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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the extent of Dvořák's influence on American musical thinking during his stay in America from 1892-95.

The Scope of the Dissertation

The investigation largely concerns itself with Dvořák's affiliation with the National Conservatory of Music of America, tracing his duties as director, teacher and conductor. Although the study refers to Dvořák's American compositions primarily through reviews written during and after his stay, an exhaustive study was not made of America's influence on the composer's compositions.

The fact that Dvořák had a binding contract with the Conservatory for the entire period of his presence in this country necessitated an examination of the Conservatory's history to determine the changes that were manifested during and after his tenure. Therefore, a detailed account was also rendered of the Conservatory's structure in terms of curriculum changes, musical organizations, faculty changes, and so forth throughout its entire history.
Need for the Study

The impetus for the study was the paucity of previous literature regarding Dvořák's activities in the United States. Although there have been discourses on the subject, no previous attempt has been made to discover and collect into one source important documents hitherto neglected and relevant to Dvořák’s stay in America. Also noteworthy is the absence of American scholarly writing on Dvořák's visit to this country. Most of the previous writings have come from countries other than the United States. This can be accounted for, along with the phenomenon of American scholarly neglect, by the obscurity of documentary evidence in the United States. Thus, for example, one of the most important sources relevant to Dvořák's tenure, namely the contracts which tell of his duties at the National Conservatory, have never before been used as supporting evidence in a study. The contracts had been stored away in private files for the past fifty years or more and were uncovered by the investigator at the end of the summer of 1963. The absence of these documents—there were two: 1892-1894 and 1894-1896—would of necessity discourage any rigorous approach to the subject.

The demise of the Conservatory itself has also effected the tacit acceptance that the United States lacks major source material. Since Dvořák was connected solely with this institution in regard to American matters, it would follow that material pertaining to the Conservatory would be highly relevant. The scrapbooks of Mrs. Jeannette Thurber, founder of the Conservatory, are in the New York
Public Library; however, these documents pertain essentially to the years 1885-1892, the pre-Dvořák era. In regard to the school's subsequent history, including the crucial Dvořák period, documents have been at a premium. Since Mrs. Thurber had failed to supplement her scrapbooks with further material, an assumption was made that the papers had remained in a private collection. Therefore, the bulk of previous European research was accomplished without the aid of these valuable documents which, after so many years, were thought to have been either lost or destroyed. The missing documents may account for the encyclopedias' giving only a bare sketch of the Conservatory's history, with no mention at all of the institution's final outcome.

Understandably then, the responsibility for any extensive Dvořák research rested primarily with the European scholar, who at least had readily available access to such papers found in Prague at three principal places: The Museum Antonína Dvořáka, the Národní Museum and papers in possession of Mrs. Julie Dvořáková (Dvořák's daughter-in-law). By ignoring the inexplicable absence of relevant material which was to be located in places other than Prague, the scholar was tacitly omitting an important area of research. It should be noted, therefore, that the major problem and perhaps main contribution of this study was uncovering and piecing together the diffuse documentary evidence which, it is hoped, will be useful in future investigations on either the subject of Dvořák or the National Conservatory.
Related Literature

Information regarding both Dvořák and the National Conservatory was gained primarily through the study of original documents, such as contracts, letters of correspondence, catalogs, pamphlets, newspaper articles, and periodicals. Several of the above items are unpublished, such as the two contracts which Dvořák signed in connection with the Conservatory. These two documents spell out Dvořák's duties as director, teacher, and conductor. Other unpublished data include letters (primarily the Dvořák-Thurber correspondence), catalogs showing curriculum changes, and pamphlets describing such organizations as the Conservatory's orchestra.

An important book, recently published (1960), is *Antonín Dvořák: Thematic Catalogue* by Jarmil Burghauser. It is divided into three sections: (1) "Thematic Catalogue" which is an exhaustive treatment of each Dvořák composition including information pertaining to matters such as date of publication (works are chronologically arranged), publisher, particulars of the manuscript, and source references. (2) "Bibliography of the Literature on A. Dvořák" co-authored by Jarmil Burghauser, Dr. John Clapham and Dr. Wilhelm Pfannkuch is broken down into two parts: (a) "Bibliography of Books and Portions of Books" and (b) "Bibliography of Articles in Periodicals." Both parts of this second section are important as a starting point in matters related to Dvořák research. The dissertation was well into the research stage when this book was eventually employed as a check to determine important reference material which had possibly been overlooked by the
investigator. Most of the references of which the investigator took note were those written in English, supplemented by a few sources in German and French; a preponderance of the references were in Czech. Since the bulk of the dissertation is concerned with the dormant state of obscure evidence recently located in the United States, Czech sources have largely been omitted. (3) The third section, "Survey of the Life of Antonín Dvořák," is based, according to Burghauser, primarily on Otakar Šourek's four-volume Dvořák biography, "supplemented and crossed checked by other accessible sources, such as personal correspondence, Dvořák's manuscripts, periodical reports and other Dvořák literature, as well as Šourek's personal estate." (Page 462.) This section was also used as a further source in noting additional reference materials pertaining to the composer's American period.

Otakar Šourek, the Czech critic and musicologist, was Dvořák's leading biographer. His four-volume Dvořák biography (1916, 1917, 1928), written in Czech, was one of the most vital sources for further studies by himself and others. The following paragraphs will consider two of Šourek's subsequent books which directly related to the investigation:

Antonín Dvořák His Life and Works, 1954, treats the "main events" in the composer's life and describes Dvořák's complete musical output "in its chief aspects." The preface of the book is highly valuable, affording an historical perspective into the evolution of Czech music. There is a selected bibliography of books and periodicals.
A priceless collection of documents is Antonín Dvořák: Letters and Reminiscences, 1954. Included are letters by Dvořák's contemporaries or by himself, and excerpts from memoirs. The author acknowledges that many documents "not less characteristic and interesting" have been excluded from this book; however, Šourek continues:

Even within this narrower selection it has been possible for me to present the material in such a way as to bring out with plasticity the chief events in Dvořák's life and indicate the continuity of his artistic development, while at the same time illuminating sufficiently clearly the most characteristic features of his creative personality. [Page 12.]

More than twenty entries concerning Dvořák in America are of particular interest. Many of these entries were taken from "Reminiscences" of Joseph Kovařík, who was Dvořák's companion on the crossing in 1892 from Europe to America and remained with him during his whole sojourn in America.

In addition to the above mentioned books by Šourek, the investigator has also utilized this author's The Orchestral Works of Antonín Dvořák and The Chamber Music of Antonín Dvořák, both published in 1954. The two books are most helpful, especially regarding the theoretical analysis given to each composition.

Another of the more important biographies is in The Master Musicians series—Dvořák by Alec Robertson, 1945. Items of interest are found throughout the book. Chapter i, "The Historical Background," is an attempt to "sketch in a sufficient background . . . made up of assorted 'shots' of history, something of musical conditions about a century before and up
to Dvořák's birth, and a word about the Nationalist move-
ment. . . " (Pages 1-2.) Other important topics include
Dvořák's pupils and his instruction at the Conservatories in
Prague and New York, The National Conservatory, the musical
situation in New York, Dvořák's style of composition and the
reasons governing this style.

A book which Alec Robertson praised and employed as
a major reference in his **Dvořák is Antonín Dvořák** edited by
Viktor Fischl, 1943. Illuminating essays on such topics as
Dvořák's musical personality, his symphonic expression, and
nationalism fill the volume.

The important writings by American authors are
limited to a few books. Most noteworthy are the following:

**My Adventures in the Golden Age of Music** by Henry T.
Finck, 1926. The author, having been a member of the Conser-
vatory's history department practically from the Conservatory's
inception, was well qualified to impart insights and obser-
vations. Of particular interest are his comments on Dvořák's
pupils.

**A Short History of American Music** by John Tasker Howard
and George Kent Bellows, 1957. The authors delve into the
roots of American nationalistic music, commenting that Louis
Gottschalk (1829-1869) was the first to experiment with this
field of composition. An interesting comparison is drawn
between Dvořák and MacDowell in respect to their views on
nationalism.

**America's Music** by Gilbert Chase, 1955, is an exam-
ination of Dvořák's impact on American music, stating that none
of his pupils "proved to be a creative artist of exceptional stature." (Page 387.) Dvořák's significance, according to Chase, does not primarily rest on his enthusiasm for American folk songs, his influence on a national school of American composers, nor his compositions inspired by experiences in the New World; Chase observed: "All these are important factors, but they are transcended by the overall liberating influence symbolized by his visit in relation to this particular moment in the development of musical culture in the United States."

(Page 392.) The "liberating influence" refers to Dvořák having "paved the way" in counteracting the German influence.

Of the numerous articles in periodicals, three in particular should be noted: (1) "The National Conservatory of Music of America," Harper's Weekly, 1890; (2) "Does It Pay to Study Music?" by James Creelman, The Illustrated American, 1894; (3) "Music in America" by Dvořák, Harper's New Monthly, 1895. The first two articles pertain to the Conservatory both before and during Dvořák's tenure. The third article is a long discourse by Dvořák on the position of music in America at that time, and his advice for the future course of music in this country. Although Dvořák was frequently quoted in newspaper interviews (particularly in regard to folk music), this article was a unique instance of his views on what he considered to be America's neglect of the arts.

Interest in Dvořák was considerably stimulated in 1941 by the one-hundredth anniversary of the composer's birth. The war, however, hindered the anticipated renaissance of much of his music. Not until the decades of the fifties and sixties was this expectation realized.
An improvement has also been apparent as regards scholarly writing. Of particular importance are the many articles by John Clapham who, since the 1950's, has given particular stress to the topic of folk music in relationship to Dvořák's art. A book by this author, on the subject of Dvořák and England, will be published (by Faber and Faber) in 1965.

Plan of Procedure for the Collection of Data or for Securing Reference Materials

Procuring reference materials related either to the subject of Dvořák or the National Conservatory has involved many channels of approach. The most important documentation was that which bore a direct relationship to the National Conservatory. Since modern encyclopedias have treated the history of this institution in a cursory manner, it was therefore assumed by the investigator that very little literature pertaining to the institution was available. This assumption was verified by the discovery that there are today few people who are at all familiar with anything related to the final years and eventual dissolution of the Conservatory. The paucity of knowledge, with regard to the ultimate outcome of the Conservatory's history, was indeed almost an enigma in itself. A school which was once in great acclaim was now scarcely remembered. Since one of the primary purposes of this study was to uncover hitherto neglected documents which had lain in obscurity, there was the necessity of seeking out scraps of information from innumerable persons and places.
Newspaper articles and periodicals from the period of the Conservatory's inception until the present were examined. Three key terms were used as a guide to selecting relevant information: (1) the National Conservatory of Music of America, (2) Jeannette M. Thurber, and (3) Dvořák. These same terms were also employed in the search through the most appropriate museums, libraries, and autograph establishments, primarily in New York City and Boston. The Library of Congress was subjected to a similar investigation.

Individuals who might possibly shed some light on any of the items were contacted by letter or telephone. The ultimate problem was to learn the final disposition of the Conservatory's files. Among the New York City people contacted were librarians of the conservatories, the editor of the Czech newspaper, and above all people who had any relationship with the National Conservatory. This last group included the family of Mrs. Thurber, the wife of Joseph Kovařík, and Maria Safonoff, whose father, Wassily, was at one time director of the Conservatory.

Below is an extract from a letter which was characteristic of the form used in locating materials:

I am particularly interested in Dvořák's activities in connection with the National Conservatory in New York. I would like, if possible, any information pertaining to the Conservatory during or after the period of Dvořák's directorship (1892-95), since I am trying to determine the extent to which Dvořák's influence was felt in music. This implies a tracing of the happenings, curriculum changes, his pupils and so forth pertaining to the Conservatory. I am at a loss, as yet, on most of these matters and particularly when and why the institution ceased to exist. Mrs. Jeannette Thurber's scrapbooks in the New York Public Library have not netted much information. . . .
The above letter was written to four people: Mr. Francis S. Thurber, son of Mrs. Thurber; Miss Maria Safonoff; Miss Janet Howard, distant cousin of Mrs. Thurber's husband; and Mrs. H. K. Forell, granddaughter of Mrs. Thurber. Most of the names were learned primarily through the help of Mrs. Dena Epstein, who is the author of a forthcoming biographical sketch on Jeannette M. Thurber which will appear in *Notable American Women*. Along with Mrs. Epstein, the autograph establishment, Benjamin's, in New York City was also an aid in determining the people who were important to the study.

The letter eliciting the most favorable response was the one to Mrs. Forell of Huntingdon Valley, Pennsylvania. The other people insisted that they had no information to offer other than what had previously appeared in newspapers and periodicals; they were at a complete loss in regard to the final outcome of the Conservatory. There was a lapse of one year before direct contact was made with Mrs. Forell, who had not replied to the inquiry. The investigation had by this time reached an impasse.

A telephone call to Mrs. Forell was to be the opening wedge in the research, since Mrs. Forell was in possession of numerous Thurber papers; permission was granted to search through these documents. Among the more important items were the first contract that Dvořák signed and numerous Dvořák-Thurber letters. Mrs. Forell also consented to an interview, offering further insight and background information concerning Mrs. Thurber. The interview also resulted in discovering that
if there were any other papers related to the Conservatory, they would be found in the office of Mrs. Thurber's attorney--Judge William Bayes.¹ This office, located in New York, was indeed the location of most of the Conservatory's files.

One other source was very vital to the study: the papers located in Prague. A letter of inquiry was sent to Dr. Jaroslav Vanický, Director of the Music Department at the Narodni Museum in Prague. Dr. Vanický microfilmed the materials at the Museum and then forwarded the letter of inquiry to Dr. Karel Mikysa, Director of the Antonín Dvořák Museum in Prague. Dr. Mikysa, writing directly to the investigator, said that "... all material pertaining to Antonín Dvořák in relationship to his stay in the U. S. A.--which is in possession of Dvořák's family [Mrs. Julie Dvořáková]--will be prepared for you by Prof. Dr. John Clapham. ..."

Dr. Clapham, on the faculty of the University of Edinburgh, was most helpful throughout the entire study. His name came to the investigator's attention by his numerous Dvořák monographs. It was learned that Dr. Clapham was doing extensive research on Dvořák in relationship to England. He was very enthusiastic upon learning that Dvořák's American period was being investigated; thus, he offered to prepare the materials which were in Prague. With the accumulation of

¹Judge Bayes died November 28, 1964. He was eighty-eight years old.
these documents, the study accomplished one of its main objectives: to locate and collect the diffuse materials pertinent to Dvořák's American sojourn.

**Plan of Procedure for the Treatment of Data**

The ensuing chapters of the dissertation are treated as follows:

**Chapter II **"Background"

This chapter provides background information in order to bring about a better understanding of Dvořák's place in Czech history, and also to gain insight into his development as a composer who wrote in the spirit of folk music.

**Chapter III **"The National Conservatory Prior to Dvořák"

The period from the Conservatory's inception, 1885, until the scholastic year 1891-92, is examined in order to show the stage of development which the Conservatory had reached prior to Dvořák's tenure.

**Chapter IV **"Dvořák and America"

The events leading up to Dvořák's being chosen to direct the Conservatory and the ensuing struggle to arrive at a mutual agreement between the two signatories—Mrs. Thurber and Dvořák—are discussed in the chapter's first part. The second half is devoted to a detailed description and comparison of the two contracts (1892-94 and 1894-96).

**Chapter V **"Dvořák in America"

This chapter is divided into eight parts; the following are the structural divisions: (1) a discussion of America's anticipation of Dvořák's arrival; (2) Dvořák's
impression of America; (3) a description of his methods of teaching at both the Prague and National Conservatory, primarily through his students' discourses; (4) his conducting activities, both in connection with the National Conservatory and with other groups while in America; (5) administrative duties as director and adjudicator; (6) the increased enrollment of Negro students during Dvořák's tenure; (7) general considerations regarding Dvořák and the Conservatory, emphasizing the salary problems and the concomitant dissatisfaction of Dvořák during his final two years in America; (8) the reasons governing Dvořák's decision not to return to America after 1895.

Chapter VI "Nationalism in America"

This chapter is divided into the following five divisions: (1) the problems inherent in the terms "nationalism" and "folk music"; (2) Dvořák's timely arrival in America (four-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America); (3) Dvořák's discourses on Negro (and Red Indian) music as a basis for an American school of composition; his American compositions (primarily the *New World Symphony*); (4) further events and discourses relative to Dvořák and the development of music in America; sociological and aesthetic implications of Dvořák's views; (5) the importance of his ideas for nationalism in America.

Chapter VII "Summary and Conclusions"

Appendixes

One of the primary purposes of the study was to uncover and collect into one source the diffuse documents pertinent to
Dvořák's sojourn in America; therefore, this part of the dissertation was designed to be as comprehensive as possible. The documents should be viewed as perhaps the study's main contribution, functioning as a guide to the present investigation as well as future discourses related either to Dvořák or the Conservatory. Appendix A contains contracts, catalogs, notices and so forth; Appendix B contains letters, telegrams and other personal memorabilia.

In the area of Worther-Central Europe would reveal a group of nations almost always struggling for survival and independence. Conflicts—religious, political, and economic—were almost always recurring either within each of the countries, between those countries, or with powers outside this area which is bordered on the west by the Germans and on the east by the Russians. The present-day situation of the paralline countries mirrors the plight that this area has known for centuries.

Bohemia has a recorded history of over one thousand years, during which time the nation experienced eras of greatness and might. Its frontiers have continually enlarged and contracted owing to the tenuous position of having German people for neighbors on the north-west, west and south.

