

Review

Source: *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*, Vol. 23, No. 474 (Aug. 1, 1882), pp. 450-453

Published by: [Musical Times Publications Ltd.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3355812>

Accessed: 07-12-2015 20:59 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Musical Times Publications Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

A PERFORMANCE of the Sonata for Pianoforte and Violin to which Sir Michael Costa awarded the prize of ten guineas and a gold medal, offered by Trinity College, London, took place at the College, on Tuesday evening, the 4th ult. The work was admirably performed by Mr. J. Conway Brown, L. Mus. (the composer), and Mr. Victor Buziau, and enthusiastically received by the critical audience assembled.

A PERFORMANCE of Farmer's "Christ and His Soldiers" was given at the Church of St. Mary-the-Less, Lambeth, on Friday evening, the 7th ult., by the Choral Society connected with the church, under Mr. W. Sexton, of Westminster Abbey. The solo parts were taken by members, and the work was rendered in a very creditable manner. Mr. A. F. Adcock, Organist, accompanied.

THE first meeting of Mr. T. Albion Alderson's Choir at Newcastle-on-Tyne will take place on September 12, when Dr. Armes's Oratorio "St. John the Evangelist" (conducted by the composer) and Macfarren's "Christmas" will be performed.

MR. WALTER PARRATT has been appointed Organist of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, in place of Sir George Elvey; and Mr. C. L. Williams (of Llandaff Cathedral) succeeds Mr. C. Harford Lloyd as Organist of Gloucester Cathedral.

THE new organ built by Messrs. Foster and Andrews, for Henfield Church, near Brighton, was opened on St. Peter's Day, by Mr. Richard Lemaire, Organist of St. John's, Southwark, who gave a Recital after evensong.

REVIEW.

L'Histoire de la Notation Musicale, depuis ses Origines. Par MM. Ernest David et Mathis Lussy. Ouvrage couronné par l'Institut. (Prix Bordin de 1880.) [Paris, 1882: à l'Imprimerie Nationale.]

THE recent publication in Paris of a complete History of Musical Notation, by MM. Ernest David and Mathis Lussy, is, in its way, an important event; and in regard to the special attention paid to the subject of musical education at this moment in our own country it is, moreover, opportune. In the French musical and literary world, M. David is known as the author of "La Musique chez les Juifs." Most English musicians are acquainted with the exhaustive treatise on "Musical Expressions" by M. Lussy. We are told in the preface to the new work that it was a prize essay, and that the comprehensive title, "L'Histoire de la Notation Musicale, depuis ses Origines," was given by the Paris Academy of Fine Arts as the subject for competition in 1880. The authors do not profess to travel much out of the region of plain narrative and research; for, as they say, to enter into the question of "comparative Semeiography" would be to create a new science worthy of the labours of a Max Müller or a Bopp. Naturally, in a subject so limited as that of musical notation, the facts they narrate will, for the most part, be familiar to the readers of the excellent articles in musical dictionaries and in encyclopædias compiled from the works of Hawkins, Forkel, Fétis, and other historians. Still, in gathering the results of the researches of a long list of authors of all times and countries into one large quarto, MM. David and Lussy have not lost opportunities of impressing on the mere mass of facts the stamp of their individual opinions. Here and there they freely express their divergence from certain of their predecessors. In the very first page we find it assumed as more than probable that no Semitic nation possessed any graphic system of musical notation. Amongst the Semitic nations are placed the Egyptians; but M. David, to whom, perhaps, we are indebted for the facts of the more ancient periods of the history, explains in a foot-note that he has classified the Egyptians with the Assyrians, Chaldeans, Phœnicians and Hebrews, not on ethnological grounds, but because of their constant intercourse with Semitic nations. The importance of the point as to whether those nations had any graphic system of music notation soon appears in the subsequent questions as to the origin of the Greek notation, and eventually of the modern European. It has often been a favourite theory with some writers that the Greek

