDFG). This progresses to a half-cadence
ending on C major in measure 4. Again, a suspension occurs, this time a 4-3 (F to E).

The next phrase (mm. 5-9) begins similarly to the first, with a series of quickly-progressing
chords in its first two measures. The progression is charted below:

Measure 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beat</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chord</td>
<td>V(^4)(_3)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>vii (\phi)(_3)</td>
<td>I(^b)</td>
<td>V(_4)(_3)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Fr(^{+6})/vi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beat</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chord</td>
<td>V/(\text{vi})</td>
<td>vii(^7)/(\text{vi})</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>vii(^8)/(\text{vi})</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>vii(^7)/(V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Harmonic structure of measures 5-6, first movement.

As can be seen, the harmony briefly visits d minor from the last chord of measure 5 through most
of measure 6. The final chord of measure 6 is a fully-diminished seven of five, leading to a
cadential \(6_4\) at measure 7. Obfuscated by a series of suspensions, it is not until the last beat of
measure 8 that an unembellished V chord appears, and the phrase cadences in F major in
measure 9.

Following this point, the chief element of interest is not harmonic ambiguity, but rather, the
boldness of the tonal plan. From measure 10, the harmonic progression becomes more
adventurous, moving through E-flat minor into C-flat major. C-flat major is enharmonically a
tritone away from the home key of F major. This itself would be an unusual choice of key, but
that he reaches it so early into the piece (moreover, in its introduction) is a fact that exhibits the
progressive nature of Bristow’s harmonic plan. The following table shows mm. 10-18 as
functions of E-flat minor and C-flat major, with measure 13 serving as a pivot chord:
Table 3: Harmonic structure of measures 10-18, first movement.

In addition to their harmonic characteristics, measures 10-18 serve as an excellent example of chamber music in the Goethe sense of dialogue. Throughout this section, the main rhythmic motion is a series of eighth-notes, usually in sets of four, which appear alternatingly in each part. This rhythmic motive is exchanged between all four instruments, and creates a texture very much like a democratic conversation in which each instrument gets a say. At this particular point, the quartet establishes itself as a true chamber work as this dissertation defines it. The harmony progresses from C-flat major to C major via a diminished chord in measures 19-20. Closing the section from measure 21, the cello sustains a dominant pedal against descending (mostly diminished-chord) harmonies in the upper three parts, and the section finishes on a C\(^7\) chord in measure 28.

The Allegro Grazioso begins on the anacrusis to measure 29. The movement as a whole follows a sonata form.

Table 4: Formal structure, first movement.
The first theme group begins at measure 29 in F major. Again, moving parts, suspensions, and chromaticism are principal characteristics. This is apparent even from the downbeat of measure 29, where the cello and second violin hold whole notes on F, while the viola and first violin, play in thirds against this. The viola part provides much chromatic color here, for instance in measure 31 (DC#CBBb). This descending chromatic motion almost seems to echo the material in measures 21-24 of the first violin. Bristow’s quartet seems to show similarities with the quartet style of Mendelssohn, particularly Op. 12. Also, the first violin passage at mm. 37-40, from a technical perspective, bears some similarity to the Kreutzer Etudes. The long-slurred descending chromatic scales (mm. 37 and 39) bear some resemblance to Etude No. 13 (though the Bristow is more chromatic), and measures 38 and 40 bear similarity to some of the optional bowings of Etude No. 2.

Figure 14: Kreutzer Etude No. 13, Measure 5

The transition section begins in measure 41, in my view (although others might say measure 37). At the anacrusis of measure 42, the viola begins with material from the main theme at measure 29 (the first six eighth notes), which is followed by a descending slurred sixteenth-note scale. The cello plays a descending slurred chromatic scale in the next measure. These are both derivative of the first violin material in measures 37 and 39. This exchange recurs in altered form

---

from the anacrusis of measure 44 through 45, with the viola continuing a scalar passage in measure 46. This repetition or quotation of material from the first theme group is typically used in the transition to the second theme group in sonata form. It occurs again in the second violin part, in measures 53-55 and measures 57-59.