\(^1\) At the treaty conferences ending World War I, the boundaries of the Czechs were fixed in accordance with the ancient boundaries of the crown of St. Wáclav. This meant that over three million Germans were now incorporated into this enlarged Bohemia. The territory in Poland known as Teschen was also given over on the grounds of its historically being of economic significance. One other boundary was changed—the border of Hungary known as Slovakia, which had been part of Hungary for ten centuries. Henceforth, "Czecho-Slovakia" was the official name given to this entire combination of newly acquired territories.
CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND

The Evolution of Czech Music

A study of the history of East-Central Europe would reveal a group of nations almost always struggling for survival and independence. Conflicts—religious, political, and economic—were almost always recurring either within each of the countries, between these countries, or with powers outside this area which is bordered on the west by the Germans and on the east by the Russians. The present-day situation of the satellite countries mirrors the plight that this area has known for centuries.

Bohemia has a recorded history of over one thousand years, during which time the nation experienced eras of greatness and might.1 Her frontiers have continually enlarged and contracted owing to the tenuous position of having Germanic peoples for neighbors on the north-west, west and south;

---

1At the treaty conferences ending World War I, the boundaries of the Czechs were fixed in accordance with the ancient boundaries of the crown of St. Václav. This meant that over three million Germans were now incorporated into this enlarged Bohemia. The territory in Poland known as Teschen was also given over on the grounds of its historically being of economic significance. One other boundary was changed—the border of Hungary known as Slovakia, which had been part of Hungary for ten centuries. Henceforth, "Czechoslovakia" was the official name given to this entire combination of newly acquired territories.
of having Poles on the north-east; and of having Slovaks on the east (northern Hungary). These borders show clearly the reason for the nation's having had to grope continually with basic problems such as maintaining its national identity and freedom.

The roots of Czech music lay among the peasants. The thirteenth century witnessed the first religious songs: "Lord Bestow Thy Grace upon Us" (Hospodině pomiluj my) and "Saint Wenceslas" (Svatý Václave). The epic Hussite hymns continued the tradition, with "the famous and traditional 'Ye Warriors of God' ('Kdož jste Boži bojovníci') as the leading one." It is interesting to note that "Saint Wenceslas" and "Ye Warriors of God" are among the themes in Dvořák's Hussite Overture (Husitská), Op. 67, 1883.

One of the high points in Czech history dates from the fourteenth century, when a foreign monarch, Charles IV, had sincere regard for the country's internal growth. In 1347, Charles became Holy Roman Emperor, made Prague the center of the Austro-Hungarian empire (which he founded), and gave to Bohemia its greatest period of glory. During his rule (1347-1378) he codified the laws, strengthened the economy, and founded the University of Prague, which was the only university in Central Europe; it had four faculties: law, medicine, art, and theology. Prague was now the equal of such university centers as were found in Paris and Oxford.

---

After the reign of Charles, the country began to encounter many problems under rulers who were not so altruistically inclined. Bohemia was soon plunged into religious dissensions during the Hussite period in the early fifteenth century. Jan Huss (c. 1373-1415), a preacher who tried to stem the German influence and was executed, was one of the first men to bring about an awareness in the Czech people of their own national identity. Although, as Paul Henry Lang observed, the Hussite movement "temporarily dampened" the Czechs' interest in music, it did result in the Bohemian-Moravian Brethren—a sect which encouraged popular singing to such an extent that in 1519 the Germans themselves issued a translation of the sect's songbook.3

The house of Habsburg was the ruling dynasty in Bohemia from the accession of Ferdinand I (1526) to World War I. Until the beginning of the seventeenth century, Bohemia managed to maintain a respectable position in European civilization. This changed, however, with the Battle of the White Mountain (1620) when the country tried to free herself from the Habsburg rule and suffered a disastrous defeat. Under Ferdinand II (1620-37) Bohemia experienced its worst religious intolerance; according to Robertson, those who refused "to become Catholics were to be forcibly persuaded or banished, but—and this... was of the greatest importance to the national music—the peasants were bound to the land and

were not allowed to emigrate." This decree was indeed fortunate for the future of national music. The country people retained and carried on their traditions of language and music, while officially the nation had become very Catholic and Germanic. The famous Battle of the White Mountain, which erupted at the beginning of the Thirty Years War (1618-1648), was another cornerstone in the foundation of Czech nationalism. Dvořák commemorated this struggle for freedom in his Hymnus: The Heirs of the White Mountain (Z Básně Dedícové Bílé Hory), a choral work.

With the loss of independence and the suppression which ensued, Czech musical creativity was subdued. Ceremonial church music was the only musical form of expression officially sanctioned. From the seventeenth century to the nineteenth century, Bohemia had many "significant" church composers: Bohuslav Černohorský (1684-1742), Jan Zach (1699-1773), František X. Brixi (1732-1771); also Czech émigrés: Josef Mysliveček (1737-1781), Antonín Rejcha (1770-1836), Jan Václav Stamic (1717-1761), Karel Stamic (1746-1831), Jan Antonín Stamic (1754-1809), Jan Dusík (1760-1812), Václav Jan Tomášek (1774-1850), and others culminating in Jan Hugo Voříšek (1791-1825).

Bohuslav Černohorský (1684-1742), composer in the polyphonic style, wrote "outstanding" works which are thought to have been destroyed at his monastery in 1754. Many Czech

---


5Šourek, loc. cit.

composers were influenced by him, although it is conjectural to ascertain who among them were his pupils; they included: J. F. Seger (1716-1782), who wrote several organ works and was one of the greatest organists at that time; F. Tuma (1704-1774), whose church-music compositions were heard by Haydn at the Vienna Cathedral; Jan Zach (1699-1773), a prolific composer who was deeply influenced by Černohorský, and whose pre-Classical style of composition was "penetrated by the spirit of Czech folk music"; he was perhaps "the only one 'to reflect something of Czech nationalism' in his music." Tartini and Gluck were also purported to have studied under Černohorský, but Grove's discovered only "unreliable evidence" to support this conclusion.

František X. Brixi (1704-1774) was an organist and prolific composer who wrote over four hundred works—primarily sacred; he was influential in revising the music which was in use in the Bohemian churches.

Josef Mysliveček (1737-1781) emigrated to Italy and was known as "il divino Boemo" because the Italians could not pronounce his name. He wrote over thirty operas, many

8Ibid., p. 1929.
9Blom, *op. cit.*, IX, 292-93.
10Robertson, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.
11Blom, *op. cit.*, II, 140.
symphonies, and so forth. Mozart knew him and appreciated his works.13

Antonín Rejcha (1770-1836) was a composer, teacher, and musicologist who emigrated to Paris where he taught at the Paris Conservatory. He came in contact with Haydn and Beethoven, and was known for chamber music as well as theoretical works.14

Jan Václav Stamík (1717-1761) was the founder of the Mannheim school of composition, whose traditions were carried on by his sons Karel and Jan.

Jan Ladislav Dusík (1760-1812) was a celebrated pianist and composer who studied with C. P. E. Bach. Haydn, as well as Tomášek, greatly admired him for his piano virtuosity; however, in the realms of composition, there is little to warrant any acclaim, primarily because of a "weakness in handling of form."15 Robertson, though, noted many passages included in the large quantity of piano works that anticipated the music of Beethoven, Schumann, Brahms, Chopin, and Dvořák; the latter's "Fac me vere tecumflere" from the Stabat Mater was pointed out.16

Václav Jan Tomášek (1774-1850), pianist, composer, and teacher, was interested in the dramatic capabilities of music; he wrote many ballads and songs set to the texts of Schiller, Goethe, and old Czech texts. Although his published
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works total over one hundred compositions in many media, he is considered to be a much lesser composer than he was teacher and pianist. Nevertheless, his two sets of Dithyrambs, Op. 52 and 65, were of historical significance, having been the "direct forerunners" of short, poetical piano pieces of the romantic age, such as Schubert's Impromptus and Moments Musicaux. He is also credited with having written "an early specimen of program music--'Elegie auf eine Rose.'"

Jan Hugo Vůříšek (1791-1825) represented a transitional stage between Beethoven and Schubert by his Impromptus, Op. 7, which were no doubt influenced by his teacher's (Tomášek's) Dithyrambs. Much of Vůříšek's music is in manuscript.

Jan František Škroup (1801-1862) was one of the few composers prior to Smetana and Dvořák who were vaguely aware of the potential of an indigenous Czech music--the prospects of which, at the start of the nineteenth century, "seemed very poor." Škroup, conductor of the State Theater Opera House, received a commission to write a completely Czech opera. The opera, The Tinker (Dráteník), "was produced with enormous success in 1826." The style is opera-comique with a libretto by Chmelensky. Although the work is acclaimed for having been the first native Czech opera, the folk element
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was employed only superficially. The opera survived and was the precursor, forty years later, of Smetana's Brandenburgs in Bohemia.

If Škroup failed to provide a folk-element emphasis in his opera, he did, however, probe the possibilities of this channel of approach by his incidental music to Fidlovačka, 1834. This work contains the song "Where is My Home?" ("Kde domov Můj?") and was adopted in 1918 as the first part of the Czech national anthem. He also edited, with Chmelensky's assistance, a collection of Czech songs with piano accompaniment.

Thus, with the possible exception of Škroup, no Czech composer was able to dispel the Germanic influence which had, by the mid-nineteenth century, exerted pressure on the country for over three hundred years. Smetana's appearance, with his great interest in nationalism, was a development which had its roots towards the end of the eighteenth century.

The awakening of the Czech's cultural heritage started with two literary scholars--Josef Dobrovsky and Josef Jungmann--who, at the end of the eighteenth century, laid the foundations for the development of modern Czech literature:

Both started the outstanding Czech contribution to Slavic studies which was to be typical of the development of Czech culture in the following century and [was] to influence the political outlook of the Czech people; . . . national life had been endangered only by German influence and . . . never suffered from any other Slavs.

Other Czech literary men developed during the first half of the nineteenth century. Jan Kollár (poet) and

---
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P. J. Šafařík (historian) continued the Czech cultural renaissance which finally culminated in the writings of one of the country's greatest historians—František Palacký. Palacký wrote the *History of Bohemia* (c. 1830)—an account of the Czechs covering only the period of independence before Habsburg rule. The book played a vital role in the revival of a national tradition.

The situation in Bohemia, as it was in most of Central Europe during the first half of the nineteenth century, was indeed precarious. Bohemia was part of the Austrian empire and at the same time a member of the ill-defined, loose Confederation of German States known as "Der Bund," which was a reaction after the Napoleonic Wars. Czech frustration was clearly evident: individual expression was limited; there was national feeling of Czechs against Germans; the leading class was composed of an imported nobility who would not mix with the masses, and who ultimately provoked a strongly democratic movement coming from the peasants and the middle class in the revolutionary period around 1848.

The result of the 1848 Revolution, having been unsuccessful, underscored the importance and far-reaching significance which the small group of Slovak intellectuals—Kollár, Šafařík, Palacký, and others—had upon the nation. The combination of the literary and political awakening finally began to spill over into the arts as well. Robertson, in his chapter on "The Historical Background," referred to Antonín

---
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Matějček's chapter on painting in Matějček's book *Modern and Contemporary Czech Art*. Matějček stated:

"By 1848, even if it witnessed political collapse, the nationalist idea was in full swing throughout every domain of intellectual life. In short, the stage was set for the appearance of a powerful personality, firmly resolved to dispel all the doubts and hesitations that hampered Czech art, revealing new sources of poetic inspiration, bringing art once more into touch with the race and nation, and furnishing to those who came after him a potent example of artistic courage and sincerity."  

Robertson suggested that this quotation, which describes the great Czech painter Joseph Mánes, might also be a portrayal of Smetana, who, in 1848, had taken an active part in the country's futile struggle for freedom.

Despite the Czech defeats, there began a gradual reform under Emperor Francis Joseph I, who granted some constitutional rights and social progress. The "October Diploma" of 1860 was an effort to gain equal rights for all cultures; two years later, the Interim Theater was opened in Prague for the purpose of producing plays and operas in Czech. Thus, official recognition was given to a language which had been submerged since 1620. The country was to wait until after World War I before attaining complete political liberty; but music, as well as the other arts, was now permitted to flourish unhampered by any official restrictions.

The man appointed to the post of musical director of the Interim Theater was Bedřich Smetana (1824-1884), the "father of Czech music," according to František Bartoš (1837-1906), a Moravian musicologist. Bartoš explained that although

---

there were outstanding Czechs before Smetana, the latter "was the first to give Czech music its characteristic stamp, its own distinctive expression, and to bring to life its typical rhythm and pulsation." Much of Smetana's national spirit was kindled during the 1848 revolutionary period when he "took an active part" in the Whitsun revolt, and also "responded as a composer to the revolutionary spirit" by writing the Solemn Overture, two marches, and the "Song of Freedom."

He also appeared to possess a very sensitive nature in Czech musical matters as witnessed in an account written by Václav Novotný (1849-1922), Czech composer and author. Novotný related "how the idea of creating an independent Czech musical style began to mature in him [Smetana] for the first time." The date was approximately September, 1857, and the place was Weimar, where Smetana was a guest at the home of Liszt. Smetana, Liszt, and Herbeck (conductor and composer in Vienna) entered upon a discussion of the musical contributions which had, up until that time, been made by the Czech people. Herbeck fiercely denounced the Czechs, asserting that they were a nation of "mere performing musicians . . . [who] have not a single composition to show which is so surely Czech. . . . " Novotný agreed that this comment contained, "unhappily, more than a grain of truth," and noted:

It is generally known that our country has always supplied all military bands and theater orchestras with musicians. . . . They greatly predominated over the small
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number of composers . . . who, born in the Czech lands, strayed abroad and there . . . became absolutely estranged from the Czech spirit.29

Smetana realized this "very well," but yet was compelled to take issue with Herbeck by recalling the names of Mysliveček, Tomašek, and Mozart, whose name was in reference to the cold reception he had received everywhere except in Prague, and who was reported to have exclaimed, "The Bohemians understand me." Smetana was rebuffed, and vowed "that he would dedicate his entire life to his nation, to the tireless service of his country's art."30

Dvořák. Prior to the American Sojourn, with Particular Regard to Nationalism

Antonín Dvořák (1841-1904) was born in Nelahozeves, a small Czech village situated about thirty kilometers north of Prague. Being the eldest of eight children born to František and Anna Dvořák, he was expected to follow in his father's butcher trade. He was about ten years old when he first experimented with the violin, without the aid of a teacher and without previous knowledge of music.

A custom in the small villages of Bohemia was to send children, at the age of eleven or twelve, to a German-speaking town or village to learn the German language. Unlike Smetana, whose first language was German, Dvořák was sent to a little town (Zlonice), and there, besides learning the language, he apprenticed for two years (1854-1856) as a butcher. He also pursued a growing interest in music by having formal lessons
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under a capable teacher and organist, Antonín Liehmann (1808-1897), who was mainly responsible for Dvořák's decision to forego the butcher trade and devote himself entirely to the profession of music.31 Liehmann taught Dvořák piano, organ, theory, and gave him playing experience as a church organist and as a member of his concert band. "He...induced Dvořák's parents not to force their son to become a butcher, but to send him instead to study at the Organ School in Prague."32

His years (1857-59) at the Organ School were seemingly uninspiring in regard to composition, but nevertheless served him well as a thorough, theoretical training ground, and provided him with a profound knowledge of the works of the classics. He rarely spoke of this school in his later years and minimized the importance of his formal training, saying: "'I studied with God, with the birds, the rivers, myself.'"33 Dr. Josef Zubatý, who was Dvořák's first biographer (1881), said in his "Recollections of Antonín Dvořák" that Dvořák gained his learning as a composer outside of school, and, in regard to the Organ School, it "served him more as a means towards acquiring the formal training for the title of musician. ..."34
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During these years, he became acquainted with the music of such romantics as Wagner, Schumann, Liszt, and Berlioz, by participating in the concert life in Prague, and by being actively engaged as a violist in two orchestras: the Saint Cecilia Society and the Prague Band of Karel Komzák. The Society's founder and director was Antonín Apt (1815-1887), who, doubtless, was partly responsible for Dvořák's wide knowledge of the Romantics, since Apt was a great admirer of their music. The Society was dissolved in 1860, but Dvořák continued at his post as violist in the Prague Band. Komzák's Band became the orchestra for the newly opened (1862) Interim Theater (Prozatímní Divadlo), now under the musical direction of Smetana. Dvořák remained a member of the Theater's orchestra until 1871.