musical system was brought by Pythagoras from Egypt. Others, with whom MM. David and Lussy agree, ascribe the origin of Greek music to the Phœnicians. So far from the Greeks receiving their system from the Egyptians, the elaborate music of the latter people in after times was wholly of Greek origin. The notation employed was alphabetical and, it may be said, numerical, since the letters served the Greeks equally for their musical and arithmetical notation. Their method of solmisation was in principle the same as the hexachordal system that prevailed in the middle ages throughout civilised Europe, and continued in Italy, according to Padre Martini, even to the latter half of the last century. The principle has lately been revived in France and England. It was a system of mutations. Where we at the present day might sing *re mi fa sol*, the Greeks, prefixing the letter *t* to the vowels, sang *τα τε τη τω*; and in following the scale *la si do* they repeated the syllables *τα τη τω*. Their system of mutation was, however, in some respects different from the mediæval, and was more scientific.* The Roman musical doctrine was that of the Greeks, shorn of refinements and superfluities such as delicate intonations and subdivisions of the octave, the multiplicity of modes, and other matters little suited to the more practical-minded Latins; who were content to receive the "immutable system," and to retain two modes—the *Lydian* and *Hypolydian*—out of the seven, eleven, fifteen, or even more, in the Greek system. They retained also the alphabetical notation, which was only transformed by the substitution of Roman in place of Greek letters, and was subsequently adopted by Boetius, handed over to Pope Gregory, utilised by Guido d'Arezzo, finally reappearing, with the Greek system of tetrachords almost intact, in the hexachords of modern history. In regard to certain points we are here of course in the midst of a maze of conflicting opinions. It is asked, "In what characters did Gregory write or note his antiphony?" "In letters of the alphabet," says Fétis. "In *neumæ*," say his adversaries. "In no notation at all," says M. Gevaert, "for Gregory knew none, and simply made choice of traditional chants and had them taught orally." Again, as to what is known in musical history as the *nota romana*, Fétis asserts it was alphabetical, because the *neumes* were not known in Italy until the eighth century. M. Gevaert confirms that opinion, in regard to the chronology at least, as he thinks both the neumatic notation and the theory of the eight ecclesiastical tones were of Byzantine origin, and did not penetrate westward until towards the eighth century. Other authorities, with whom MM. David and Lussy seem inclined to side, assert that the *neumes* were known in Italy long before the time even of St. Gregory, and that it was the neumatic notation—the veritable *nota romana*—he employed in the antiphony he caused to be exhibited as a model before the altar of St. Peter's. The Rev. P. Dom. Joseph Pothier, whose work on the Gregorian melodies was noticed a short time since in THE MUSICAL TIMES, is of opinion that in all ages the alphabetical or numerical notation has been used only for purely didactic purposes. The *neumæ* are entirely distinct in object and origin, and have never supplanted the letters, nor were the latter at any time substituted for the *neumes*. They existed simultaneously. The one explained the other; as, we may add, alphabetical symbols, numerals, syllables, grave and acute accents, and other signs are used at this day, to explain the staff notation in regard either to questions of abstract tonality or correct intonation. It appears from what we are told by M. David that the *tonal accents* employed by the Hebrews had many characteristics in common with the neumatic notation. There is nevertheless some doubt as to the date at which these accents originated. A high authority places it about the period the Talmud was finally edited—that would be only in the sixth century of our era. We have already quoted the opinion of M. David, that no Semitic nation had a musical notation of its own. The music of the psalms and poetry of the Jews in ancient times was therefore learned orally and by tradition, and was noted neither by letters of the alphabet nor other signs.

* To purely English readers the Greek solmisation suggests a curious question as to the correct pronunciation of the *epsilon*. Was *re* pronounced *tay*, or how? No other sounding of the English letter *e* would answer the purposes of the solfeggio.