The harmonic structure of the transition is quite interesting. The chart below provides an overview of some of the harmonic progressions during this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures:</th>
<th>41-42</th>
<th>43-44</th>
<th>45-46</th>
<th>47-48</th>
<th>49-50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chord:</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g♯₄/₃</td>
<td>a₀₄/₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function in F:</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V / vi</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>vii₀₄/iii</td>
<td>vii₀₄/IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures:</th>
<th>51-52</th>
<th>53-54</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>57-58</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chord:</td>
<td>f♯₀₄/₂</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>c₆/₄</td>
<td>It⁺⁶/c</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>c₆/₄</td>
<td>It⁺⁶/c</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function in c:</td>
<td>vii₀₄/₂/V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>i⁶/₄</td>
<td>It⁺⁶</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>i⁶/₄</td>
<td>It⁺⁶</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Harmonic structure, measures 41-61, first movement.

The harmonies in measures 47 through 52 are a series of fully-diminished sevenths leading to (Beat 4 of) measure 52 and a D⁷ acting as the dominant seventh to G major in measure 53.

The second theme group, beginning at measure 68, is in C major, the dominant of the main key. Unusually, this theme is restated in C minor at measure 78. Next, A-flat major is used in measures 83 to 90. As mentioned previously, this third relationship between tonal areas was a trademark of Beethoven’s quartets, so Bristow was perhaps influenced by those works. During this section, unexpectedly, Bristow uses material from the first theme during the second theme group (mm. 84-93). This is not a monothematic exposition, such as Haydn often wrote, since there is clearly a distinct second theme at measure 68. Using first theme material in the second
theme group definitely is definitely out of the norm. D minor appears at measures 94-95, again, a third away from tonic. This coincides with a striking change of mood, with a fortissimo dynamic and repeated sixteenth notes in the lower three instruments. A progression is made back to C major, established at measure 100. More of the first theme material is used from this point until the first ending in measures 111-112, which points back to the beginning of the Allegro Grazioso.

The development begins in measure 115. Establishing D-flat major in measure 117, material from the first theme appears in the first violin through measure 121, where the second violin adopts similar material for two measures, followed by the slurred descending scale figure (slightly altered) in the cello in measure 124. To this point, the sharing of thematic roles has included three of four instruments, a fairly strong representation of the collaborative nature of chamber music. After having been in D-flat major, measure 125 establishes D-flat minor. In both cases, it is important to note the Beethovenian third relationship to the home key of F major. First theme material is used in a similar manner by the first violin and the cello until measure 132.

For all the use of the first theme in the development, there seems to be no use of the second theme, which is unusual. In measures 133-138, a motive based on the first six eighth-notes of the first theme is exchanged throughout the four parts, again in a manner very characteristic of chamber music as we have defined it. In measures 145-151 there is a long, sustained dominant pedal in the cello, suggesting the eventual modulation back to F major. The thematic material in the first violin seems to be loosely based on the eighth-note passage at the beginning of the first theme. The chart below shows the progression of harmonies throughout much of the development section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures:</th>
<th>115-116</th>
<th>117-120</th>
<th>121-124</th>
<th>125-128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chord:</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Db</td>
<td>Ab(^7)(_{16/5}^1)</td>
<td>db</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function in Db:</td>
<td>V(^7)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V(^7)(_{16/5}^1)</td>
<td>i (borrowed from minor mode)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures:</th>
<th>129-131</th>
<th>132</th>
<th>133</th>
<th>134</th>
<th>135</th>
<th>136</th>
<th>137-138</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chord:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E(_3^4)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bb (A natural in cello)</td>
<td>A(_4^4)</td>
<td>d(_6^6)</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function in d:</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V(_4^4)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>iv(^7)</td>
<td>V(_4^4)</td>
<td>i(_6^6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures:</th>
<th>139-140</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>142</th>
<th>143</th>
<th>144</th>
<th>145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chord:</td>
<td>b(^7)</td>
<td>C(_7^b9)</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>G(^7) (C in cello)</td>
<td>C(_7^b9)</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function in f:</td>
<td>vii(^7)</td>
<td>V(_7^b9)</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>V(^7)</td>
<td>V(_7^b9)</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Harmonic structure, measures 115-145, first movement.

The movement from d-flat minor to A major at measure 129 (a major-third relationship, enharmonically), is an important structural change. The modulation to d minor, established in measure 137, begins with the use of closely related chords in measure 134. Measures 142 to the first beat of measure 144 are best described as a dominant (C) pedal with chords suspended over it, with the pedal continuing at mm. 145-151.