The years between the time he graduated from the Organ School (1859) and his emergence as a composer (1876) were spent in experimentation. His style was varied, showing influences ranging from Beethoven and Schubert to Wagner and Liszt. In discussing Dvořák's "profound admiration for Beethoven," Clapham noted that this period was characterized by unbridled energy—"he had not learned how to discriminate in his choice of materials...."35 Robertson, too, discerned a mixture of styles, and suggested that the "cosmopolitan" tendency took precedence over the Czech.36 Although the enthusiasm he showed for the high Romantics led to
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"chaoticness in form," the experimental years did provide an enrichment for his imagination, especially in the realms of harmony and sound.\(^{37}\)

The experimental compositions were unperformed. Like Brahms, Dvořák destroyed, or was constantly revising, much of his music. He did not, however, subject himself to contrapuntal exercises, as did Brahms.\(^{38}\) An incident which is related in the "Recollections" by Josef Foerster (1859-1951), one of the foremost Czech composers, clearly exemplifies Dvořák's persistency as a craftsman. The incident concerned his submitting a three-act opera, \textit{King and Charcoal Burner} (\textit{Král A Uhlíř}), to the Prague Theater in 1871. A critical report on the opera's worth failed to materialize, and finally the score was simply returned to the composer, without any comments. Foerster continues the account of Dvořák's reaction:

> The critical moment found him strong and resistant to the hardest blows of fate. Though depressed by family troubles, he did not lose courage. He consigned and rejected the score to the flames of his poor man's fire, and began to write again.\(^{39}\)

Šourek rejected Foerster's statement that the score was destroyed, "for it was found long after the composer's death and produced at the National Theater in Prague on May 28, 1929."\(^{40}\) A revised version of the opera was produced at the Prague
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Interim Theater in 1874. Šourek pointed out that the same libretto was employed, but "not a single bar" of the first version remained. 41

The above incident revealed that Dvořák had a persistent character that was not easily discouraged even at this early stage of development, when poverty was still quite evident. Too, the point of his having rewritten the opera's complete musical score revealed an example of the attitude of his later demands as a teacher of composition, and also dispelled the notion that Dvořák was uncritical of his own works. Clapham elucidated on this matter, stating that "there is much more trial and error in his craftsmanship than is generally realized." 42 The reason for this misconception of Dvořák's working habits is, as Clapham suggests, that:

It has been fostered by mis-statements such as Kovařík's that the String Quartet in F Major (the American) was composed in only three days. This quartet was composed rapidly, but it was merely sketched in three days and after an interval of one day was written out in score in a further twelve days. Such speed was exceptional for Dvořák. His normal method of working was to prepare a sketch first and either to score the work in full after reaching the end of the sketch or to sketch and score alternately as the composition progresses. . . . There is no evidence that he had Mozart's gift of being able to conceive a whole movement in his head. . . . 43

The misstatements were possibly engendered by the realization of Dvořák's prolific output during his early activity as a composer. During this time, when he was a violist in the Interim Theater, he managed to find time to
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write a considerable number of works including a song cycle—Cypresses (Cypřiše)—entractes, several chamber works (no less than five string quartets), three long symphonies, overtures, masses, and two operas—Alfred and King and Charcoal Burner. The character of variety, evident at this early stage of development, was to remain with Dvořák throughout his life. Dvořák expressed himself on the subject of his working habits, in an 1886 interview, stating that when he first started composing, he worked fast and non-critically—"I cared not what they were like, as long as I could only get my ideas on paper." The interview, however, also contained evidence that his writing habits had changed and that he no longer was so impulsive:

I have learned to be more careful. . . . I play it over . . . until I have exactly what I want. After that, the writing does not take long, and what has been on my mind for some months is on paper in about a week or even less. 44

Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that upon submitting his compositions to Brahms, the latter was quick to observe obvious omissions of flats, sharps, and natural signs, and thus concluded that the works were written "somewhat hastily." 45

The early years of Dvořák's creativity were perhaps in no small way responsible for the great amount of confusion surrounding the assigned opus numbers for both early and later
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works. Around 1873, Dvořák apparently embarked upon a sorting out of what had been written up until then; works were destroyed and others received new opus numbers. Simrock subsequently assigned new numbers, and thus, as Stefan suggests, "... sometimes three works of Dvořák have, or have had, the same opus number." An excellent account of this problem is given in Jarmir Burghauser's Antonín Dvořák: Thematic Catalogue, stating that "the opus numbering is of very limited significance as a guide to the actual chronological sequence of Dvořák's compositions. ..." Šourek accounted for the limited success of the F major Symphony's première (in 1879), declaring that Dvořák did not receive full justice owing to the "misleading numbering of the symphony." This symphony, known as the Third (Op. 76), presumably had been written after the First (Op. 60) and Second (Op. 70). The actual and original opus number of this so-called Third Symphony is, however, Op. 24 (written in 1875), and instead of it being designated the Third, it should be called either the Fifth (because it is the fifth in order of composition) or the First (because it is the first of the published symphonies—written five years before the "First" in D major, and almost ten years before the "Second" in D minor). The
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problem of opus numbers is still perplexing, as Alan Rich notes: "No major composer since the days of Haydn is quite so hard to catalogue. An incredible muddle exists in identifying the Dvořák quartets ... [and] symphonies."50

A new period in Dvořák's life was begun in 1873, with two events of major personal significance: his marriage to Anna Čermáková, and his Hymnus, which heralded his public debut as a composer. He had given up his post in the Interim orchestra, and in the years 1874-1877 held the position of organist at St. Adalbert's Church.

Living circumstances during these first years of marriage must have been difficult. He relied primarily on his own creative work, supplemented by private teaching and the post at St. Adalbert's. Another source of income was derived from the Austrian State's Ministry of Education, which granted aid to young, poor, and talented artists. In 1874, Dvořák received a grant after having had his financial situation assessed. The following is taken from the certificate which attested that Dvořák was without sufficient means of support:

... married and father of one unprovided child, has no property, and that, except for a salary of 126 gulden which he received as organist of the Church of St. Adalbert and 60 gulden which he earns monthly by the private teaching of music, he has no other source of income.51

It is implicit that Dvořák's inclination toward a career in composition was strongly developing. Certainly, he could
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have continued his viola playing in order to increase his income, but he chose to sacrifice present living conditions for the purpose of his own creative work in composition. His high romantic style was beginning to subside, and in its place was substituted an emulation of the classical masters, coupled with his own personal investigation into the resources of Czech national music. Henceforth, Dvořák's works "became typical of all his subsequent musical compositions." He endeavored to free himself from foreign influences, as Šourek explained:

The conviction that truly national music must spring from folk art had long been part of Dvořák's thinking. It then sufficed merely for him to come in close contact with the rich source of national music, for the corresponding harmonic elements to ... free his work from the domination of foreign ways of expression, which were inducing him toward formalism and complexities in construction. Thus, he was enabled to create music in which he really found himself.

The search for his own channel of approach, as regards composition during the early periods, no doubt influenced his later thoughts on the subject. His first success did not manifest itself until he had written the Moravian Duets (Moravské dvojzpěvy), Op. 32, in 1876. By experimenting and empirically discovering unlimited possibilities in the area of folk music, Dvořák naturally retained a proclivity towards the general cause of this type of music. His later clamoring for America to search for music indigenously American (chapter vi) arose from the first successes he himself had experienced during the earlier years in Bohemia.
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After having written the Third Symphony in E-flat major, Op. 10 (1873), which still exemplified the characteristics of the high Romantics (that is, monothematicism, diffuse-ness of material, peculiarities of scoring), Dvořák embarked upon a search for individual expression. It should be pointed out that the peculiarities of scoring were in fact the seeds which were later to be transplanted and were to re-emerge as one of the outstanding qualities of Dvořák's craft of composition. His earlier experiments with such instruments as the English horn and the bass clarinet were perhaps due to emulating the music of Liszt and Wagner, and not to his own later sensitivity in regard to tone color. The Preface of Šourek's Orchestral Works of Antonín Dvořák declares that the greatness of Dvořák's orchestral music lies mainly in the scoring, and that the musical line and the timbre of that line were simultaneous manifestations of Dvořák's art. Šourek said:

The fact that his every musical thought sounded well, because it was born and imagined in a given musical context, and was thus inseparably bound up with that instrument's tone colouring, was precisely the secret of his creative genius.54

If the Third Symphony was a peak in Dvořák's imitation of his high Romantic idols, the next two symphonies--D minor, Op. 13 (1874) and the F major, Op. 76 (originally Op. 24 and dated 1875)--were indicative of the transformation then taking place within the composer's craft. Traces of the Liszt-Wagner influence can still be heard in the D minor work; however, the Fifth Symphony in F major definitely represents a clear
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break from that traditional style. In this latter work, the true Dvořák had still not emerged to its full ripening. It would appear that, having realized his dependence on certain devices of orchestration in his previous symphonies, he now strove for economy of means—both in thematic material and in scoring. The F major work bears a strong resemblance to Beethoven: the overall pastoral mood; the specific treatment of the third movement, which has definite overtones of Beethoven's Scherzo from the Seventh Symphony; the obvious alternation of dynamics from a loud crashing chord to a subdued undercurrent of woodwind motion in the third movement, which is startlingly similar to the development section of Beethoven's Leonore Overture No. 3.

Dvořák remained relatively unknown to the musical world until 1877. By this date, however, he had composed a large quantity of works in many media, including nine string quartets and six operas. Through all of these he had one quest: to create music which was characteristically national in tone. At first, this was brought about by a "mood" in a few movements and without any definite indication. The mood was of melancholy sadness alternating with merriment, and was later designated by Dvořák as being a dumka (a type of folk song of Ukrainian origin). An example of the dumka mood can be seen as early as 1875 in the F major Symphony's slow movement. Knowledge of this fact, in regard to the dumka's ambivalent nature, perhaps sheds light on the

---

diffuseness of form which characterizes the composer's later works; for example, the second movement of the Symphony From the New World follows a clearly defined logic if one is cognizant of the nature of a dumka.

Dvořák wrote more and more "with the spirit of Czech folk music, and . . . he stylizes the national dances and national folksongs in artistic form." 56 Besides the dumka, he investigated the inherent musical possibilities of Czech dances: the furiant (rapid tempo characterized by alternating two and three beat rhythms), the polka (moderate duple meter), the sousedská (moderate triple meter), and the skočná (rapid duple meter—a type of jig). These typical Czech dances were quite often found in his scherzo movements; for example, the "Alla Polka" movement from the String Quartet in D minor, Op. 34 (1877), contains a stylized polka in the first section, contrasted with a middle section which contains the rhythm of a sousedská. H. C. Colles noted that all folk music and dances have one thing in common: they contain "one idea at a time." The "Alla Polka," mentioned above, is cited by Colles as having a trio which is merely an "interlude," giving the dancers a "breathing space before they resume." 57 Colles was inclined toward the opinion that Dvořák "set out to compose his [own] music to his country's honor." In this respect, the Hymnus was cited as having "no discernible
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relation to any folk origin." Both Colles and Robertson referred to Dvořák's not following the example of Rimsky, who, confessedly, imitated folk songs. Robertson cited an analagous situation between Eliza Doolittle and Dvořák: Like Eliza, he was apt to "relapse at any moment into his native speech."60

Clapham noted that "Dvořák borrowed directly from folk songs only [on] some half dozen occasions, ... [and] whenever he did, he usually extracted a small fragment ... which he liked to transform."61 Among the examples cited by Clapham is one occurring in the first movement of the Bagatelles (Maličkosti), Op. 47, wherein the principal theme is taken from the tune "The Bagpipes Were Playing" ("Hraly dudy"). The design of the original folk song, as Clapham points out, is two two-bar phrases: ab ab bb ab; Dvořák used the second phrase as his antecedent phrase, changed it from major to minor, repeated it, and then balanced it with a new phrase of his own, which is also heard twice.

Another example cited by Clapham is found in the Slavonic Dances (Slawische Tance), Op. 46 and Op. 72 (1878 and 1886), the complete set of which contains only two dances of folk song derivation: numbers eleven and thirteen out of the total of eighteen dances. Number eleven (a skočná) has a subsidiary theme "melodically reminiscent of part of a Czech folk song 'Below the Oak, behind the Oak' ('Plod dudem,
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Clapham notes that only four bars are taken from the middle of the original (example 1). The changes (example 2) are manifested by the minor mode, the initial downward leap and the steps of the downward scale. These changes alter the character of the original in the most masterly fashion. 63

Example 1. Czech folk song "Below the Oak, behind the Oak."


The thirteenth dance (a špacírká) was inspired, according to Šourek, by a folk dance Dvořák had witnessed at his summer retreat in Vysoká. 64 The špacírká—a little-known dance—is in two parts: a slow strut and then a fast dance

---
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in a circle. The original two-part form (example 3) was kept intact; in Dvořák's version (example 4), however, the major mode was changed to minor, the fourth beat of each measure was embellished, and the fast section (Vivace) presented a simple pattern at first and then was modified further in a number of variants.

Example 3. Czech folk dance (a špacírká).


It is apparent from the above examples that Dvořák was consciously aware of the folk sources upon which he had drawn. Although he changed intervals or tonality, he still retained the tempo and the rhythm of the original melodies.
It should be noted, however, that the complete set of Dances, which is frequently mentioned as one of Dvořák's most popular accomplishments, contained only the two small instances of definite borrowings shown above.

In a speech delivered before the Royal Musical Association's eighty-ninth session (1962-63), Clapham delved into the folk origins of Dvořák's music. The following information has been drawn solely from this account (page numbers refer to an extract of the Proceedings). He asserted that Smetana "wore the cloak of nationalism more consciously and deliberately than Dvořák did" (page 75), because the former, who was seventeen years Dvořák's senior, had taken an active part in the years of revolution and reawakening (page 75). "Naturally, Dvořák was a keen nationalist . . . but there was not often cause for him to show signs of fanaticism." In assessing the influence that folk song and language had on him, one of the conclusions reached by Clapham was to point out that "perhaps two-thirds" of Dvořák's themes start at the beginning of a bar--a characteristic of Czech and Slovak prosody (page 76); Smetana, on the other hand, had a proclivity "to begin phrases anacrusically" (page 76). Other items of folk influences include: the Three Blind Mice motive (page 77); the leap of the fourth from the dominant up to the tonic and back, followed by a further descent, usually by a step (page 77); upward leaps of a fourth, fifth, and octave followed by gradual descents (page 78); three bar phrases

(page 79); beginning a piece in a major key and modulating to the tonic minor (page 80); tonal shifts from E major to D major, "a change closely related to the true Moravian modulation" (page 80); pedal points sounding like a bagpipe (page 81).

The above account represents a few of the many points brought out by Clapham at the Association's meeting. His comprehensive treatment of the folk elements found in Dvořák's compositions ended with a statement concerning Smetana and Dvořák. Although both composers were described as "genuine and sincere nationalists," Smetana was shown to be skeptical in regard to possible methods of approach; Clapham asserted:

Smetana succeeded in imbuing his music with a strongly Czech spirit without drawing very much upon the basic elements of his country's folk music, and was unwisely dogmatic when he declared: "By the imitation of the melodic cadence and rhythm of our folk songs no national style will be formed, but at most a weak imitation of the folk songs themselves, an absolute violation of dramatic sincerity." Dvořák has disproved this, and demonstrated that by absorbing the very essence of the folk heritage of Moravia and Slovakia, in addition to that of Bohemia, he too could be just as genuine and sincere a nationalist as Smetana. [Page 83.]

The turning point in Dvořák's life occurred in 1877, when Brahms, who was a member of the committee sponsored by the Austrian Ministry of Education, was especially impressed by Dvořák's Moravian Duets and obtained a scholarship for him. More than the scholarship, however, was the fact that Brahms responded to a Dvořák plea, and wrote to his own

66 Especially noteworthy is his detailed description (pp. 82-88) of each dance contained in the Slavonic Dances. See also the author's "A Dvořák Anniversary," Musical Opinion, LXXXII, No. 977 (1959), 303.
publisher, Fritz Simrock, who became Dvořák's principal publisher. At the beginning of 1878 Simrock published the Moravian Duets, which were the first of Dvořák's compositions to be published by this Berlin firm.

The work which achieved worldly acclaim for its composer was the first series of eight Slavonic Dances, Op. 46 (1878). These dances, modelled after the Hungarian Dances of Brahms, had no literary program; yet, according to Šourek, "they had a poetic inspiration which was firmly rooted in reminiscences of his own nation's past." Although he was to have followed the example set by Brahms, he instead went beyond the German master by giving "refined musical form and content to the outstanding types of Czech Dances" (skočná, sousedská, furiant, and so forth). The refined musical form and content was to be a characteristic of Dvořák throughout the remainder of his life; as Šourek so often repeated: Dvořák wrote with the "spirit" of Czech music, and thereby he created a "typical national color."

Mention has been made that Brahms was very instrumental in Dvořák's rise to worldly acclaim. One other man, Louis Ehlert (1825-1884), was almost of equal importance in regard to the positive influence he had on the musical public of Germany, and also the added sense of confidence he gave to

67 The Dvořák-Brahms letters of correspondence pertaining to the publishing of the Moravian Duets may be found in Geiringer, op. cit., and in Šourek, Letters, pp. 38-44.

68 Šourek, Life & Works, p. 51.

69 Ibid.
Dvořák. A Wiesbaden composer and critic, he wrote in the *Nationalzeitung* that the *Slavonic Dances* (first set) is a "work which will make its triumphant way through the world"; its composer is a "real talent." Presumably, the recommendation of Brahms was sufficient for having Simrock publish the *Slavonic Dances*; however, the fee which Dvořák received for this work was a mere three hundred German marks. This fact places Ehlert's critique in a position of importance: Dvořák was, until that time, unknown and still quite poor; the response from Ehlert's statement, according to Ehlert, "produced a positive 'run' on the music shops and ... made ... [Dvořák's] name overnight." In New York, the work was premiered by Theodore Thomas in the winter of 1879-1880 with "sensational effect."

Its success gave Dvořák a clear indication of the path he was to pursue. With a few exceptions, most of his compositions were now cast in a national mold. It should be pointed out, however, that Czech folk music surrounded him since childhood, and hence whatever he wrote was music deeply felt to be his own; that is, there was no conscious effort (with the few exceptions previously cited) to adapt Czech music, but rather a spontaneous act of creativity. His style, therefore, was a natural reflection of Czech folk music.

---


The decade of the 1880's was characterized by Dvořák's reaching the heights of musical maturity, along with an increasing, worldwide popularity. He never failed, though, to remind people of his origin; an example of this is cited in Zubatý's "Recollections": During a triumphant visit to England in 1886, Dvořák was angered by a placard that read "Herr Anton Dvořák," and he insisted that it be changed to read "Pan Antonín Dvořák."73 Despite the many accolades received during the height of his fame, he inevitably would recall and make known the pride he had for his country, along with his deep humility. In a letter of thanks to an admirer, Dvořák wrote in 1886 that "I am just an ordinary Czech musician, . . . and although I have moved quite enough in the great musical world, I still remain what I have always been --a simple Czech musician."74 He continued writing successfully in all media, although his operas did not receive the enthusiastic acclaim he felt they warranted.75

His supporters, other than Brahms and Ehlert, were: Edward Hanslick (1825-1904)--Austrian music critic of Czech descent--who was one of the adjudicators for the Austrian Ministry of Education; Joseph Joachim (1831-1907)--director of the Berlin Academy, and famous Hungarian violinist--who brought many of the chamber works, especially the string quartets, to the attention of the public; Hans Richter (1843-1916)--Hungarian conductor--who premiered several Wagner operas as well as many

74 Ibid., p. 13.
75 Šourek, Life & Works, p. 18.
Dvořák works, especially in England; Leoš Janáček (1854-1928)--Moravian composer (opera--Jenufa)--who, as conductor of the Philharmonic Society in Brno, Moravia, zealously propagated Dvořák's music.