The Talmud, which in other respects enters into minutiae absolutely frivolous, does not, says M. David, make any mention of the "tonal accents." What it does mention is that a certain Levite was reprimanded for not teaching to his colleagues—and it is understood orally—a melody he had composed for the recitation of a canticle. Everything, as our authors remind us, moulds itself to surrounding conditions. It may be assumed that the earliest, like later, music used in religious ceremonies had a very restricted compass, and was little more than what Aristotle calls the "seasoning of poetry" by varied and organised modulations of the voice. The *neumæ* themselves were scarcely more than mnemonics or aids in remembering a melody more or less familiar. The older neumatic signs, made up of points and commas and curves, without guiding lines, were not as numerous or as systematic as those of the Greek notation, but they were more complicated; and, adapted as they were to nearly all forms of vocal expression, they served their purpose so long as the music was homophonic, and the intervals sung were not greater than a third, or at most a fifth. The significance of the fact that the gradual reform of the neumatic notation was contemporaneous with the appearance of the organum and the first germs of harmony in modern Europe has naturally been noticed by all historians; although at this period, from the eighth to the eleventh century, the narrative of musical history is not very connected or clear, and it does not appear that any nascent idea of harmony had much influence in suggesting the happy notion, so curiously overlooked by all ancient nations, of graphically fixing the intervals of the scale by placing the points—or *puncta*—of the neumes on separate lines and spaces.* Guido, to whom this invention at least may be ascribed, was not by any means unmindful of the organum or diaphony of his day, but he, and his precursors, Aurelian de Réomé, Remi d'Auxerre, Huebald de Sainte Amand, Odon de Cluny, and the rest, were monks, devoted to one object: the service of the Church, and the right rendering of the homophonic tones. It was rather to the second great reform in musical notation—mensurable music—that the gradual progress of harmony lent so much aid and finally perfected. Another powerful element in both reforms—the influence of popular or profane music, always despised by the ecclesiastics—has received ample justice at the hands of MM. David and Lussy. The growth of the modern harmonic system was in its turn greatly assisted by a change of scale, which may not have had its origin in the period we are speaking of, but the first written evidence of the reform occurs in the tenth century. The Greek system of scales was minor, and the central note we may call A, or *la*. It is often stated that Guido d' Arezzo added the *gamma*, or G, to that system; but long before the assumed date of the appearance of the *micrologus*, the scale, or, more properly, system of scales, is to be found in the diagrams of his predecessors, Odon de Cluny and others, and exactly as it is presented in the hexachordal system of a later period, which as a system was in principle major, and by the system of mutations wholly and practically so. The fundamental scales were C and F, and the nominal *dohs* of the system of mutations were *ut*, *fa ut*, and *sol re ut*. The whole system, *gamma* included, was Greek, and even the hexachords were founded on an admission and an application of the Greek system of tetrachords. From the fact we have already seen, that the Latins retained only the Lydian and the Hypolydian modes of the Greek system—C and F—there is reason to think that the transformation of the antique and minor system into the modern major system might have commenced at a very early period in our era. Offering here an individual opinion, we confess it is very difficult to comprehend what modern historians and musicians mean in using, so specifically as

they do, the expression *old tonality*, when by a very ordinary process we can evoke at least seven major and modern keys from the Greek "perfect system," and can add more with the "immutable system," taking C and F as points of departure in transposition. MM. David and Lussy quote the disparaging remarks of Aristoxenus and Ptolemy in regard to *notation*. Those philosophers could not admit that "notation" should be accepted as proof of the science of music. To this our authors rather petulantly reply: "that may or may not be; but if Aristoxenus and Ptolemy had thought proper to give us one or two copious examples of music in the then revised notation, they would have saved posterity a world of trouble." That is most true; but at the same time there is a tendency amongst musicians to mistake the symbols for the things symbolised; and it is just possible that the contempt expressed by the moderns for the "old tonality" is one of the fruits of that tendency. Although we should wish to follow this important and interesting work by MM. David and Lussy page by page, we can afford to pass over, as indeed we have already done, the well-worn subject of "mensurable music," and we feel inclined to make a bound forward to the two examples of modern notation given in the concluding chapter. These are an extract from a pianoforte fantasia by Thalberg, and another from an arrangement of the overture to "Oberon" by Zarbeski; the latter scored on four staves, for the piano *à claviers renversés*. From this pinnacle of an edifice which is truly one of the greatest marvels we possess of human ingenuity we can with our authors—or shall we say with M. Lussy—review the process by which it has been raised. We need not trouble ourselves to go back again to the age of Pericles or of Nero. Setting aside the two or three specimens we have of ancient music, all of doubtful authenticity, we are asked under the guidance of M. Lussy to judge the music of the ancients by the cumbrousness of their notation; and if that is not sufficiently convincing, by the despicable construction of their instruments. As for Guido, "to the learned," says M. Lussy, "he will henceforth be nothing more than an intelligent reformer of methods of musical teaching; but to the general public, whatever is said or done, he will always be the inventor of the gamut, and the originator of our system of notation." However little Guido may have done, there is at least one thing he did not do—one thing to his credit, in the eyes of M. Lussy—he did not invent that "monstrosity," the "system of mutations and hexachords." As for the "Harmonic Hand," no one knows who invented it—John Cotton, or somebody—but it is better that its origin should remain in obscurity. These old devices of our ancestors began to disappear at the approach of the seventeenth century. But musicians in those days seemed to have thrived so well and lived so long, we have to go back to 1517, the date on which Hubert Waelrant was born in Antwerp, to trace the bud that finally expanded into the full-blown "modern tonality." It was he who invented the system of *boecdisation*, afterwards approved and adopted by Calvisius. But following Waelrant, who died in 1595, we have Van den Putte, otherwise *Erycius Putaneus*, who published in Milan, in 1599, a treatise bearing in its long title those significant and almost classical words, "*Sive septem discrimina vocum*." There were also: Anselm, the Fleming; Pedro Urena, a Spanish monk; and, according to Merseune, the Frenchman Lemaire, in 1605, and others, to whom is ascribed a share in the honour of "inventing"—as it is usual to say; but shall we not say, rather, "re-establishing"?—the seventh note of the scale. It is even doubtful whether the word "re-establishing" is strictly correct. In the book itself we are noticing, as well as in others, and particularly in "L'Histoire de la Musique dans l'Antiquité," by Gevaert, we find that the Greek method of solmisation was by *trines*, or triads, as they called them; and because the unit, so to speak, of their *system of scales* was the tetrachord, just as the unit of the mediæval system was the heptachord. Where required, the Greeks changed or repeated the syllabic sign after the *third* note, as— $do\ re\ mi\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} fa\ sol\ la \\ do\ re\ mi \end{array} \right.$. In the Middle Ages they changed the sign after the sixth note. In the fully expanded system of these days, having the whole complication of keys pictorially before our eyes, we only repeat the sign