The recapitulation begins on the anacrusis to measure 156. Once again, the first theme group is in F major, and is identical to its first appearance in the exposition. But in the recapitulation, the transition is much shorter and harmonically simplified. Its initial six bars are identical to the exposition, but from m.174 a V\(^7\) / V leads to five measures of the dominant (C). The second theme group begins after this, in measure 180, this time in the home key of F major. Yet, the harmonic journey continues touching V\(^7\) – I\(_6^6\) of Gb major (196-199) and other keys (e.g. E-flat minor at 201) before again settling in F major (m.212), with a root position tonic that shifts immediately to a I\(_6^6\) (cello playing a C) at measure 212, and finally in root position at measure 223.
220. A coda occurs at measure 212 until the end of the movement, which closes with a shortened restatement of the first theme, passed among the four instruments, ending on a root-position F major chord.

The second movement of the quartet is an Adagio in D-flat major and 6/8 meter. It is in ternary form:

Section I – Db – m. 1
Section II – Ab – m. 18
Section III – Db – m. 28

There is a clearly defined theme in the beginning of section I, which is repeated in section III. In fact, the first 11 ½ measures of sections I and III are identical. The remainders of each section (after the first 11 ½ measures) differ in both thematic material and harmonic function. Section I modulates so that section II begins in A-flat major, while Section III retains its tonality in D-flat major. Section II is distinct as a separate harmonic region, but it lacks a clearly identifiable theme like that seen in sections I and III. Measures 18 and 19 possess what could have been the beginning of such a theme, but the idea is abandoned in measure 20. The same is true for measures 23 and 24. Section II could have provided more contrast if it had some degree of thematic unity. The movement as a whole is rather short, even allowing for its adagio marking, considering the length of the other movements.

The third movement is a minuet and trio, the minuet in F major, and the trio in B-flat major. The use of a minuet, as opposed to the scherzo common in Beethoven, is somewhat unusual for a work of the mid-nineteenth century. In any case, my recommendation would be to perform the movement at a speedier tempo for a minuet. In marking the movement as a minuet, Bristow may have been trying to allude to earlier works of the classical period. Yet as will be shown, the
minuet’s tonal scheme is quite progressive, so perhaps Bristow was attempting to blend a newer harmonic language with an older form.

The minuet is distinctive for an eighth-note motive (F-G-A-G-A-F), which is repeated or imitated by all the instruments, often transposed and with altered intervals (such as G-A-Bb-A-Bb-G). This often serves as a device for chromatic coloration. This motive seems to bear some resemblance to many of the slurred eighth-note passages in Mendelssohn’s Overture to *Märchen von der schönen Melusine* (published 1836; see Figure 15, p. 226), although Mendelssohn’s passage is largely arpeggial, not scalar. That said, the *Melusine* motive is traded between instruments in a way similar to Bristow’s minuet. Bristow would have performed this work in the Philharmonic prior to composing this quartet.

![Figure 15: Mendelssohn’s Overture to *Märchen von der schönen Melusine*, violin I, violin II, and viola, mm. 11-14.](image)

The first section of the minuet is repeated following a first ending (mm. 20-22), and the second ending leads to second section at measure 26. There is a bold unison passage (with octave

---

displacement for viola and cello) in measures 28-33. Here again, Bristow’s adventurous harmonies progress to distantly related keys. Beginning in A major at measure 26, measure 34 is in D major. Measures 42 to 57 move to F-sharp major, a half-step above the original key. This is an incredibly unusual tonal plan for such a movement, especially considering that the minuet was an older genre. From measure 66 to 70, the cello plays repeated quarter notes on C, which establishes the base for a I\(^6\) section in F major. This changes to B-flat major \(^6\) inversion in measure 72, with an F in the cello. Of course, the section ends in F major, and the minuet is repeated after the trio. Throughout the minuet, the eighth-note motive is passed around by all four instruments, and is emblematic of this collaborative type of chamber music with shared positions of prominence among the voices.

The trio serves as a contrast to the minuet in nearly every manner. The melody is entirely in the first violin, with the other instruments providing harmonic support, generally in the form of tied dotted half notes. Measures 124-127 feature a syncopated feel, with the second violin and viola progressing a quarter-note ahead of the first violin. But with the exception of a few grace notes, the fastest rhythmic unit is a quarter note, nearly all of which are in the first violin part. This section lacks the harmonic boldness of which the minuet and first movement have shown us Bristow was capable. Perhaps this was the composer’s attempt to distinguish the trio stylistically, or maybe he was much more interested in the minuet.