A highlight of the years 1884-91 was the series of eight visits which Dvořák made to England, a country predisposed to the medium of choral music. Impressed by the magnitude of the choral ensembles (as is evident in a letter written in 1886 after a rehearsal of his Stabat Mater, Op. 58, 1877), Dvořák wrote: "Don't get a shock! 250 sopranos, 160 contraltos, 180 tenors and 250 basses. . . ."76

In another letter to his father, written after the second concert of the composer's music, Dvořák was ecstatic in regard to the English musical public: "I cannot tell you how great is the honor and respect the English people here show me. I am the lion of this year's musical season in London!"77 He had a receptive audience always eager for his next work.

"Since the days of Handel and Haydn no composer--except perhaps Mendelssohn--had been so acclaimed in England."78 Most of Dvořák's music met with complete success; however, his judgment of the English people--"The English do not love music, . . . they only respect it"--could be attributed to the "partial failure" of Saint Ludmila, Op. 71 (1886).79

---

76 Kourek, Letters, p. 75.
77 Ibid., p. 77.
78 Hadley, loc. cit.
79 Ibid., p. 263.
In 1891, Cambridge University awarded him a doctorate in music *honoris causa*, particularly acknowledging his interest in music of all countries: "With what art has he molded to his purpose the musical characteristics of races other than his own--... the gypsies or... the Italians." 80 That same year, Dvořák was appointed professor of composition and orchestration at the Prague Conservatory, remaining there until 1892, when he was appointed director of the National Conservatory in New York. Chapter v will discuss his activities at both of these conservatories.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Bohemia has a recorded history of over one thousand years, during which time a slow but inexorable development had taken place in regard to the music of that country. A study of the country's history reveals that the socio-political life of the nation was of major import on the evolution of Czech music. Because of its central geographical location, Bohemia naturally was exposed to two major influences, the Germanic and the Slavic. The country reached a peak of development in the fourteenth century under the rule of Charles IV, but afterwards, under the Habsburgs, began to lose its national identity. The early fifteenth century witnessed the Hussite wars; two centuries of unrest followed, culminating in the famous Battle of the White Mountain (1620), which snuffed out the last vestiges of the country's fight for freedom. For more than two centuries afterwards, the national identity of

---

the Czech people had all but vanished, with the exception of the peasants who were forced to remain on the land. Slowly, however, the Czech language began to be resurrected, with its concomitant awakening of a national consciousness.

Although the 1848 Revolution was a political failure for Bohemia, it did, nevertheless, effect a loosening of the nation's literary and artistic restrictions, finally resulting in an official recognition (1860) of the Czech language. Complete political liberty, however, was not to be realized until after World War I.

Music flourished at the courts of the early Bohemian kings, and was greatly stimulate by the Hussite and Reformation periods. Despite the suppressions which the Czechs underwent, there remained a continuation of musical activity throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In fact, musical life in Bohemia was of such significance that Charles Burney was led to comment that Bohemia was the "conservatory of Europe."

The eighteenth century produced a number of significant Czech composers, primarily in the realm of sacred music. There were also many Czechs who played a leading part in the growth of the Classic Period, and there were others who were influential in developing important Romantic Period characteristics.

Music indigenously Czech, however, was not to appear until the nineteenth century. Prior to Smetana and Dvořák, two composers might be mentioned as having investigated, although in a very limited way, the potential of purely Czech
music: Jan Zach (late eighteenth century), and Jan Škroup (early nineteenth century).

Smetana and Dvořák were products of their times. Smetana, having taken an active part in the revolutionary events of 1848, had to search for a national identity. Dvořák, on the other hand, did not actively enter upon the scene until after 1860, when official recognition was given to the Czech language. Unlike Smetana, whose first language was German and who later had to learn Czech, Dvořák was born into a Czech community, and therefore he did not have to search for a national identity. The decree of 1620, whereby the peasants were forced to remain in the country, was indeed providential; the true Czech composer had to evolve out of peasant stock, and so it was natural that Dvořák—having folk music in his veins from the very beginning—was to emerge as a composer of significance. One might say that the time was right for a Dvořák to appear. Whereas Smetana had paved the way by directly utilizing the resources of Czech folk music, Dvořák wrote in the spirit of this medium and refrained, for the most part, from employing folk melodies. This was a style which was most natural for him.

The early period of Dvořák's compositions, however, revealed an emulation of the music of Beethoven, Schubert, Liszt, and Wagner. These experimental years (the decades of the 1860s and 70s) witnessed an enormous output of compositions—mostly unperformed—and finally resulted in his subconsciously coming upon a style which was most natural for him; this style could best be described as characterizing the
spirit of Czech folk music—rarely employing the device of keeping the folk melody intact. The Moravian Duets (1876) and especially the Slavonic Dances (Op. 46, 1878) were shown to have been imbued with this folk-element spirit. Both of these works were landmarks in Dvořák's rise to worldly acclaim; in this respect, it was pointed out that Brahms was the main protagonist in this ascent, having persuaded Simrock to become Dvořák's publisher (in 1878).

The decade of the 1880s witnessed a continuation of Dvořák's prolific activity as a composer. His works had by then achieved international recognition, and he was now in great demand to visit other countries. Notable among the sojourns were the numerous visits to England, where he was given an acclaim similar to that accorded Handel, Haydn, and Mendelssohn.

In 1891, the Prague Conservatory appointed him professor of composition and orchestration—a post which equipped him with further teaching experience before his extended sojourn in America in 1892.
CHAPTER III

THE NATIONAL CONSERVATORY PRIOR TO DVOŘÁK:

THE PERIOD FROM 1885-91

Introduction

Under the word "conservatoire," the Encyclopedia Britannica (1910) devoted one paragraph to the National Conservatory, stating:

The chief public institution for teaching music in the United States is the National Conservatory of Music of America, founded in New York in 1885. The famous Dvořák was for a time its director. Other well known American establishments are the Peabody Conservatory in Baltimore (1868), the Cincinnati College of Music (1878), and the New England Conservatory of Music in Boston (1867). ¹

The description clearly establishes that the National Conservatory was, at the beginning of this century, not only among the well-known conservatories in the United States, but the public institution for teaching music in this country. It is also interesting to note that Dvořák is the only person mentioned in the paragraph.

This chapter sets forth the history of the National Conservatory from the time of its inception until the period directly preceding the choice of Dvořák as director. The following items are discussed: (1) the concept of a national

conservatory; (2) the National Conservatory and the American Opera Company; (3) the Conservatory's students, curriculum, and faculty; (4) the struggle for national recognition. It should be noted that throughout this entire discussion, one person was responsible for shaping the Conservatory's history --Jeannette M. Thurber.

The Concept of a National Conservatory

The tradition of free instruction appears to have been the underlying cause for the establishment of most conservatories, including the one in New York. Many of the European conservatories were founded in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The Paris Conservatoire was established in 1795 "... on the basis of a school for gratuitous instruction in military music. ... " Other enduring conservatories, founded during the nineteenth century, include: Prague (1810), Royal Academy of Music (1822), Brussels (1833), Leipzig (1843), Cologne (1849), Royal College (1882).

One of the primary purposes for which New York's National Conservatory was founded was to provide free instruction to talented individuals who could not afford the expense of a good musical education. It was therefore implied that those conservatories which had previously been established--in Boston, Baltimore, and Cincinnati--were, according to the National Conservatory's founder, not realizing the benefits that a conservatory, in the European sense, should provide.

\[2\text{Ibid.}\]
Jeannette Meyers Thurber, founder and president of the National Conservatory, was born in New York City, January 29, 1850. Her father had migrated from Denmark to New York City in 1837. Her maternal grandparents, the Rev. Dr. Eliphalet and Anne (Barnard) Coffin Price, were of American origin. A well-educated woman, Mrs. Thurber reputedly spoke five languages fluently. In an 1887 news item, she was described as knowing "as much about music critically as any woman in America." Her "passion," according to the article, "is that of a scholar and connoisseur."  

The idea of a national conservatory was first conceived by Mrs. Thurber in 1875 while traveling through France. In one of the only accounts ever recorded of this fact, Mrs. Thurber explained in an 1887 interview "how she had...conceived

3 Only cursory information can be found in the limited number of books on the subject of the National Conservatory or Mrs. Thurber. In 1934, The National Encyclopedia of American Biography (New York: James T. White & Co., p. 216) did contain an article on Mrs. Thurber, which included an outline of her contributions to American musical life. This biography was found in Current Volume D—the designation for articles on persons still living; however, it is interesting to note that no further article appeared in this publication relevant to Mrs. Thurber's death in 1946.

4 Adam Badeau wrote the article; however, the name of the Philadelphia newspaper and the exact date other than 1887 is not on the news clipping found in Mrs. Thurber's scrapbooks of 1885-1892. These documents are now located in Room 84 of the main branch of the New York Public Library. This particular item (Badeau's article) can be found in the scrapbook marked Volume III, p. 175.

Most of the documents referred to in this and the ensuing chapters were found at two sources: the office of the Honorable William Bayes, 37 Wall Street, New York City (Judge Bayes, besides having held the office of secretary of the Conservatory, handled Mrs. Thurber's estate); the papers in possession of Mrs. H. K. Forell (granddaughter of Mrs. Thurber) residing at 2261 Valley Road, Huntingdon Valley, Pa. Both Judge Bayes and Mrs. Forell have entrusted the investigator with these documents.
the idea of a national English conservatory of music, and an opera company in connection with it.  

Mrs. Thurber then elaborated on this idea, as reported by the interviewer:

"At that time [1875] she drew a sketch of her idea. It was in the form of a wheel, the hub representing the national company and the spokes the auxiliary companies. There were to be four branches of the conservatory—one for the cultivation of the voice, for the development of dramatic action, for instruction in instrumental music, and the advancement of ballet."

The idea of a national company with auxiliary companies was to be an unfulfilled lifelong pursuit. It was further brought out at this interview that she had taken an active part in establishing children's concerts in New York during the early 1880's under Theodore Thomas' direction.

Mrs. Thurber's concept of a national conservatory was finally realized on September 21, 1885, when the institution known as The National Conservatory of Music of America received its legal status by a "Certificate of Incorporation." (App. A, 243.) The purpose of the school was "to found, endow and maintain a musical academy within the state of New York, for the education of persons in the lower and higher branches of music." The original trustees included the wealthiest families of America; among the group were Andrew Carnegie, August Belmont, and Francis B. Thurber (Jeannette's husband).

---


6 Ibid.

7 Appendix A contains contracts, formal agreements, and notices; Appendix B contains letters, telegrams, and other personal memorabilia.
The National Conservatory and
The American Opera Company

The first "branch" of the Conservatory, known as the American School of Opera, was officially opened on December 15, 1885, located at 128 East 17th Street, New York City. (App. A, 245: Formal Announcement.) A brochure of that time, issued by the trustees to friends and supporters of the Conservatory, stated that "a national conservatory has many branches," and it was decided after much deliberation to concentrate on "one leading branch before proceeding to the formation of others"; this branch was to be "voice." (Judge Bayes' papers: a brochure.) It should be noted that there were two names under which the school was known: the National Conservatory and the American School of Opera. This resulted in mass confusion which finally led Mrs. Thurber to petition that the name of the American School of Opera be dropped, leaving the National Conservatory. The matter was passed on March 3, 1886, and officially came into effect on April 15, 1886. (Judge Bayes' papers: copy of petition and notice of its passage.)

There were several reasons for deciding that opera should be given primary emphasis. Mrs. Thurber expressed her feelings in an interview which took place on May 23, 1886.8 "The time has come," she said, "for America to free herself from absolute dependence upon foreign talent"; moreover, every "petty" state in Europe was in possession of a national

opera company and a national conservatory, while the United States had neglected these worthy pursuits, with the result that American students were compelled to go abroad for their musical education. Declaring that the purpose of her conservatory was to "offer to the best voices of America the best training that we can give them," she pointed out that, traditionally, America ceases to care for music students after the completion of their studies; there is no "outlet" for them in terms of their future employment. Mrs. Thurber wished to rectify this situation by the utopian means of practically guaranteeing employment in the American Opera Company; she said: "To commence, with honor, the career for which they have been educated, would be a thing unheard of in the history of music. The American Opera Company supplies the need thus indicated."

Another purpose in establishing an American opera company was to present to the American public the great European operas sung by Americans in the English language. An 1886 pamphlet declared that "nine-tenths of the principal singers" in Mrs. Thurber's opera company "were Americans by birth." (Judge Bayes' papers.) The calibre of performances was very high, as can be seen by the press items quoted in the pamphlet, which pointed out that:

"The principal artists have not only been creditable, but have agreeably surprised the public, ... [since] we have demonstrated that it is possible to give performances of "Grand Opera of the highest class with American artists in the roles usually occupied by foreign singers."

Note was also made of the Opera Company's orchestra, chorus, ballet, and scenery—all of which were "superior to anything
heretofore presented in this country," and merited the favor­
able criticisms of the reviewers.

In 1886 the Opera Company issued a "Resolutions of
Auxiliary Organizations," a printed document which set forth
proposals by committees organized under Mrs. Thurber's prodding
and representing the major cities of the eastern half of the
United States. (Judge Bayes' papers.) The plan was to estab­
lish auxiliary branches of the Opera Company in the cities of
Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, St. Louis, Cleve­
land, and Louisville—each of which proposed to raise $50,000
(Louisville promised $25,000) in order to pay the necessary
expenses. The American Opera Company (name changed to the
National Opera Company in December, 1886) in New York was to
be the "parent" Company which was to receive three-fourths of
of the $50,000 contributed by each city; the remaining one­
fourth to be used for the local opera company. Aside from
the apparent advantage of using the name of the prominent
American Opera Company, each city, according to the document,
was also to derive "the influence of the National Conservatory
of Music connected therewith."

On July 30, 1887, an application was made to dissolve
the Opera Company because of liabilities amounting to over
$100,000. (Mrs. Thurber's scrapbook.) It appears that Mrs.
Thurber's friends in the large cities had failed to fulfill
their promised good intentions. The actual dissolution of
the Company, however, did not take place until September 27,
1887. (Judge Bayes' papers: news item of September 28, 1887.)
During the limited years of its existence, the Opera Company was as highly respected as the Metropolitan Opera Company (founded in 1883), and it was one of the first to present the great European operas in English. In its two years of active existence no less than twenty operas were produced, including *Lohengrin, Flying Dutchman, Orpheus, Merry Wives, Sylvia, Faust, Aida, Les Huguenots, Magic Flute*, and *Martha*. It should be noted that the members of the Company were not students but accomplished artists. Replying to an accusation of ruining the voices of students, Mrs. Thurber declared: "The National Conservatory is totally distinct from the National Opera Company," and, she added, that a student was "never sent" to the National Opera Company.9 This implies that the Opera Company did not have the services of the students until after their three years of study.

*The Conservatory's Students, Curriculum, and Faculty*

The inception of the Conservatory was brought about, according to an early pamphlet (Judge Bayes' papers), by a "need" which had previously existed to provide a musical education to "Americans with musical endowments of exceptional excellence." This education was to be given "free of cost."

In setting forth the "purpose, scope, and spirit" of the Conservatory, the trustees—with Mrs. Thurber at the helm—emphasized the American aspect of the enterprise, stating that the institution "deserves the support of true-hearted

---

Americans." The entering student body, according to the pamphlet, was to consist principally of native-born Americans, "not over twenty years of age if female, and twenty-three if male, able to devote their whole time to their studies." It was also stipulated that the students "maintain themselves in New York, or its vicinity" during the course of their three years of study—which time varied with the capabilities and progress of each student. Whereas entrance to the "School of Opera" was limited to students showing "natural endowments" judged to be "exceptional," admittance to the Conservatory was possible without "any previous knowledge of music."

On October 29, 1887, a contract was drawn up between a student (Joseph Belder of New York City) and the Conservatory. (App. A, 246.) This document is the basis for the following account regarding the students' commitments to the Conservatory.

If the Conservatory so requested it, the student was required to serve the Opera Company "for a period not exceeding three years from the termination" of his Conservatory education and to accept a salary determined by the Conservatory and the Opera Company. This part of the agreement was later nullified when the Opera Company was dissolved.

Upon completion of his Conservatory studies, the student was obligated to support the institution for five years "for the purpose of enabling it to continue its educational work." He was required to pay this compensation to the Conservatory immediately on receipt of any income and to keep the Conservatory informed of his activities by a written
statement every three months for the five years after graduation. Apparently, the trustees counted upon the school's eventually becoming self-sufficient and thus ceasing to necessitate outside endowments.

This outcome, however, never materialized, not only because of the Opera Company's dissolution but also owing to the tacit acknowledgment that students under twenty-one years of age were not held responsible for the contents of the contract. It should be noted that many of the Conservatory's students were very young and hence accounted for this problem. Knowledge of this defect in the contract was finally realized and acted upon in 1899--after the Conservatory had been in existence fourteen years. On February 10, 1899 an "Act" was passed in the New York State Assembly authorizing that the National Conservatory's contract was also binding on pupils "within the age of twenty-one." (App. A, 279: Act of 1899.)