* MM. David and Lussy devote an interesting chapter in the history of the staff and the clefs to show again how the modern five-lined staff arose from the eleven lines formerly used, by the simple excision of the *sixth line*, which, as a *lucus a non lucendo*, represents the middle C, the pivot of the system of clefs, occupying the space now existing between the staves of a pianoforte score. Another curiosity of musical history they mention is the "heptarchy" ruling in musical notation: seven notes, seven sharps, seven flats, seven naturals, seven forms of notes, seven rests, seven clefs, seven measures of time, seven modes of expression or execution, seven forms of grace notes, and seven octaves in the usual compass of an instrument.

to complete the octave. It seems to us as unreasonable to call the mediæval scale *hexachordal* as it would be to call the Greek scale *trichordal*; and the whole difficulty is in confounding a *scale* with a *double-octave system*, and, in fact, in confounding theory and system in general with the details of notation. In regard to graphic detail, for which, perhaps, we are as much indebted to Guttenberg as to Waelrant, we are indeed immensely in advance of our forefathers; but it is always a question whether the comparative absence of mental effort, which M. Lussy rightly enough claims as the distinctive merit in the process of reading the modern notation, is an unmixed advantage in regard to a thorough knowledge of music, and whether the very facility of reading is in its effects not somewhat akin to learning by rote or by ear.