The Finale is a sonata-form movement in F major, with a vivace tempo in 2/4 meter. The first theme group of the exposition features thematic material generally in the first violin and cello parts, with the second violin and viola usually providing harmonic support in repeated eighth notes. A key feature of the thematic material in both the violin and cello is a series of three notes, ascending (most often) in a scalar progression, in the rhythm of two sixteenth notes followed by
an eighth note, or other longer duration. The first three entrances of the first violin begin with this figure. It is prominent in the cello, especially at measures 6-8, 14-16, and 18-21. C major is established at measure 29, where the first violin begins new melodic material of relative technical difficulty, under which the other instruments play longer, more sustained chords. Seven bars before the transition, an interesting exchange occurs between the instruments. The ascending 16th-16th-8th figure, mentioned previously, is isolated from the larger theme and transmitted among all four instruments. It serves as an interesting contrast to what has otherwise thus far been a texture dominated by first violin and cello.

The transition begins at measure 47. A phrase of the main first theme appears in F major (mm. 47-56), but is followed by similar material in F minor (mm. 57-62). A section of Ab7 harmonies (mm. 63-70) leads to Db major, and new contrasting material, at measure 71. This section is fortissimo, with march-like dotted eighth and sixteenth-note figures, and double-dotted quarter and sixteenth-note figures. While the lower three voices emphasize the downbeat, the first violin often accents the second beat, creating a rhythmic counterpoint. The passage in the first violin at measures 83-88 is rather challenging, including several sixteenth-note runs. The second theme group, in the dominant (C major), begins at measure 102. The second theme itself, beginning at measure 104, is a very lyrical, Mendelssohnian melody. It is supported underneath by a C pedal in the viola and a continuous sixteenth-note passage in the second violin which outlines the C major chord with the coloration of an added major 6th (A). As the harmonies change, so do the pitches in the second violin passage, creating a technically-challenging section if taken at a brisker tempo. The exposition, which is repeated, ends on a C7 chord, the dominant-seventh of F major.

3 Note that the first three pitches of the cello entrance at mm. 2-3 (BCD) are the same as the first violin in the opening of the first movement.
The development begins in E major at measure 222, in a $\text{6}_4$ inversion, as outlined in second violin and viola parts. In the harmonic transition from the end of the exposition to the development, C$^7$ enharmonically acts as a German augmented sixth to E major. An unusual feature is that the development section begins with a change in key signature to E major (four sharps). Here, unlike in the first movement, the development contains material from both the first and second themes. The section opens with four measures of first-theme material in the cello, followed by four measures of second-theme material in first violin, and this pattern repeats once more. In measures 238-249, the cello repeats a figure based on the opening notes of the second theme. The viola adopts this motive at mm. 246-249. Above this, the first violin has a series of $16^{\text{th}}$ and $8^{\text{th}}$ note runs, based on the ascending $16^{\text{th}}$-$16^{\text{th}}$-$8^{\text{th}}$ figure, mentioned previously, which is derived from the first theme. Below, I will outline some of the key harmonic points of the development section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>222</th>
<th>230</th>
<th>238</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>262</th>
<th>270</th>
<th>278</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>B'</td>
<td>c#</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>C (later C')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Key tonal areas, development section, fourth movement.

An abrupt change in both key and key signature to A-flat major (four flats) occurs at measure 250. Beginning here, the first violin plays the second theme material in an upper register. The middle two parts create an interesting texture that is comprised of the sixteenth-note motive, occurring in alternating manner between the instruments, ascending in second violin and descending in viola. In measures 264-270, the cello plays the motive derived from the beginning of the second theme (as it had in mm. 238-249). The section from measure 278 to 286 is, in my view, a rhythmically-augmented statement of the ascending scalar motive, only occurring in quarter and half notes, as opposed to eighth and sixteenth notes in the original statements. The
development as a whole shows excellent synthesis of the first and second themes, as well as development of motives from these themes. The finale’s development is surprisingly more advanced in motivic development and variety than that of the first movement.

The recapitulation begins in measure 302, in F major. The first theme group is essentially identical to that of the exposition. The reappearance of the transition section is modified to be slightly shorter, so that the second theme group remains in F major, beginning at measure 390. Here, the viola takes the lengthy and difficult sixteenth-note passage that the second violinist had in the exposition. The first violin retains the main thematic material. In measures, 412-414, the second violin briefly quotes the motive derived from the opening of the second theme. Beginning at measure 420, the first and second violins share the melody displaced by an octave, but unusually, the second violin is in the upper octave. The piece leads toward its close with a bold unison (with octave displacement) statement of the sixteenth-note material from the first theme, leading to a succession of V-I progressions before closing on tonic.