It is interesting to note that neither the above account nor any of the early catalogs which the investigator has seen refers to the tuition expense for those students who could afford to pay; yet, there is evidence to support a conclusion that there was a tuition fee. In a lengthy article detailing a number of factual items, the Washington Post quoted the figure of $300 annually as the actual cost of educating a Conservatory student, who in turn was only required to pay one-third of that cost.10 Of the 258 students enrolled in the Conservatory at that time (1890), the report added,

10"Mrs. Thurber's Plan for Maintaining Her Conservatory," The Washington Post, April 20, 1890.
only twenty-one of them were paying for their tuition. The report of paying students was comparatively small, but it was a little larger than an earlier report of the paying students during the 1887-88 year when there were only ten paying students out of a total of two hundred.11

In any case, it can be seen that although the students had the privilege of a "free" education, they actually were obligated to reimburse the Conservatory for at least five years after graduation. It should be pointed out, however, that aside from the problem of having an enrollment of students considerably youthful, the Conservatory also granted admittance to Negro and blind students, thus further handicapping the problem of reimbursements. Finally, it should be noted that there is strong evidence to support the conclusion that the Conservatory was primarily a girls' school (a further handicap). Harper's Weekly published an article (unsigned) which related the history of the Conservatory (1885-90); noting a lack of support, the article demanded: "Why should not some of our millionaires bethink themselves of the music schools which are chiefly resorted to by young girls?"12 The 1892-93 catalog substantiates the claim that most of the music students were female. (Judge Bayes' papers.) This proof is found in the large majority of female names included in the list of Conservatory students. The


catalog also contains the programs of concerts for the year 1891; these programs give further evidence that over ninety percent of the student performers were female. An enrollment of this kind would indeed be a handicap for any support which was expected to be forthcoming after graduation. The Conservatory probably had to cope with the problems of either the student's not needing employment because of marriage, or the student's having difficulty acquiring good placement.

Curriculum

The report of the board of trustees to friends and supporters of the Conservatory (noted previously) sets forth the school's "main object":

... the thorough cultivation of the vocal powers, from the earliest rudiments of solfeggio to the fullest development of lyric and dramatic singing. Schools, however, of elocution, accompaniment, and arms were considered desirable, and even necessary, adjuncts.

The inclusion of solfeggio in the curriculum was unique in American music schools at that time, according to a later circular issued by the Conservatory. (Judge Bayes' papers.) This circular, "Why Solfeggio (Sight Reading) Should be Taught --Because It Is the Foundation of a Musical Education," claimed that the Conservatory "was the first to introduce it [solfeggio] in this country in 1885." The textbooks employed for the teaching of solfeggio were by Danhauser, Batiste, Lemoine, and Lavignac. There was also a solfeggio class for children. Mrs. Thurber inevitably would emphasize that the

---

13Ibid. The Harper's article also declared that amateurs as well as those seeking a professional career in music were admitted, and that there were two curricula which students could pursue: a preparatory and an advanced.
Conservatory was emulating practices established at the great European conservatories—namely Paris—where solfeggio was the most important subject. A short history of the National Conservatory covering the years 1885-1915 was issued by the Conservatory in 1916; the pamphlet—"Thirty Years of the National Conservatory of Music of America," written by the critic and historian Henry T. Finck—continued to expound upon the virtues of the Conservatory's solfeggio courses "modeled" upon those in Paris. (Judge Bayes' papers.) Finck asserted that solfeggio was emphasized more at the National Conservatory than it was at other music schools in the country. Hence, solfeggio remained firmly in the curriculum for at least thirty years after the Conservatory's inception.

The three most notable omissions in the curriculum during the school's first few years were those in composition, piano, and orchestra. These defects were partly remedied in the 1888-89 season, when courses in composition and piano were instituted. There were apparently orchestral and choral classes, but no public concerts were given until the tenure of Dvořák.

Faculty

The trustee's objective was to secure "the best available masters for the teaching of all that contributes to the formation of an accomplished artist." Finck claimed that "no American conservatory had ever had one half as many famous
musicians on its staff of instructors as Mrs. Thurber's had."

Eleven faculty members were enlisted to teach eighty-four students during the Conservatory's first season. The next two years witnessed a considerable increase in the student enrollment, while the faculty remained comparatively the same. A listing of the faculty for the 1887-88 year was contained in numerous news advertisements which appeared in the New York area on November 26, 1887. The list included: Jacques Bouhy --director; Ilma Di Murska, Gertrude Griswold, Frida Ashforth, Jacques Bouhy, and Christian Fritsch--singing; Ferdinand Q. Dulcken--repertoire; Jacques Bouhy--opera; F. F. Mackay --elocution; Jacques Bouhy--ensemble; C. Bornemann, Alberto Francelli, and Fred Rumpf--solfeggio; Mamert Bibeyran--stage deportment; Regio Senac--fencing; Pietro Cianelli--Italian.

The music courses were taught by people who had previously gained recognition, with the exception--it is interesting to note--of the solfeggio faculty. The names of Bouhy (baritone who trained at the Paris Conservatory), Murska (widely acclaimed soprano), and Dulcken (English pianist and composer who studied under Mendelssohn, Moscheles, and others), all appear in Thompson's *Cyclopedia* (1958). Bouhy was the director of the Conservatory from 1885-1889. Most of the faculty were of European extraction and had been, in some way, connected with the Paris Conservatory.

---


15 *Daily State Gazette* (Trenton, N. J.), Nov. 26, 1887.
They were obtained primarily through the industrious work of Mrs. Thurber, who was often described as "indefatigable." She elicited information from the highest sources, as can be seen in a letter by Leo Delibes. (App. B, 284.) Responding to a request by Mrs. Thurber to comment on Theophile Manoury (a candidate for the post of voice department chairman), Delibes was "honored" that Mrs. Thurber should request information from him regarding Manoury. He wrote, in part:

Mr. Manoury is classed among our best singers, not only because of his beautiful baritone voice—strong and fine quality—but also because of his qualities of style. He is a former student of our Conservatory, from where he left with the first prize, including the solfeggio prize which proves his worth as a good musician; then he had a brilliant debut at the grand opera, at which place he remained associated for two years. . . . [Translated from the French by M. R. Aborn.]

Delibes went on to say that Manoury was completely qualified "to exercise the functions of professor." The letter was written in 1889 and signed: "Leo Delibes—composer, member of the Institute, professor of composition at the [Paris] Conservatory of Music." It is apparent, from this example, that Mrs. Thurber would accept only highly endorsed people to staff her school.

An 1888 report of the trustees (Mrs. Thurber's scrap-book) revealed that the faculty was still comparatively small, totaling only thirteen members; however, at the start of the 1888-89 school year, the Conservatory obtained, perhaps, its most outstanding additions prior to Dvořák's tenure. On September 2, 1888, an advertisement appeared in several newspapers announcing the additions to the faculty. The following
includes the important names found in the notice:16 Rafael
Jossey--head of the piano department for twenty years and
"The greatest pianist residing in America";17 Adele Margulies
--concert pianist who, as will be seen in chapter iv, was
partly responsible for Dvořák's being chosen to come to
America; Leopold Lichtenberg--American born virtuoso who later
became the Conservatory's chief violin teacher in 1899;
Oscar Klein--German pianist, organist and composer who was
Dvořák's predecessor as teacher of composition at the Conser-
vatory; Henry T. Finck--American music critic and author who
was the music editor of the New York Evening Post from 1881-
1924, and remained a history of music lecturer at the Con-
servatory until his death in 1926. Thompson's Cyclopaedia
(under "Finck," page 545) inaccurately sets the date of his
appointment at the Conservatory at 1890.

A major addition occurring in 1889-90 was Victor
Herbert, a composer and cellist who, along with Margulies and
Lichtenberg, formed the Trio Club--a touring group which was
established in 1889. Herbert was a naturalized American
(born in Ireland) and apparently was associated with the Con-
servatory in a peripheral manner, for he is not mentioned in
Thompson's Cyclopaedia (under "Herbert," page 784) in rela-
tionship to either the Conservatory or the Trio Club. Another
important name added to the 1889-90 faculty was James G.
Huneker--American-born critic, author, and pianist who taught
both music history and piano at the Conservatory.

17"The National Conservatory," op. cit., p. 969.
A brochure was distributed in 1889 in order to advertise the newly formed Trio Club of Margulies, Lichtenberg and Herbert. (Judge Bayes' papers.) One page of the notice contains: a list of the Conservatory's incorporators, faculty, and courses; a statement of purpose, and a notice of the dates of the "Semi-Annual Entrance Examinations." (This page of the document is in App. A, 247 of the dissertation.) Of particular interest is the comparatively small faculty for the reportedly "258 students from thirty-three different states and territories." Of particular interest is the comparatively small faculty for the reportedly "258 students from thirty-three different states and territories."\(^{18}\) However, at the beginning of 1890 the faculty was enlarged by the following members: Otto Oesterli--flute, Joseph Schreurs--clarinet, R. Reuter--bassoon, A. Trepte--oboe, L. Manoly--contrabass, and J. Cheshire--oboe. The Musical Courier (February 5, 1890) noted that these names "will at once be recognized as the best that could have been secured in their respective departments." (Mrs. Thurber's scrapbook.)

The 1890-91 faculty consisted of "forty odd names" of which, according to Harper's, "there are only three or four which are not known throughout the country as those of competent specialists." The piano classes, having an enrollment of 207, had become "even more important than the vocal classes." The orchestral classes were conducted by Frank Van der Stucker and Gustav Hinrichs, "two of our best-known orchestral operatic conductors, both of them especially identified with the progress of American music."\(^{19}\)

\(^{18}\) "Music for the Nation," The Washington Post, April 20, 1890.

\(^{19}\) "The National Conservatory," loc. cit.
The Struggle for National Recognition

Mrs. Thurber's life-long quest for governmental recognition, both in regard to endorsements and financial support, was founded on her thesis that the Conservatory was truly an American form of artistic expression. The 1889-90 brochure expressed this Americanism by enlisting "all patriotic and music loving Americans" to support this institution as a "national enterprise of the utmost importance to the artistic future of the land." As has been noted, the Conservatory gave free tuition to needy students. Mrs. Thurber bore the major brunt of this expense, reportedly having contributed about $100,000 for the first year's expenses,20 and approximately $1,000,000 for her total life-time contributions to the Conservatory.21

A report to the trustees was issued "within a few weeks of completing its [the Conservatory's] Second Scholastic Year." (Judge Bayes' papers.) The report stated that 165 pupils had been given "the best musical education to be had on this side of the Atlantic." The students were from "every part of the United States," and candidates "had to be refused for lack of space and lack of funds." It appears from the report, however, that the Conservatory itself was in serious danger of being dissolved (the National Opera had already ceased to exist). This possibility is attested by the statement which read: "A multitude of half-educated students would

20 "Mrs. Thurber Talks," loc. cit.
21 Finck, op. cit., p. 274.
be the result of any suspension in the work of the Conserva-
tory. . . . " The total burden of expenses was apparently
on the incorporators, who bore the responsibility "as the
one security" to whom the employees of the Conservatory
"might look for the payment of salaries." Having "laid these
facts before" the trustees, the report concluded by announcing
that the Conservatory had an "honorable obligation" to pay
its debts "amounting to from $15,000 to $20,000--due to
teachers only." This debt was to be paid "whether it [the
Conservatory] continues or not."

It is interesting to note that the above stated debt
was relatively a small figure in comparison to the $15,000
which was to be the salary of only one person--Dvořák. The
debt, therefore, was apparently a bluff on the part of Mrs.
Thurber to obtain support from the incorporators--only three
of whom were actually following through on their pledge to
"found, endow, and maintain" the Conservatory. Mrs. Thurber
herself certainly could have withstood any debt occurring at
that time, when she was in the millionaire class.

The first instance of her campaign to connect the
Conservatory with the national government occurred at the
beginning of 1888. She requested the government to give
financial aid to the school, amounting to $200,000. This
document was addressed to the members of the House and Senate
and signed by the trustees. (Mrs. Thurber's scrapbook.) The
purpose of the Conservatory was stated along with the matter
concerning free tuition. The trustees submitted this request
to the congressional members' "judicious and patriotic
consideration" and listed the following facts: (1) "The National Government appropriates certain sums of money for such causes as the development of agriculture." (2) Music ranks first among the arts, and therefore "every European government subsidizes greatly for its development." (3) "America has done nothing to promote music education of its people, or to develop any musical genius they may possess." (4) "America is second to none" in regard to musical talent. (5) The National Conservatory was established through "private munificence." Although tuition was free, the report continued, the students were responsible for contributing to a general fund "for a time" after graduation (the specific "five years" was not mentioned). (6) This item requested that $200,000 be included in the appropriations bill. A statement—sounding as though the Conservatory were in a category similar to West Point—followed: "Each Senator and Member of the House shall have the privilege of nominating one pupil, who, upon passing the requisite examination as to talent, shall be taught free of charge."

Editorials from newspapers of the East sounded out the controversial nature of the requested governmental support. The Washington Post, recognizing that the request to aid the advancement of music was unique, noted that the Conservatory "has accomplished an amount of good even beyond the expectation of its founders."22 The New York World, however, adamantly pointed to the narrowness of the proposal, claiming

"if it may aid musical culture in New York, why should it not be called on to assist art study in Boston and useful schools in other cities." The Albany Express called the whole idea a "political heresy so utterly at variance with the American system of government." The proposal was turned down, but in 1890 Mrs. Thurber again renewed her efforts to make the school truly national. A Washington D. C. news item (title of paper unknown) dated January 16, 1890, revealed that "a movement has been started in this city, looking to the extension of the scope of the National Conservatory of Music, and its final permanent establishment at the Capitol." (Judge Bayes' papers.) At that time, it was Mrs. Thurber's plan to have the thirty-three states (the number represented by the students at the Conservatory) contribute toward the annual maintenance of the Conservatory, estimated at $50,000. These figures were reported in a Washington Post news item which succinctly brought the issue into clear focus. The article questioned the fairness of "draining" this amount every year from Mrs. Thurber, since it was noted that:

An institution which is so thoroughly national as the Conservatory, which banishes narrowness, sectionalism and prejudice from its charter, and which should appeal to the patriotic, ought certainly not be sustained merely by one woman, no matter how devoted she may be to her art.  

The article also could have mentioned her support for native American composers. Under the auspices of the

---

24 Albany Express, Feb. 26, 1888.
25 The Washington Post, April 20, 1890.
Conservatory, a concert devoted solely to works of American Composers was given in Washington on March 26, 1890. The Philadelphia Press reported that the event was "an important step . . . taken in the work of placing American music on a plane with other branches of American art," since this was the "first time a concert program selected wholly from the compositions of Americans" was given. Among the list of composers on the program were John K. Paine (1839-1906), Dudley Buck (1839-1909), Frank Van der Stucken (1858-1927), and Arthur Weld (1862-1914)—all of whom "conducted the orchestra," the report added, "which consisted of sixty-five musicians from New York." Other composers included: Arthur Foote (1853-1937), Arthur Whiting (1861-1936), Edward MacDowell (1861-1908), Arthur Bird (1856-1923), Frederick G. Gleason (1848-1903), George W. Chadwick (1854-1931), Wilson Smith (1855-1929), and William W. Gilchrist (1846-1916).

Thompson's Cyclopedia (1958) contains the biographies of these American-born composers—the majority of whom contributed in some significant way towards America's recognizing its own native composers.

Notwithstanding her many accomplishments, Mrs. Thurber failed to receive the aid she deserved, and therefore a new approach was begun at this time. Mrs. Thurber, along with the trustees, realized that no national support would be forthcoming unless the Conservatory could move its location to Washington. They also were aware that this was an opportune

---

time to effect such a transfer, since the country was preparing to celebrate the four-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America. In connection with this, there was great public agitation to have the main celebration in Washington--a city devoid of any "art atmosphere." Consequently, a suggestion was made to Mrs. Thurber that her Conservatory, relocating in the nation's capital, might fill this void.

A representative of *The World* interviewed Mrs. Thurber in regard to the progress being made to effect the transfer. Mrs. Thurber showed the draft of a national charter which was to be submitted to Congress for approval. (The charter will be discussed later.) In answer to the question of her plans "for Washington," Mrs. Thurber expounded upon the virtues of having a "Columbus Memorial Building which will be a worthy name for the Beaux Arts [fine arts], including the National Conservatory. . . ." She envisaged this idea to be in keeping with the times, stating:

What would be more appropriate when so many million dollars are being spent for a transient celebration at Chicago? [The 1893 World's Columbian Exposition.] There should be commemorative action taken at the national capital for the great anniversaries [discovery of America and the one-hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the federal capital in Washington] which are approaching--action which would permanently emphasize and illustrate the progress of our country in the various branches of art--in short, the first step towards nationalizing art. . . . I will pledge my feeble efforts for this cause, and I believe there are sufficient patriotic people willing to devote a portion of the wealth . . . to perpetuate and beautify them.28


When asked whether she expected "the government to aid in such work," Mrs. Thurber replied, "No, not now. It must be established by individual effort, but in time public opinion may demand that its usefulness be extended more rapidly than it can be by individual contributions." Unfortunately, this further development never materialized.

It should be noted that the choice of the Conservatory's future location provoked some controversy. In a letter to the Washington Evening Star, W. T. Harris (United States Commissioner of Education) wrote that New York (rather than Washington) should be the site. Strongly favoring a "concerted action" to establish a truly "National" Conservatory, the Commissioner then posed the question:

Is it not equally obvious that it should be located in New York and that, as soon as may be, branches of the main institution should be established in other large cities of the country? These branch institutions should at first undertake only the first and second grades of the work, leaving the central conservatory to do the finishing work. Thus, the branches would perform the important function of sifters and feeders--sifting out the incompetent and feeding the central conservatory with pupils of first-class ability. 29

On the other hand, an editorial in The Washington Post sympathized with the Washington citizens who took "a deep interest in the proposed" project, and who felt "that the movement would be greatly strengthened if the Conservatory could be transferred from New York City to the national capital." 30

The drafters of the proposed national charter (mentioned earlier) included Mrs. Thurber and two attorneys

29 W. T. Harris, "Music as a Center of Art," The Evening Star, Feb. 26, 1890.

30 The Washington Post, May 11, 1890.
Frank Lawrence and the Hon. William Choate. A letter of May 26, 1890 from Judge Choate to Mrs. Thurber reveals that Mr. Lawrence apparently wished to change the name of the Conservatory. (App. B, 286.) Judge Choate, however, pointed out in the letter that "the phrase 'The National Conservatory of Music' is more comprehensive and appropriate than 'Musical College, School or Academy,'" and that it would also carry just as much "distinction."