As an ardent Fétisian, M. Lussy announces with emphasis the final recognition in the seventeenth century of the pivot of the modern tonality; that luckless interval the *tritone*, which has been proscribed, detested, and cursed as the *diabolus in musica*. The marvellous powers of this interval formed part of the almost Pauline call or revelation which, as Fétis recounts, occurred to him whilst journeying in the Bois de Boulogne. The revelation, however, was by no means complete. When from the *claviers renversés*, or summit of the edifice of that system of modern notation to which M. Lussy himself has contributed some scrolls and ornaments, we look back on the past he and his colleague have so clearly placed before us, we cannot help receiving a different impression to what it appears to us they intend to convey. In tracing with them the evolution of musical notation, the past, instead of receding, seems to come nearer and nearer. This very theory of the *tritone*, which Fétis had adopted with an appreciativeness only a little more passionate or intense than some of his predecessors, is a link with the past, rather than an abrupt departure from ancient systems. The monkish detestation of the interval is a negative proof of its recognised value in former ages; and all that Fétis could tell us of its power in the modern and vertical system was already made visible in the *musica pieta* of the ancients. If in making these comparisons we allow our minds to be impressed by the recollections of modern symphonies and music-dramas, the ancients may appear pigmies; if we choose to ponder on all that is suggested by the mechanism of modern musical typography and instruments, they become shadows; but if the question be the theory of the mechanism of notation, we feel inclined, with M. Gevaert, to hint at the possibility of our knowing in some respects less than they did; and of our not even knowing all that our own vaunted system of notation could be made to reveal. In the fifth and concluding chapters of the history of musical notation we are reviewing, MM. David and Lussy deal generously, and in many respects fairly, with the several attempts that have been made in late years to reform the modern notation. Our authors admit that only two systems—the Galin-Paris-Chevé, in France, and its analogue, the Tonic Sol-fa system, in England, have achieved any success. Both methods are systems of mutation like the hexachordal system of the Middle Ages, which, it is worth while remembering, existed for more than half a millenium. We quite agree with M. Lussy that it was a transitional device, and that its permanence was no absolute proof of its merit, in view of the difficulty of disturbing an intellectually indolent and unimpressionable world when it has once nestled itself in rut, groove or crevice. Still, if in the full tide and apparent perfection of our modern notation old principles have been revived, it suggests the probability that they correct some marked defect in the present system. This we can assume, on the principle more than once referred to by our authors, that the general progress of evolution, which has a trick of recoiling and advancing, will be dependent on existing conditions. With perfect justice MM. David and Lussy remind us that the Galin system—and we think it is the same with our Tonic Sol-fa method—was not intended to supplant, but to supplement the ordinary notation. Such we imagine to be not only the true view of the case, but it also indicates the peculiarity which has given to those systems their real value. The modern system of notations undoubtedly deserves all the praise and preference M. Lussy bestows. In its totality we can even allow it to be the best conceivable instru-

ment for the visual representation of musical ideas. The little defects M. Lussy himself has tenderly pointed out are barely worthy of notice; but its chief defect is its very completeness in one direction only. Of all notations, and by reason of its pictorial properties, it best lends itself to what modern musicians know and prize as *form*. It is exclusively a *fixed doh* notation; or, to go back to an older terminology, it is a *thetical* or *positional* notation, and thus represents above all the practical element in music. What M. Gevaert, in referring to the Galin system, calls a *notation dynamique*, represents the principle of the *movable doh*; which can henceforth never be more than a theoretic or accessory principle. We ourselves are not quite satisfied that even such an expression as a *dynamic notation* is allowable. A notation—of whatever kind—must from the very nature of the thing, be *positional*, referring to something expressed or understood in the sense of a *doh*. Even the more or less abstract neumatic notation possessed a species of clef representing the *tone*. The "functional principle," casually mentioned by MM. David and Lussy, resides in the *doh* itself. It is the *doh* only which is in *power*; not the notation. An apparent difficulty in these too much forgotten doctrines is easily explainable: when the *doh* is to be considered as an intrinsic part of the notation, and identified by the numeral 1, or by the letter C, or any other symbol held to be initial, it is both in *power* and *position*. To discuss questions of this nature did not, perhaps, enter into the purposes of MM. David and Lussy as simple historians, but we must say their penultimate chapter on "Reformers and Innovators" is a trifle lean, and somewhat disfigured by the mere prejudices of specialism. Modern craftsmen in music, experts in their own system of notation, and employing only one method of transposition, the *keyboard shift*, are apt to overlook not simply the intrinsic merits of other methods, but to judge them from a pedagogical point of view, as methods of teaching music, whilst in truth, as a question of principle, they are also methods of *understanding music*. The broad and separate principles of the fixed and the movable *dohs* are the foundation not only of systems of notation but of technical theory, which is a question of notation, the notation representing the concrete art and science of music. For the last 150 years musicians have abandoned old methods, and have been beguiled by scientific and arithmetical questions, all important in their way, but subsidiary; and they were treated as subsidiary by the ancients, who wisely postponed them as final refinements of the art. It is not therefore astonishing that in the very latest treatises of musicians there is abundant evidence that, with all their learning, they do not even now perceive the difference between one principle and the other; and that, whether it be a question of the *fixed doh* or the *movable doh*, the respective principles and methods are curiously interchanged and misapplied. Many of us would find it difficult to explain intelligibly our opinions, and off-hand, as to which of the two principles—to the movable or to the fixed *doh*—are we to refer the Greek system of modes. The old question as to whether the *relative minor* or the *tonic minor* represents one principle or the other, is not so easy to decide and thoroughly expound as some might imagine. Again, how is it that musicians, after presenting their series of chords in relation to a particular tonic, hesitate and prevaricate in pretending to explain to their readers or pupils a fact so elementary as a *change of resolution*? The reason is, that we accustom ourselves to work with the visible representation of the several scales or keys on the horizontal lines of the staves, and all that is latent in the system we overlook. The "dynamic methods," revivals of ancient systems, are calculated to correct these habits. On that account, with all gratitude to MM. David and Lussy for their researches and vivid and orderly presentation of the historical facts of the question of musical notation, we feel disposed to reproach them, not for over-estimating the modern system, but for seemingly to magnify its advantages at the expense of accessory methods. These, in reality, provide the key to what is otherwise a labyrinth of only partially intelligible symbols, representing well enough, with the aid of the clef and the staff signature, gradations of pitch, and with sufficient accuracy for didactic purposes; but, masterpiece of ingenuity as the modern no-