***********

The most identifiable influences on the compositional style of Bristow’s quartet appear to be Mendelssohn and Beethoven. See Chapter VI, “Bristow’s Quartetto, Op. 1 in Context” (p. 200) for a detailed contextual discussion of the work.
Editor’s Notes

First Movement

m. 52, viola: The last eighth note on beat 4.5 was originally written in the upper octave as an F-sharp, but then crossed out with an “X” and replaced with an F in the octave below (notated without an accidental, but F-sharp is obviously correct). Bristow likely did this in order to avoid a parallel tritone with the first violin. The downbeat of measure 53 remains in the original octave.

m. 68, cello: In the manuscript, the G appears in both octaves, but both are partially marked over. The editor recommends the C as the lowest note, optionally played as a double stop with the G in the upper octave, a perfect fifth above.

m. 80, viola: This appears to say mezzo piano, but it is difficult to tell. Further, the fourth beat of the viola seems to have a staccato marking, but it has been omitted in favor of greater stylistic unity of the parts.

mm. 90-93, violin I: There is a series of decrescendo markings, which might better be viewed as emphasized, semi-accented figures.

m. 93, violin I: On the fourth beat, the C is clearly indicated in the score. In the space above this, a small dot appears where an E would be. It is unclear if it is intended to be a note head. If so, it would make the contour of beats 3 and 4 differ from the previous 3.5 measures, so the editor favors the use of C.

m. 95, viola: Tenuto in the viola part. It has been changed to match the violins.

m. 96, cello: The manuscript contains an A for this measure. Perhaps Bristow intended A-flat, with the accidental continued from the previous measure. This would make slightly more sense, but still be an odd match with the G in the viola, less than an octave above. The editor recommends G.

m. 104, viola: There appears to be a half-note C in the manuscript, but Bristow’s intention is unclear. It could be omitted to be more consistent with the similar figure at measure 108, or retained to resemble measure 102.

Second Movement

m. 5 and m. 32, viola: The second half of the measure is blank, in the manuscript. The editor has inserted two E-flat eighth notes, as shown.

Third Movement

mm. 12-19: The short decrescendo markings appear in all parts. View these as the same emphasis gestures mentioned previously.
mm. 29-33: The accents shown are, in the manuscript, the same ambiguous accent/decrescendo figure that Bristow often included. This figure, appearing in repeated succession as this, leads the editor to believe that Bristow had intended some sort of a decrescendo effect in these measures. It is doubtful that the pianissimo at measure 34 was intended to be subito.

m. 71, cello: It appears that Bristow originally filled this measure with the same three quarter notes on C double stops as appeared in the previous several measures. He removed beats two and three, but kept beat one, and wrote in the CDEDEC figure above it. It is unknown if Bristow considered the low C on beat one to be essential.

m. 159, violin II: In the manuscript, both a C and D are written, then smudged over. The editor believes that Bristow wanted to use the C as a continuous lower note in this part. In such had occurred, then starting from measure 156, the pitches would have been F,C,G,C,G,C,A,C. However, C does not fit with the harmony, and D does.

Fourth Movement

m. 243, cello: The second beat of the measure is smudged in the manuscript, but the editor is fairly certain that this was his intention, given the repetitious passage.

m. 327 and m. 329, violin II: Bristow’s accidental markings appear somewhat unclear here. The editor first believed B flat to be the intended pitch, but on further consideration, B natural makes more sense. In measure 329, this allows a G major-minor seventh to lead to C major in the next measure. A B natural in m. 327 would keep the passage in closer resemblance to its earlier appearance in the exposition.

mm. 345-346, violin II: In the manuscript, the crescendo in measure 346 actually begins in measure 345 and lasts for both measures. This contradicts the decrescendo in measure 345, which is written above the staff in the manuscript. It has been rewritten to match the other instruments.

mm. 420-421, violin I: Bristow apparently wrote four measures (420-423) with the first violin playing an octave higher, then erased most of this. The upper octave in the double stop, measures 420-421, was not erased, but is not necessary as the second violin plays this line in the higher octave.

m. 494, violin I: There are two slurs in the manuscript, one on both beats, each encompassing an eighth-sixteenth-sixteenth figure. It has been rewritten for greater consistency with previous appearances.

m. 505, violin I: The manuscript contains one additional eighth rest. (Quarter note, eighth rest, eighth rest, sixteenth rest, sixteenth note)
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