The charter, recorded as "Public Act--No. 159," received its national approval on March 3, 1891, when it was passed by Congress. The act was later amended on March 4, 1921. (App. A, 248: text of the act and the amendment.)

The main supporters in the Senate were apparently McMillian and Stewart, as evidenced by a telegram to Mrs. Thurber announcing the passage of the act and requesting that she wire her thanks to both of these senators. (App. B, 287: telegram of March 3, 1891.)

The final form of the charter was innocuous enough --merely asking for approval to have the Conservatory in Washington, while containing no reference at all to a proposal for governmental allocations. The last two sentences of the 1891 document contained the main provisions:

Said corporation is hereby empowered to found, establish, and maintain a national conservatory of music within the District of Columbia for the education of citizens of the United States and such other persons as the trustees may deem proper in all the branches of music. The said corporation shall have the power to grant and confer diplomas and the degree of doctor of music or other honorary degrees. [The 1921 amended version authorized branches outside of Washington.]
An editorial in the New York Evening Post, noting that the International Copyright Bill was passed in the Senate on the same day, said that the Conservatory's bill was also of significance "from an intellectual point of view" because "... no American conservatory has hitherto had the power of legally conferring the degree of doctor of music; and the bill is ... perhaps the first instance of anything by the national legislature in behalf of music." The editorial was mistaken, however, when it ended by assuming that "hereafter" the Conservatory would be located in Washington. The Conservatory, in fact, remained in New York for its entire history; and, according to available evidence, at no time was there even a branch established in Washington. In any case, it should be noted that the Conservatory's publicity announcements inevitably referred to the charter's governmental endorsement.

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter was to present the history of the National Conservatory from its inception in 1885 to the period preceding the choice of Dvořák as director in 1891. Evidence was shown that through the efforts of Jeannette M. Thurber--the Conservatory's indefatigable founder and president--American students were given the opportunity of an excellent conservatory education without the expense of going abroad. Besides acquiring an outstanding faculty (of national and international reputation) and designing the curriculum,

31 Evening Post (New York), March 18, 1891.
Mrs. Thurber was also responsible for taking on the full burden of expenses accruing from the idea of free tuition.

The basic plan of the Conservatory was similar to the one set by the Paris Conservatory; that is, free tuition was given to talented and needy students, solfeggio was the basis of instruction, and, according to early catalogs, a branch of the Conservatory was established. It was pointed out, however, that the American School of Opera (an ostensible branch) was in fact the Conservatory itself.

The word "National" in the Conservatory's name was well chosen since the student enrollment represented over thirty states by 1890. In 1891, after failing to receive government subsidy, Mrs. Thurber sought to transfer the Conservatory to Washington. She reasoned that: (1) the Conservatory might then be recognized by the American public as truly national. (2) Since the four-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America was approaching (1892), a fitting tribute might be a Columbus Memorial Building in which the Conservatory along with the fine arts would be permanently housed; this would emphasize the progress of art in America --"in short, the first step towards nationalizing art."

Although her projected change never materialized, she did succeed in gaining governmental recognition by the passage of a congressional charter--the main provision being that the Conservatory could establish a branch in Washington. Of greater significance, however, was that the charter's passage represented the first time, according to available evidence, that Congress acted on a matter pertaining to the arts.
The causes of the Conservatory's financial problems could be attributed to two principal sources: the National (American) Opera Company and the students themselves. The opera company, founded by Mrs. Thurber in 1885, had a dual purpose: to present European works in English and to provide employment for graduates of the Conservatory. Although highly acclaimed for its productions of the great European works, the company was dissolved in 1887 with liabilities amounting to over $100,000. The other source—the students—stemmed from a stipulation in the contract between the students and the Conservatory: the students were expected to contribute a part of their earnings to the Conservatory for five years after graduation. This arrangement, however, failed to develop the Conservatory into a self-supporting institution, since it was shown that a substantial proportion of the graduates—being very young and female (some, apparently, were also Negro or blind)—could not meet their obligations.

The chapter frequently alluded to Mrs. Thurber's contributions in building up America's image of its own musicians. Not only did she stress the education of native-born talent, but she also sponsored the first concert entirely devoted to American-born composers. The realization that she was fully cognizant of the potential in America's composers perhaps sheds new light on the contributions made by Dvořák in this country. It can be seen that Mrs. Thurber certainly needed no one to point out that America had something to offer in regard to its own composers. It remained, however, for Dvořák to explain that American composers should investigate their own folk
resources and thereby create a style of their own—exclusive of foreign influence.
CHAPTER IV

DVOŘÁK AND AMERICA

Introduction

It has been shown in chapters ii and iii that both Dvořák and Mrs. Thurber were nationally inclined. The compositions of Dvořák were shown to have reflected the spirit of Czech folk music. The worldly acclaim accorded him in 1878 was manifested only after the many influences of his youthful period were cast aside; in place of emulating the style of the high Romantics, he followed his own natural Czech instincts.

Mrs. Thurber, too, had a propensity towards her native country, firmly believing that a new era was emerging in which American musical education would take its place beside the best that the European conservatories could offer. Her founding of the National Conservatory in 1885 was shown to be a giant step in this direction; the talented among the needy had an opportunity to acquire the equivalent of a European education without having to go abroad. Mrs. Thurber was also responsible for the first efforts in bringing to the public an awareness of native American composers.

By 1891 both Dvořák and the National Conservatory had gained wide recognition. Dvořák was granted honorary doctorates from the Universities at Cambridge and at Prague and
was warmly received at such places as London and Moscow. On January 1, 1891, he assumed the post of professor of composition at the Prague Conservatory, a position he retained until his sojourn in America. In the same year, the National Conservatory was granted a congressional charter.

It should be noted, however, that neither Dvořák nor Mrs. Thurber had reached a firm level of security. After the success of 1878, Dvořák was besieged by conductors, choral societies, and other musical organizations to write music. Robertson felt that most of this music could be described as merely "pleasant note spinning," and noted that Dvořák in later years told Sibelius, "'I have composed too much.'"¹ Robertson further implied that Dvořák's success with the Slavonic Dances encouraged Simrock and other publishers to prod him to write "popular" music, thereby "robbing him of the severe critical faculty of his youth."² Dvořák, though, appears to have been quite indignant in regard to the dictates of Simrock. The Dvořák-Simrock disputes reached a breaking point in 1890, when Simrock offered him only 1,000 marks for the G Major Symphony, Op. 88, explaining that even small works have difficulty in finding a market. Dvořák declined, according to Stefan, because the amount was too small--both for the magnitude of the symphony and for his own reputation among other publishers.³

²Ibid., p. 85.
symphony was finally published by Novello in 1892. Dvořák's work at the Prague Conservatory was equally unrewarding in regard to his salary, 1,200 gulden, which was a fraction of the amount he was to receive in New York.

Although Mrs. Thurber had achieved a measure of success through the national charter, the financial problems—which beset the school from its inception—were still in evidence. Public support had failed to materialize despite the apparent weight of a congressional act. Mrs. Thurber alone had to sustain the burden of expenses which increased with each additional faculty member. Student reimbursement, as mentioned in chapter iii, was not to be counted upon as a likely prospect for easing the burden.

The Events Leading to Dvořák's Being Chosen as Director of the National Conservatory

The first instance of an association between Dvořák and America occurred eight years prior to his arrival in this country. The occasion was his second visit to England in 1884, when he met Dudley Buck (1839-1909)—an American composer, organist, and conductor who had studied at the Leipzig Conservatory, and, according to Novotný, was an ardent admirer of Dvořák. Buck suggested that Dvořák go on a "concert tour" of America; Dvořák was initially reluctant to undertake the "long journey," wrote Novotný, who added the prophetic note: "At first Dvořák did not appear keen . . . but now he seems

all at once to have taken to the idea and, if the conditions are attractive enough, America will see our composer." These conditions were not to prevail until the summer of 1891.

On March 3 of that year, the Conservatory's charter had gained congressional approval. It appeared that from Mrs. Thurber's viewpoint the Conservatory was fully established and recognized. However, the school did need to fill the office of director—left vacant by Jacques Bouhy in 1889.

There were two candidates being considered for the post of Conservatory director: Dvořák and Jan Sibelius, both of whom had a predisposition towards the cause of nationalism. Stefan claimed that Mrs. Thurber wanted Dvořák because of his name-drawing power: "She had to have a famous European musician" to recoup her losses in the National Opera and the Conservatory, the investments of which, according to Stefan, had cost her $1,500,000 in two years."⁵ After a 1941 interview between Stefan and Adele Margulies (Viennese pianist and teacher at the Conservatory), Stefan reported the circumstances surrounding the choice of Dvořák over Sibelius.⁶ Mrs. Thurber, who wanted a "famous European composer," asked the advice of Miss Margulies, who subsequently asked her Viennese teacher, Anton Door, "for a suggestion." Door recommended Dvořák and Sibelius (who had studied in Vienna). The final choice of Dvořák, according to Stefan's

⁵Stefan, op. cit., p. 186.

report of the interview, was a question of expediency regarding distance. Miss Margulies explained that a trip to Prague, near her native Vienna, for a personal interview would be much more convenient than the journey to Finland. Thus, by chance, was Dvořák chosen over Sibelius. Paul Nettl, Czech musicologist, noted this "strange way" in which history was made, and queried: "... Had Sibelius headed the work at the Conservatory, who knows what turn the history of American music might have taken?"  

The first word that Dvořák received on the subject was a telegram of June 6, 1891; Mrs. Thurber had sent the message from Paris, where she had been visiting. The interview which was supposedly the influencing factor regarding the choice never materialized, for there is no apparent evidence to support the theory that a meeting between Dvořák and Margulies had actually taken place.  

There appear to have been a few telegrams sent by Mrs. Thurber during that period of decision. Many of these messages were without dates, therefore presenting a perplexing problem as to their correct chronological order. In a letter of June 20 (Dvořák to A. Göbl), Dvořák wrote:

\[\text{I am to go to America for two years. The directorship of the Conservatoire and to conduct ten concerts (of my own compositions) for eight months and four months vacation, for a yearly salary of $15,000 or over 30,000 gold francs. Should I take it? Or should I not?}^{9}\]

---

7Paul Nettl, "When Dvořák Came to the New World," Musical Courier, CXXIV, No. 3 (1941), 5.
8Sourek, op. cit., p. 143.
9Ibid.
An undated and unsigned telegram (App. B, 28810) was not, however, nearly so detailed, asking only whether Dvořák would accept the position as director starting October 1892, and lead six concerts of his works.

The letter to Göbl in Šourek's Letters was directly followed by another letter to this same friend, who was secretary on an estate of a prince in Bohemia, and a "very intimate friend" of Dvořák from 1862 until Dvorak's death.11

The letter corroborated the six concerts mentioned in the telegram, and perhaps is one of the most important letters made public regarding any research on Dvořák's contract with the Conservatory. In the absence of the actual contract, this letter has had to serve as a reference for researchers. (Part of the letter is on p. 92 of this chapter.) Since an obvious gap exists between the two Göbl letters--June 6 to August 1--and since these letters are the only documents covering this period in Šourek's Letters, the ensuing unpublished letters are given in full to illuminate the difficulties which Dvořák and Mrs. Thurber encountered in arriving at a final agreement.12 These letters were written

---

10 This telegram as well as many other documents in this chapter was photographed for the investigator by Dr. John Clapham at the Prague Dvořák Museum; they are reproduced with the kind permission of Dvořák's heirs.

11 Šourek, op. cit., p. 50.

12 Some of these documents are not the originals but rather copies made by Mrs. Thurber. Only original letters of proved authenticity (handwriting authenticated by the investigator) are included in the Appendix; copies made of letters are therefore excluded from the Appendix (with the exception of copies made by the original author); some of them, however, will be found, written out in full, in the
by Dvořák, Mrs. Thurber, and Henry Littleton in June and July 1891, and reveal many anxieties which Dvořák experienced during the hectic period before he gave a verbal acceptance, and ultimately before he actually signed the contract.

Apparently, Dvořák was reluctant to ask Mrs. Thurber, directly, the many questions turning over in his mind regarding the Conservatory; consequently, he turned to his friend Henry Littleton (London publisher--Novello), requesting his aid in obtaining information. In a letter of June 22, Dvořák wrote to Littleton informing him that Dr. Tragy, the director of the Prague Conservatory, "has no objection to the engagement of America, and if I accept for two years, after that I can take [resume] my position on [at] the same institution [Prague]." Dvořák followed this sentence with an emphatic declaration (no corrections have been made by the investigator). He wrote:

But it is very necessary (so tells me Dr. Tragy.)

1. to know more particulars about the Conservatory in New York
2. and it must be from any body [who?] is in no condition with the leaders of the Conservatory that he can give an impartial account of it.
3. how old is the Conservatory
4. Where [in the margin beside this word appeared the word "who"] are the leaders
5. Where ["who" in the margin] is Mr. Thurber
6. how many pupils are there, etc.

If you can give me know (perhaps by your own people in New York) which is the position of Mr. Thurber and the chiefs of that institute, afterwards I shall be able to enter in further particulars. [Mrs. Forell's papers.]

main body of the dissertation. All of the copies are in Mrs. Thurber's handwriting. The originals as well as the copies are reproduced with the kind permission of Mrs. H. K. Forell, granddaughter of Mrs. Thurber.
Several interesting points may be inferred from the letter. Although it was written to "My dear friend" without any name, the friend was definitely Littleton, who inserted the corrected words in the margin of Dvořák's letter. Judging from the letter, Dvořák heard very little about the Conservatory; if he heard anything at all, it was probably from Mrs. Thurber, since he had asked Littleton to elicit information from someone who had no connection with the school. The letter was one of the few instances omitting the subject of money. Finally, the faulty English reveals that Dvořák, at this date, was not very fluent in the language. This might possibly imply that: (1) his future duties as director of the Conservatory could not become too involved in matters pertaining to policy statements; (2) his future duties as composition teacher would encounter language difficulties.

The letter was obviously not meant for Mrs. Thurber to see; yet, Littleton did, in fact, enclose it in another letter of June 25 (App. B, 289) to Mrs. Thurber, who was still in Paris. Apparently, Littleton had assumed the role of intermediary between Dvořák and Mrs. Thurber. His letter implored her to be patient with Dvořák's "inquiries" and that eventually Dvořák would accept the position, implying, in this respect, that Littleton was very influential in Dvořák's final acceptance of the position. Since Littleton's handwriting was obscure in certain words, a "translation" of his English is given in full. Littleton wrote:
Dear Mrs. Thurber

Enclosed I show [?] Dvořák letter just received; it was evidently not intended for your eyes but I thought it better to send it to you at once and I can, of course, rely that you will [not?] let Dvorak know that you have seen it. He seems to be still suspicious of my cautions but I feel certain that he intends to accept the position if you are able to wait while he makes all his inquiries. Perhaps you will kindly tell me what to say in answer to his inquiries. Some of them, of course, I can answer myself and further I can tell him that it will cause too much delay to [write?] to America. Awaiting the [word too obscure] of your reply. I am--yours sincerely

Alfred H [enry] Littleton

I have taken the liberty of translating some of Dvořák's English on his letter. [This refers to the margin corrections "who" and "who" in Dvořák's letter of June 22, quoted previously.]

Littleton apparently wrote a letter to Dvořák at this same time advising him "to accept" the position "at once." Dvořák, however, was now receiving counsel from Dr. Tragy, "the advocate," who was head of the Prague Conservatory. Tragy was very business conscious, as revealed in Dvořák's letter of July 6 to Littleton. Dvořák wrote, to "my dear friend," in part:

Many thanks for your letter. You advise me to accept at once. All right. But Dr. Tragy (the advocate) says it is necessary: (1) to see the contract; (2) to deposit a larger sum at a bank (before sailing); (3) and instead of $15,000, $20,000 salary for eight months. [Mrs. Forell's papers.]

The most interesting part of the letter was the point asking for $20,000. There is no previous literature on this aspect of Dvořák's actually demanding more than the exorbitant amount of $15,000; too, this fact is all the more incredible since the advice came from Tragy, who was paying Dvořák a salary of only 1200 gulden (roughly $1,000). It should be noted that in regard to financial arrangements --in this matter and in future discussions on the subject
there is a strong possibility that Madame Dvořák was the practical member of the family. This disclosure was recently set forth by Dr. Clapham, who wrote: "I have heard in Prague that it was Dvořák's wife who was the efficient one over business matters, not he himself." Since there were so many instances of financial problems erupting during Dvořák's American visit, the fact that a possibility exists of Dvořák himself being quite oblivious to financial matters is reassuring; the notion of Dvořák's having essentially altruistic motives in regard to his American venture is kept more intact.

Although the letter of July 6 was written to "my dear friend," the recipient can definitely be established as Littleton; in the letter, Dvořák said: "... I am sending you the revise [revision] of the Requiem..." Obviously, the "you" referred to Littleton, Dvořák's publisher. It is also interesting to note that Littleton apparently forwarded this Dvořák letter also to Mrs. Thurber, who in turn made a copy (the one of July 6, which was employed for this account --Mrs. Forell's papers.)