tation may be, it fails utterly in defining specific tonal or tonic relations in harmony. Unimprovable as it may appear, and in most respects is, as a *fixed doh* notation, it still bears the impress of a certain period of its existence when the new tonality was already highly developed, but when the "continuous melody," involving the "continuous," or what may be loosely called the "non-cadential harmony" of the modern music-drama, must have been inconceivable. The defect cannot be remedied. It is inherent in the nature of the notation, in its origin practically adapted to a melodic system. But it discloses the use of accessory methods that, whatever may be their value in elementary teaching, are in principle essential to a right comprehension of the theory of modulation, in which a sense of absolute pitch is only of secondary importance. The whole art of music is a question of organised contrasts and of relativity.

FOREIGN NOTES.

THE first public performance of Richard Wagner's new music drama "Parsifal" is to take place on the 1st inst., at Bayreuth, and for some time to come this latest manifestation of the genius of the reformer will supply the chief topic for discussion in advanced musical circles, both in Germany and elsewhere. In the face of the extraordinary interest clustering around the performance in question, we are reminded of the following enthusiastic words of a contemporary German music-historian, viz.: "To speak of the 'success' of a first production of a new work by Wagner sounds in these days almost like a platitude. It is an event. As a matter of fact, every new work of Wagner's since 'Rienzi' has proved an artistic creation of enduring value, and an enrichment of the *répertoire*."

We read in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Musik Zeitung*: "Among the new and most remarkable effects included in the forthcoming performances of 'Parsifal' at Bayreuth may be mentioned a bell-instrument, manufactured by Steingraber, of Bayreuth, after a design made by Hofkapellmeister Hans Richter. The mechanism of this instrument consists in a keyboard of four keys, some six centimetres wide, each striking upon six pianoforte bass strings, whereby the sound of four distinct bells is produced. In connection with four gongs (manufactured in England), of corresponding tonality, the peal of bells is so exactly imitated that we seem to hear four mighty brass tongues speaking down from the giddy heights of a cathedral spire. One of the most difficult portions of 'Parsifal' to manage, both musically and scenically, is the magic with the flower-nymphs in the second act. Thirty excellent singers, including six solo voices, have, however, already completely mastered the intricacies of this scene. Among the six soloists there is a singer from New York, Fräulein Johanna Meta, who some time since made her *débüt* at Munich as *Elsa*, in 'Lohengrin,' and was at once engaged at the Hoftheater."

Among the French musicians who have gone to Bayreuth to witness the "Parsifal" performance are M. Camille Saint-Saëns and M. Charles Lamoureux, the well-known *chef-d'orchestre*.