Mrs. Thurber's reply to Littleton's letter of June 25 acknowledged Littleton's help and also mentioned having been in correspondence with Dvořák during this interval of time --June 25 to July 10 (App. B, 291: Mrs. Thurber's copy of her July 10 letter). Her letter clarified several issues: (1) that $7,500 will be deposited one month before Dvořák's

sailing date, "but," she added, "we can offer no more than he agreed when he discussed the matter with me, viz: to accept $15,000"; (2) that the position was to be for two years, and not only eight months (presumably, Dvořák preferred a shorter stay in America); (3) that Dvořák "is dealing with a different class of people than if he signed with an agent"; (4) that Dvořák was to have "eight months Conservatory work only--the other four months he should use for concert work"; (5) finally, that Littleton himself should instruct his own lawyer "to prepare [a] draft contract to be sent to him [Dvořák] at once if you deem wise." In other words, Mrs. Thurber wanted to reassure Dvořák--by having Littleton's lawyer handle all the legal transactions--that there was no reason to feel anxious over any of the points which were to be contained in the contract.

No mention of the contract's author is given in Šourek's Letters. However, from the above unpublished letters and the letter given below, one may deduce that an associate of Littleton was instrumental in helping with the draft. The Dvořák letter, below, contains the statement: "Yesterday I [Dvořák] got a copy of the contract." Since this letter was written on August 1, the time lapse between June 10 and the August date would, perhaps, have approximated the time necessary in drawing up the contract.

As stated previously, the letter of August 1 from Dvořák to Göbl has been used extensively by researchers, since this document did contain many of the contract's contents. The following, then, is the pertinent paragraph of Dvořák's letter to Göbl:
And now something about America. Yesterday I got a copy of the contract. It is very long but I don't know yet whether I shall accept it. It seems that I should have three hours a day teaching composition and instrumentation and, in addition, prepare in eight months four concerts with the pupils of the Conservatory and give six concerts in American towns at which the main works to be performed would be Stabat, The Spectre's Bride, Ludmilla, Requiem, symphonies, and overtures, etc. For that, I should get $15,000 or, in Czech money 35,000 gulden. Before I leave they will deposit half the remuneration in Prague and the other half I should get by month in advance. There is only one hitch. I want the $7,500 to be paid up by the end of May 1893 so that I could have holidays in June, July, August and the first half of September--which I should prefer to spend in Bohemia. If they meet this condition I shall probably accept.\textsuperscript{14}

Comparing this letter with the contract which Dvořák signed in 1892, most of the letter's statements did, in fact, correspond with the provisions of the contract. There are, though, further provisions (which will be noted later in this chapter) contained in the contract, which the letter failed to acknowledge. Also, the item of the "six concerts in American towns at which the main works to be performed would be Stabat, The Spectre's Bride ..." does not fully agree with the contract. The number of concerts, according to the contract, were not to exceed six, and the compositions to be performed at these concerts were not specifically identified but rather designated as programs comprised "wholly of works composed" by Dvořák.

In Šourek's book, the letter of August 1 is directly followed by a letter of October 24, thereby presenting, once again, the problem of a wide gap in regard to the time-interval between documents; consequently, the following

\textsuperscript{14} Šourek, op. cit., p. 144.
unpublished information will be examined in order to continue clarifying the issues surrounding the events leading up to the final signing of the contract.

A letter from Mrs. Thurber to Dvořák, dated September 3, 1891 (App. B, 293), suggests that Dvořák had received a draft of the contract and had made "alterations." According to the letter, Mrs. Thurber had sent a telegram to Dvořák, giving her approval of the alterations. The letter, sent from Paris, added that "Mr. Littleton will have the contract prepared according to your notes, and I will forward it to you for your signature. Kindly return the contract to me without delay." (The contract refers to the one spoken of in this letter, that is, the one which Littleton will have "prepared.")

These alterations, to which the September 3 letter referred, have been uncovered by the investigator. They offer further insight regarding the contents of a preliminary draft of the contract and the subsequent changes that were made by Dvořák. (App. A, 249: "Contract Alterations" accompanied by a translation of the German text into English.) These alterations imply that the original draft of the contract was written under the supervision of Mrs. Thurber; moreover, the alterations suggest that the subsequent drafts were primarily the work of people associated with Dvořák (Littleton, for example). It should be noted that although there was no date found on the alterations, the assumption of their having been written around a date directly preceding the letter of September 3 can be substantiated. In the first
place, both the letter of September 3 and the document of the alterations contained the word "alterations"; secondly, there were no further letters which alluded to the subject of alterations, with the possible exception of a November 20 letter wherein Mrs. Thurber requested Dvořák to mail his contract "with the alterations you desire--as I would like to have your signature as soon as possible." (App. B, 295: letter of November 20, 1891.) Although the "alterations" might conceivably be the document to which the November 20 letter referred, there is a stronger possibility that this document should be associated with the letter of September 3.

The "alterations" corresponded to the wording of the signed contract, and thus showed that Dvořák or an associate of his was responsible for the wording of the contract's main provisions. From the newly discovered document, some interesting facts may be deduced: (1) Dr. Tragy's suggestion of "$20,000"--not appearing in the alterations--was probably vetoed by Littleton's lawyer as an unfair demand; (2) regarding students whom Dvořák was to instruct in composition and instrumentation, Dvořák was very emphatic in demanding that he would accept "only" the "talented" students; (3) aside from his instructional duties in composition and instrumentation, Dvořák was also asked to teach "in other branches of music." This provision was "not acceptable" to Dvořák; (4) there was no mention, in the original draft, of programs devoted wholly to the compositions of Dvořák, since Dvořák made the alteration: "The program of at least one of these concerts shall consist entirely of the works of Antonín
The signed contract, though, differed from this one item, in that he was to prepare no more than six concerts—all of which were to be programs consisting only of his own compositions. This implies, then, that although Dvořák provided the original stimulus for an all-Dvořák concert, Mrs. Thurber more than obliged by proposing that there should be the possibility of six of these concerts.

From the foregoing, it is apparent that both parties of the agreement were generous enough with each other's requests. The signed contract contained no provisions which were not mutually acceptable, thus providing a favorable approach to the beginning of the relationship between the two signatories—Mrs. Thurber and Dvořák.

A letter from Mrs. Thurber to Dvořák, dated September 17, 1891, implied that Dvořák had, in fact, told Mrs. Thurber that she could announce his acceptance of the position (Appendix B, page 294). Therefore, the acceptance was made before the contract had been signed; this fact is brought out in Mrs. Thurber's statement at the end of her letter: "I cabled your acceptance to America ten days ago [September 7] and will forward to you whatever newspaper notices may appear." Her letter also mentioned the alterations: "I enclose two copies of the contract, embodying your alterations in English and German which Littleton has just sent me." She felt that Dvořák would find the contract "satisfactory" and "doubted" that any further changes were necessary.
Mrs. Thurber also wrote to Littleton on that same day, September 17, 1891 (Forell papers). A copy of the letter she had written to Dvořák was enclosed in her letter to Littleton, with the request that Littleton encourage Dvořák to sign the contract—the alterations of which, wrote Mrs. Thurber, "I have yielded in every particular... " This again corroborates the theory that Mrs. Thurber was very cooperative in all that Dvořák demanded. The letter also contained the first suggestion of Dvořák's writing something on the occasion of his future sojourn in America. Continuing his role as intermediary, Littleton was asked by Mrs. Thurber to "suggest to him [Dvořák] to write something to be performed the first time at his first concert in New York... " This matter was to emerge later (letter of July 10, 1892) in a definite proposal to have the subject of the composition connected in some way with the 400th anniversary of Columbus' discovery of America. (The exact details of the July 10, 1892 letter will be discussed in chapter v.)

The document in Šourek's Letters which follows the letter to Göbl of August 1, 1891, is a document bearing the date of November 10, 1891. This is a letter from Dvořák to August Bohdanecký—a friend of the composer. The letter revealed that Dvořák still had not signed the contract: "... Yesterday I sent the contract, revised for the third time, to London, and if they agree to all my changes—I shall sign." By November 20, as previously noted, the contract

15Ibid., p. 145.
had yet to be signed. (App. B, 295: letter from Mrs. Thurber
to Dvořák.) In fact, the letter also continued to mention
the subject of alterations; Dvořák was requested to mail his
contract with the "alterations" he "desired."

The next extant document was a letter of December 29,
1891 (App. B, 296), from Mrs. Thurber to Dvořák. The letter
tacitly implied that all the problems connected with the con-
tract had been settled. There was no mention, of any kind,
that Dvořák had actually signed the contract.

The contract employed in this study is undated, except
for "1892" appearing directly beside Dvořák's signature. Since
there is no available evidence to prove that Dvořák had signed
the contract in 1891, one may assume that the contract was,
indeed, signed in 1892—although the exact date of the 1892
signing is unknown.

The Contracts Detailing His Duties As
Director, Teacher, and Conductor

The 1892 contract was one of two contracts which
Dvořák signed relevant to his position at the Conservatory.
The 1892 document was an agreement covering two years—the
1892-93 school year and the 1893-94 school year. Since this
contract was binding for only two school years, another
contract—signed and dated April 28, 1894—was to cover the
third year, 1894-95, of Dvořák's stay in America.

Both of these agreements (the complete documents appear
in App. A, 266 and 277) will be discussed and compared pri-
marily in relationship to his duties as director, teacher,
and conductor. Matters pertaining to salary arrangements will also be mentioned, since the salary payments were to cause a great amount of concern for Dvořák during his American sojourn. Perhaps this concern was an influencing factor, both in regard to his general happiness (which, in turn, influenced his creativity), and his ultimate decision to leave America in 1895—never to return again. With the exception of the salary arrangements, most of the contents of the two contracts were essentially similar; that is, the second contract contained no major adjustments regarding his duties at the Conservatory. It is interesting to note that the physical appearances of each document were markedly dissimilar: the length of the first contract was almost twice that of the second; the first was written in long hand—the second was typewritten.

Since the first contract is obviously a more detailed account of essentially the same items contained in both documents, the earlier contract will be employed in giving an account of Dvořák's assigned duties in America. The discussion will in turn be followed by a review of the adjustments contained in the later contract, after which a comparison of the two documents will be given.

The First Contract—1892

The contract was to be in force during the periods extending from September 23, 1892, to May 23, 1893, and from September 23, 1893, to May 23, 1894. At these times Dvořák was prohibited from engaging in any work outside of the jurisdiction of the Conservatory; however, the four summer
months of each year were to be spent as he wished. This contract, as previously noted, was a mutual agreement between the two signatories--Dvořák and Mrs. Thurber. The contract did, however, favor "the party of the second part"--Dvořák--as revealed in practically everyone of the document's eleven paragraphs.

The salary schedule was to be $15,000 per year, half of which was to be paid before his departure to America, and the other $7,500 to be paid in eight monthly installments. The monthly payments were to begin on September 23, 1892--the day that his work was to begin at the Conservatory; the payments would end on April 23, 1893--one month in advance of the school-year's closing. Upon receipt of the April 23 payment, the entire $15,000 would be paid.

The exact salary schedule was also to prevail for the 1893-94 school year: that is, half of the $15,000 payable in advance of the school year; the other half payable in eight monthly installments.

The full significance of the salary which Dvořák was to receive could best be realized if a comparison were made to figures more natural to him. For example, it was previously noted that for his duties at the Prague Conservatory, he received 1200 gulden (approximately $500). Furthermore, in regard to suggested fees for his compositions, the Symphony From The New World was offered to Simrock for M2000 (marks) which in 1893 was approximately equal to $500!16

16Original letter from Dvořák to Simrock, July 28, 1893, written in German. (App. B, 300.) This document is also found in Šourek's Letters (in the English translation only), p. 162.
The aforesaid salary was to be payment for his position as Musical Director of the Conservatory. As Director (the titles Musical Director and Director were interchangeably used in the contract), Dvořák was given responsibilities in three areas: administration, teaching, and conducting. The following will treat each of these areas as they are found in the contract.

**Administration**

(1) "To provide and assist at all the Conservatory examinations which will take place three times a year, and each of which may last a week." (2) To set aside one hour per day three times a week "for the purpose of receiving persons in connection with the [Conservatory] ... who may wish to consult with him."

It should be noted that the word administration does not appear in the contract. This term, however, is used in the study for the purpose of giving further clarification to Dvořák's precise functions. Both of the items mentioned above might conceivably be placed under another heading; for example, item (1) may be more appropriate under the heading of teaching. The wording of each item contained enough ambiguity to warrant this confusion. What, for example, did the word "provide" in item (1) actually imply? In regard to item (2), were these consultations to be guidance sessions with the students pertaining to their work, or were these three hours set aside each week for the purpose of administering (or receiving) advice on administrative matters? Consultations of this latter sort, perhaps, would be with
Mrs. Thurber or other members of the administrative staff. Again, it should be emphasized that the contract contained no direct references to actual matters of administration. The omission of any clause to this effect implied that Dvořák was not to incur any responsibilities regarding the Conservatory's general policies.

Teaching

(1) "To teach composition and instrumentation" three hours per day, two days a week, "to the most talented pupils only." This item is the only one mentioned regarding actual teaching assignments. No further clarification is given as to the length of time and subsequent emphasis of the two areas—composition and instrumentation. Therefore, one might query: Were these areas to be taught jointly, or were they to be presented separately? The usage of the phrase "most talented pupils only" bore a striking resemblance to a provision in Dvořák's contract with the Prague Conservatory; the Prague document contained, according to Šourek, "the proviso that he would be assigned only specially talented students."¹⁷ Dvořák himself was apparently the prime mover in the "talented only" stipulation, according to one of his pupils, Vítězslav Novák, who spoke the following words at Dvořák's funeral: Dvořák "was a teacher only for the talented. Pupils who got to him through inadvertence or out of curiosity he managed to get rid of very quickly."¹⁸

¹⁷Šourek, op. cit., p. 136.
¹⁸Ibid., p. 137.
Conducting

(1) "To arrange the programs for four concerts to be given by the pupils of the Conservatory, and to direct the orchestra and chorus in connection therewith if required by" the Conservatory. (2) To "conduct such number of concerts as he may be required, not exceeding six in each scholastic year. . . . " These concerts were to "consist wholly of works composed" and "arranged" by Dvořák; the Conservatory itself was to "engage . . . only good executive forces so that the chorus and orchestra shall be thoroughly prepared and that the concert rehearsals held with them" would satisfy the composer. Further, these concerts were to be "given in New York or any other city in the United States with the exception . . . [of] Chicago during the time when the 'World's Fair' is taking place in that city."

The number of concerts contained in items (1) and (2) totaled a figure not in excess of ten. Although item (2) was given a detailed description, item (1) was vague, containing no further explanation other than what was found in the item itself. Apparently, the phrase "to arrange the programs" meant that Dvořák was to suggest the works to be performed at these four concerts. Also, the item was further clouded by the phrase: "to direct the orchestra and chorus . . . if required by the Conservatory." Did this imply that Dvořák was only responsible for suggesting the works to be performed, but was not expected to conduct these concerts unless the Conservatory so requested it?
More space was devoted to item (2) than any of the other duties described in the entire contract. This would imply that Dvořák's conducting assignments—especially the programs of his own works—were to be regarded as one of his most important functions at the Conservatory. There was, however, ambiguity in this item also, as there was no indication whether the orchestra and chorus of "good executive forces" were to be recruited from the Conservatory itself or from other sources. It should also be noted that item (2) was not given a particular time schedule as was the case with the other duties. The weekly schedule of all duties, with the exception of item (2) noted above, as they appear in the contract, was as follows:

Monday--Two hours to be given to the preparation of the students for the performances and concerts of the Conservatory and one hour for business consultation in pursuance of the arrangement referred to in Section 3 of this paragraph. [Section 3 refers to item (2) under administrative duties--page 100 above.]

Tuesday--The whole three hours to be devoted in giving instruction in composition and instrumentation to the most talented students only.

Wednesday and Friday--The three hours to be occupied in the same manner as on Monday.

Thursday and Saturday--The three hours to be occupied in the same manner as on Tuesday.

In summary, the complete document was quite lengthy, but the items pertaining to Dvořák's duties were relatively brief. Simply stated, he was scheduled to function in the capacity of director for a minimum of eighteen hours per week, evenly divided over a period of six days. The schedule included a reference to his conducting duties in connection with the student personnel, but failed to mention any reference to the additional conducting assignments in which only his
own works would be programmed—these to be performed by an orchestra and chorus recruited from good executive forces.

The Second Contract

(Signed in New York on April 28, 1894)

The periods covered in this second agreement between Dvořák and the Conservatory included: a six month period either from September 1 to May 1, or from October 1 to June 1 of 1895 and 1896. Apparently, Dvořák had originally planned to stay on at the Conservatory for at least another year after his actual final farewell to America (in 1895).

The salary changes went through some major adjustments, as revealed in the following: For the first period (1894-95) Dvořák was to receive $8,000; for the second period (1895-96) he was to receive $10,000. Payments were similar to those set forth in the first contract, that is, half the salary in advance, and the remainder to be paid by the month in advance.

Compared with the first contract, Dvořák had taken a considerable cut in salary—from $15,000 to $8,000—for the school year of 1894-95, and a promise of an increase of only $2,000 for the 1895-96 year. The explanation for these major adjustments could be attributed to the Panic of 1893 when Mrs. Thurber's husband, Francis, lost a considerable amount of his fortune.

As previously stated, the two contracts contained essentially the same provisions regarding Dvořák's duties. The only change to be noted was in respect to the latter
contract's omission of any reference pertaining to concerts devoted entirely to Dvořák's compositions. In fact, the clause regarding his conducting duties implied that Dvořák was to be relieved of having "to conduct the rehearsals [italics supplied] of the National Conservatory Orchestra and Chorus . . . for the preparation of the students for the performances in concert. . . ."

Summary and Conclusions

The idea of going to America was first considered by Dvořák during his second visit to England in 1884. Dudley Buck (1839-1909), an American composer whom Dvořák had met in London, suggested that Dvořák embark on a concert tour of America. Although the suggestion was appealing, the conditions were thought to be not as yet suitable for undertaking such a long journey. The right conditions were not to emerge until 1891.