Joachim Raff, whose death we announced in the obituary column of our last number, has left two symphonies in an entirely finished state, one of which is already in the hands of the publishers, Messrs. Linnemann, of Leipzig. They are entitled respectively, "In the Autumn," and "In Winter," thus completing the symphonic cyclus of the seasons contemplated by the composer, whose "Spring" and "Summer" symphonies are already familiar numbers in concert programmes. The public examinations at the Hoch'sche Conservatorium, at Frankfurt, whereof the deceased musician was the director, were held from the 4th to the 8th ult. "On the first four days," the *Frankfurter Zeitung* remarks, "the pupils of the higher vocal and instrumental classes were heard, while on the fifth day the members of the class for composition, which had been personally conducted by the Director, produced some of their own compositions. The result of these examinations is the most honouring tribute that could be offered to the memory of the late Principal of the institution, and the most conclusive testimony to the fact that with his great productive activity Raff combined

the best qualities of a teacher who devoted himself with enthusiasm and with the most scrupulous attention to the duties of his office." No successor to the deceased composer in the directorship of the Hoch'sche Conservatorium has yet been named.

At Strasburg, fragments from a new opera entitled "Melusine" (a favourite subject, it would seem, with modern composers) were produced with much success. The composer is Herr Müller-Reuter, a Professor of the Conservatorium of that town, and a late pupil of the Hoch'sche Conservatorium at Frankfurt.

An opera by the Duke Ernst of Coburg, entitled "Diana von Solange," was produced at the Kroll'sche Theater in Berlin last month, and met with a very favourable reception.

A process by which decorations and other scenic accessories are rendered practically incombustible is now being applied by some of the leading theatres in Germany, whose example will doubtless soon be imitated by others. The process, the invention of Herr Pafen, of Frankfurt, consists in the impregnating of canvas and similar inflammable material with a chemical preparation, which in no way affects even the most delicate colours or the durability of the object impregnated, while introducing a new and important element of safety in case of fire. Experiments recently made with the preparation at the Court Theatres of Munich and Cassel have proved completely successful, even sheets of gauze when exposed to a gas flame refusing to become ignited, the only effect produced being a very slow carbonisation. The significance of this fact becomes the more apparent when we remember the enormous sheets of this most inflammable of all materials employed in some of our modern stage representations, notably in the "Nibelungen" Trilogy, for which alone the Munich Hof-Theater, for instance, is said to have some 9,000 square metres of gauze-sheets amongst its scenic properties.

Herr August Wilhelmj, the eminent violinist, has returned to his home at Wiesbaden after an absence of nearly four years, during which time he has made the round of the world, visiting North and South America, New Zealand, Australia, Asia (China, India, &c.), and returning to Europe *via* Egypt. The artist has met everywhere with the most enthusiastic reception, and has been almost overwhelmed with valuable presents and other tokens of admiration and regard.

Glinka's opera "Life for the Czar" is to be produced next month at the Hamburg Stadt-Theater, under the auspices of Dr. Hans von Bülow, who will conduct the first performance of this interesting work.

A commemorative tablet has been attached to the house—No. 18, Galerie Strasse, at Dresden—indicating that Carl Maria von Weber resided there from September 1822 to the time of his death (1826).

On the 12th ult., a hundred years had elapsed since the first representation on any stage (in Vienna) of Mozart's opera "Die Entführung aus dem Serail." Six years later, in 1788, the work was likewise produced at Berlin with great success, although a critic of the period deemed it his duty to advise the young composer to "take a lesson first from Dittersdorf before attempting to write a comic opera."

Contrary to the statement made in German journals, and reproduced in these columns, Herr Max Bruch has declined the proffered conductorship of the New York "Liederkrantz," which has been conferred upon Mr. Theodore Thomas, the well-known American conductor.

Gratuitous performances were given at most of the Paris theatres on the 14th ult, the anniversary of the national *fête*. At the Grand-Opéra M. Ambroise Thomas' "Françoise de Rimini," was performed, for the last time this season, on the occasion in question, and at the Opéra-Comique "Les Noces de Jeannette" and "Le Pré-aux-Clercs," as the closing performances before the vacation.

Four new operatic works are said to be now in the hands of M. Carvalho, the Director of the Paris Opéra-Comique, to be brought out at that establishment during the coming season, viz.: "Lackmé," by M. Léo Delibes; "Manon," by M. Massenet; "Carmosine," by M. F. Poise; and "Diana," by M. E. Paladilhe.

M. Massenet, says *La Musique Populaire*, will next winter pay a visit to Berlin, Hamburg, and Vienna, in order to be present at the production there of his opera "Hérodiade."