The National Conservatory had been without a director since 1889. In 1891, with Congress having given its approval to the Conservatory's charter, Mrs. Thurber felt that the time was right for the Conservatory to have as its director a composer of worldly acclaim. Dvořák and Sibelius were the two candidates considered for the position. Both composers were widely recognized and also possessed a predisposition towards the cause of nationalism. Because of the impracticability of a personal interview with Sibelius, who was residing in Finland, Dvořák had been chosen.

The position was made known to him in a telegram from Mrs. Thurber on June 6, 1891. Three months of vacillation
followed, and finally on or around September 7, 1891, Dvořák gave at least a verbal acceptance. The actual contract, which was to require many alterations before being approved, was not signed until 1892—no less than seven months after Dvořák received the telegram of June 6, 1891.

The agreement, valid for two years, was the first of two contracts which Dvořák was to sign with the Conservatory—the other being the agreement of April 28, 1894. Both contracts contained essentially the same information; but, there was one important difference in regard to his salary: the second contract revealed that his yearly salary of $15,000 had to be reduced to $8,000 for the 1894-95 school year, and then increased to $10,000 for the season of 1895-96. It was noted that the decrease was probably influenced by the Panic of 1893.

With the exception of conducting assignments, his duties were to remain comparatively the same for the entire three years of his tenure. The earlier contract stipulated that there would be a possibility of his conducting six concerts devoted entirely to his own compositions; the second contract, on the other hand, omitted any reference to this item. Both contracts, however, contained a reference to his rehearsing the student orchestra and chorus, not necessarily to be conducted by him.

His teaching schedule was to consist solely of nine hours per week of classes in composition and instrumentation; only talented pupils would be admitted into these classes.
The contracts were very vague in regard to possible administrative duties; in fact, it is questionable whether any of these duties existed at all. Moreover, Dvořák was to be relieved of any responsibility to the Conservatory during the time when the school would be closed, further implying that he was to have limited opportunities in policy-making decisions. Hence, the title of "director," which was to be his for three years, was to be in no way construed as signifying a governing of the Conservatory. This function, apparently, was to be left in the hands of Mrs. Thurber.

It can be seen that the first contract favored Dvořák. His duties at the Conservatory were not very demanding, and there were to be opportunities permitting further recognition of his own compositions by way of public performances of these works. Therefore, the provisions of the first contract were, indeed, ideal for him.

The second contract was not nearly so accommodating. The unfavorable salary adjustments, coupled with the omission of any reference to an all-Dvořák concert, were doubtless to be of some consequence in Dvořák's ultimate decision to leave America forever in 1895.
CHAPTER V

DVOŘÁK IN AMERICA

America Prepares For Dvořák's Arrival

The American public learned of Dvořák's impending journey immediately after he had given verbal acceptance to Mrs. Thurber's offer. A news report of September 10, 1891, revealed that Mrs. Thurber had sent a cable announcing the engagement of Dvořák. Enlisting him at the Conservatory was viewed as one of the "noblest achievements" of Mrs. Thurber, and, the report added, it was in no way connected with a mere publicity stunt. "Dvořák's name stands far above any possible attempt to use his reputation in an advertising scheme."¹

However, his name was, indeed, to be fully utilized not only during his stay in America but also before his arrival in this country. The idea of having announced Dvořák's verbal acceptance—almost one year before his arrival—indicated that the Conservatory was going to take full advantage of Dvořák's name. As early as December 29, 1891 (before the contract was signed), Mrs. Thurber wrote to Dvořák (App. B, 296: letter of December 29, 1891) requesting photos and autographs which were to be used for publication, and she added, "I would like you to write upon the two photographs

¹The New York Truth, September 10, 1891.
and the two manuscripts 'To the National Conservatory of Music--New York.' One of these documents was used in a Conservatory pamphlet. (App. B, 297: Dvořák manuscript.)

Dvořák's introduction to the American public was planned on a large scale. Since his arrival was to take place at approximately the same time as the Columbus Day celebration, it was felt that the two occasions should be jointly produced. This knowledge is revealed in a letter of June 10, 1892, to Littleton from a person associated with the Conservatory.

The letter to Littleton contained information regarding a Festival Concert which was to take place on October 12, 1892, at the Metropolitan Opera House under the auspices of the Conservatory. Edmund Stanton, secretary of the Conservatory, was to be in charge of the Columbian celebrations, and it was "to be made the occasion for introducing Dr. Dvořák for the first time to the American public."

Littleton was requested to ask Dvořák to write a composition suitable for the occasion. The letter said:

Will you please write to Dr. Dvořák and propose to him that he should write for the occasion a cantata (not to take longer than thirty minutes) for soli, chorus and orchestra. Mrs. Thurber is trying to get suitable words for the occasion written by some good American poet and will send them to you as soon as possible. Should Mrs. Thurber not succeed in getting suitable words in time, the proposition is that Dr. Dvořák choose some Latin hymn such as "Te Deum Laudamus" or "Jubilate Deo" or any other which would be suitable for the occasion.

2A copy of this letter was sent to the investigator by Dr. Clapham who uncovered it while on a visit to Vysoká in September, 1963. The letter's author, noted Dr. Clapham, is not known due to the illegible signature: either B. Bachen, B. Bachur, or B. Bachuz are possibilities.
Littleton apparently acted immediately upon this request, as evidenced in an article by Mrs. Thurber, who wrote of her having received a letter from Dvořák on this matter. Dvořák's letter of June 25, 1892, acknowledged having received Littleton's request, and that he was pleased with the idea; Dvořák wrote: "Just now I got a letter from Littleton, of New York, from which I see that you [Mrs. Thurber] have the splendid idea I should write a Columbus Cantata (or something like) which ought to be given at my first appearance in New York." Mrs. Thurber replied to Dvořák on July 10, 1892 (App. B, 298), regarding the proposed cantata: "As for the Columbus Cantata," she wrote, "I do hope that you will find it convenient to write something for October 12; 'The American Flag' [text by Joseph Rodman Drake], which was sent to Littleton, would be most appropriate."

The letters, noted above, imply that Dvořák had received a copy of the text for "The American Flag" months before his trip to America, if one may assume that Littleton had forwarded the text immediately to Dvořák. According to Stefan, however, the text had not been seen by Dvořák until only six weeks before the sailing date to America, and therefore accounted for Dvořák's having been unable to complete the composition in time for the proposed concert. If this is true, then the blame could properly fall on Littleton; if it

---

3Letter from Dvořák to Mrs. Thurber, June 25, 1893, cited by Jeannette M. Thurber, "Dvořák as I Knew Him," The Etude, XXXVII, No. 11 (1919), 693.

is false, that is, if Dvořák actually had possession of the text almost three months prior to his journey, then the blame should fall on Dvořák's shoulders.

In any case, Mrs. Thurber had provided the impetus for *The American Flag* (*Americký Prapor*), Op. 102, and was not responsible for the delay in its completion (January 8, 1893). Ironically, the work, which was to commemorate Dvořák's arrival in America, was not to receive its first performance until after Dvořák had left America forever. On April 15, 1895, Dvořák sent the manuscript to Kovařík; on the front page of the score, Dvořák wrote a note explaining the circumstances surrounding the work's inception. His note to Kovařík was as follows:

> Kindly accept this remembrance. It is a composition which should have been performed at Carnegie Hall in New York the day of my first appearance in public in America, October 12, 1892 [actually the first two dates of Dvořák's public appearances were October 9 and 21]. This composition, I composed before my first visit to America, and as I was not able to finish it in time, I had to compose another so I wrote the *Te Deum* which was actually produced for the first time on October 21, 1892, when I had the honor to present myself to the New York audience. This year [1895], upon the request of my wife, I decided to have this composition published at the publishing firm Schirmer.

The 1892 Conservatory catalog had the clear purpose of publicizing the name of Dvořák. In addition to his name appearing on page 1 (this page is in App. A, 266, listing the officers and trustees of the Conservatory), there were other references to him: in connection with his teaching "the Advanced Class in Composition" (page 4), and the cost of

---

5Hazel G. Kinsella, "Dvořák and Spillville, Forty Years After," *Musical America*, LIII, No. 10 (1933), 5.
being admitted to this class (page 5); in connection with his name heading the list of faculty (pages 6-7: App. A, 269); and finally in connection with a prize competition to be sponsored by the Conservatory (App. A, 271). A discussion of each of these references is given below.

Under the department of theory, that is, "harmony, counterpoint, and composition," Dvořák was to teach the class designated as "The Advanced Class in Composition." It should be noted that this was the only teaching assignment mentioned; there was no mention of "instrumentation" as found in the contract.

The page devoted to tuition showed that the cost of studying with Dvořák was very high. Although the catalog stated that "all applicants having remarkable talent are taught free," and "to those who are able to pay, a moderate charge, as will be seen, is made," the price scale was to the contrary. Whereas most of the classes at the Conservatory cost from $10 to $60, the tuition for Dvořák's one class in composition was priced at $300. Apparently, there were no individual lessons, as witnessed by the statement—appearing on the same page as the fees—that "individual lessons [are] given in class."

Dvořák's name headed the list of faculty whose "membership," the catalog boasted, "embraces the foremost artists and instructors of America, and it may be affirmed that no Conservatory abroad can lay claim to so admirably efficient a corps of teachers." It can be seen (Appendix A) that Dvořák's name was found under three headings: director,
composition, and chorus; but, on the other hand, it was absent under the orchestra heading. The absence of an orchestral assignment and the inclusion of a chorus duty were in contrast to what the contract had stipulated.

Finally, the two pages describing the prize competitions further illuminated his name. In the statement addressed to "American composers and authors," the reason for the prizes was given:

The National Conservatory, desirous of emphasizing the engagement of Dr. Antonín Dvořák as its Director by a special endeavor to give an additional impulse to the advancement of music in the United States, proposes to award prizes for the best Grand or Comic Opera, Libretto, Symphony, [and so forth], each and all of these works to be composed or written by composers and librettists born in the United States and not above thirty-five years of age.

The subject and prizes were as follows: grand or comic opera, words and music--$1,000; libretto for a grand or comic opera--$500; symphony--$500; oratorio--$500; suite or cantata--$300; and piano or violin concerto--$200. A separate "special jury" of five or more "competent" judges for each category was to examine these works which were to have been received between September 1 and October 15, 1892. Dvořák's name headed the list of judges in each category, and it is interesting to note that some of the more prominent names on the juries--names such as George Chadwick, Arthur Nikisch, and William Gilchrist--were not members of the Conservatory's faculty (App. A, 271: the juries). It should also be noted that as early as December 23, 1891, the announcement of this prize competition--emphasizing Dvořák's appointment--had been
brought to the attention of the public. An item in Mrs. Thurber's Scrapbook attested to this fact.6

Dvořák's First Impressions

The New World in which Dvořák found himself when he set foot on American soil for the first time, September 27, 1892, was also new in regard to its music. Stefan stated that "there were still very few composers who could have written music in consonance with this newness."7 Stefan further pointed out, however, that good performers were readily available, especially in New York, since "there was plenty of money to attract European artists of reputation."

Among the major performing organizations of that time were: The Metropolitan Opera—founded in 1883; The Philharmonic Society (1842), which gave a season of sixteen concerts under Anton Seidl; The Brooklyn Philharmonic Society (1857); The Boston Symphony Orchestra (1881) under Nikisch; The New York Symphony Society (1878) under W. Damrosch (this orchestra merged with the Philharmonic in 1928); The Beethoven Quartet (1873) and The Kneisel Quartet (1885)—both of which were Boston organizations. Music schools, however, were not so flourishing, according to Stefan; they were business enterprises which accepted only paying students, and which did not offer a systematic course of study. Mrs. Thurber's

6The item is on page 97 of the Scrapbook and bears the title "Kate Fields Washington," Dec. 23, 1891, p. 438.

7Stefan, op. cit., p. 192.
Conservatory, on the other hand, "was actually run as an educational institution."8

Dvořák's first impressions of America were very favorable. These impressions were recorded in a letter (October 18, 1892) written to Dr. Emil Kozánek, a friend in Moravia. New York, Dvořák wrote, "is magnificent, lovely buildings and beautiful streets and then, everywhere, the greatest cleanliness."9 At first, he and his family, including his wife and two eldest children plus Joseph Kovařík, lived at the Clarendon Hotel on East 18th Street; soon afterwards, all five of them moved to their permanent living quarters—a private two-story house at 327 East 17th Street which was located a few minutes away from the Conservatory at 126-128 East 17th. Kovařík, an American who studied at the Prague Conservatory, had returned to America with Dvořák, who took him in as a member of the family and arranged for him to meet Mrs. Thurber. (App. B, 299: Dvořák's card of correspondence introducing Kovařík to Mrs. Thurber.) Kovařík (a violist) became a member of the Conservatory's faculty.

The first public reception for the composer took place October 9, 1891; this was sponsored by the Czech population in New York. Dvořák was greatly moved by this welcome, which included a program of his own works. He wrote (in the letter to Kozánek, mentioned above) that "there were three thousand people present in the hall—and there was no end to

8 Ibid., p. 193.

the cheering and clapping." Dvořák also evidenced some consternation mixed with a feeling of supreme bliss when he added: "What the American papers write about me is simply terrible --they see in me, they say, the savior of music. . . ."

A notice appeared in all newspapers on October 9, announcing that a Grand Concert commemorating the first appearance of Dvořák would take place at the Music Hall (Carnegie Hall) October 21, 1892. The orchestra on this occasion was to be, the notice added, the Metropol Orchestra of eighty members and a chorus of three hundred. (Mrs. Thurber's Scrapbook.) The program for this concert included the Te Deum, Op. 103, which was written in Bohemia during the summer of 1892. (The other works on the program are discussed in chapter v.) It is interesting to note that the planned Columbus Day celebration never took place. The manuscript of the Te Deum bears the inscription: "... Composed in honor of the memory of Columbus (to be celebrated in New York, October 12, 1892). . . ." 10 The work was written for soprano, bass, chorus, and orchestra.

One of the most important documents among the twenty documents contained in Šourek's Letters dealing with the American period is the letter from Dvořák to Josef Hlávka (an architect and founder of the Czech Academy of Sciences and Arts). Dvořák's letter 11 of November 27, 1892, to Hlávka (1831-1908) contained a wealth of information regarding his


impressions and his duties. The following discussion was based on that letter.

The letter was written two months after his arrival, and he still continued to show much enthusiasm and happiness in his new venture, commenting: "And why shouldn't we [be happy] when it is so lively and free here and one can live so much more peacefully—and that is what I need. I do not worry about anything. . . ." He evinced great admiration and anticipation for the concerts to be conducted by him in Boston on November 29 and 30.12 These concerts were to be "arranged by the highly esteemed President of our Conservatory, the tireless Mrs. Jeannette M. Thurber," he wrote, "at which the Requiem will be given. . . ." Admiring the way the "Americans work in the interests of art and for the people," his description of the concert arrangements revealed a sense of astonishment:

The concert on December 1 will be for only the wealthy and the intelligentsia, but the preceding day my work will also be performed for poor workers who earn $18 a week, the purpose being to give the poor and uneducated people the opportunity to hear the musical works of all time and all nations!! That's something, isn't it? I am looking forward to it like a child.13

The statement "musical works of all time" certainly does reveal a childlike naiveté on his part or else a lack of any humility.

12In the letter Dvořák gave the dates as Nov. 30 & Dec. 1; however, Burghauser's Thematic Catalogue, p. 558, states Nov. 29 as the "general rehearsal for workers" and Nov. 30 as the date of the performance.

13Sourek, op. cit., p. 151.
The letter also referred to his concert of October 21, the Grand Concert spoken of previously, and it mentioned Colonel Higginson's "glib speech at my first concert—a thing unheard of here...." Higginson apparently propelled Dvořák into considering seriously the possibilities inherent in music indigenously American. The speech, according to Dvořák, stated the purpose to be served by his stay; Dvořák wrote: "The Americans expect great things of me and the main thing is, so they say, to show them to the promised land and kingdom of a new and independent art, in short, to create a national music." Since Higginson's speech was titled "Two New Worlds --The New World of Columbus and The New World of Music," it is interesting to note that the phrase "new world" was not included in Dvořák's commentaries. One might reflect upon the possibility of Higginson's speech having been an influence on the title of Dvořák's E minor Symphony; however, the phrase was commonly in use during the Columbus celebrations. The speech, in any case, seemingly left a vivid impression on Dvořák, who did, in fact, devote much of his attention to the cause of music which was indigenously American.

Dvořák was greatly impressed, according to his letter to Hlávka, by the quantity and quality of the pupils at the Conservatory. He noted that they had come from as far away as San Francisco, and that most of them were poor. Commenting that his class of eight pupils was small, he quickly added that "some of them [are] very promising." "

15Šourek, op. cit., p. 152.
His comments regarding the prize competitions were contradictory to the figures given in the catalog (previously noted); thus, Dvořák's figures read: oratorio--$1,000 (catalog showed $500), libretto--$1,000 ($500), and piano or violin concerto--$300 ($200). It should also be noted that his comment regarding the opera award did not specify grand or comic opera, although he correctly gave the figure of $1,000 as the prize offered for that medium.

As a member of the several juries granting the awards, Dvořák thought himself to be proficient in identifying the relative value of the large quantity of manuscripts submitted. He told Hlavka that he was required to go through all the manuscripts, but added that it did not involve much effort: "I look at the first page and can tell straight away whether it is the work of a dilettante or an artist." He apparently was impressed with at least some of the manuscripts received in each category with the exception of opera: "As regards operas, they are very poor and I don't know whether any will be awarded a prize." Perhaps, at this point, he was somewhat embittered by the public neglect which his own operas had received.

He found the style of American composers to be similar to that of his own land, that is, having been under the influence of the German School; but he also recognized a spark of something new: ". . . here and there another spirit, other thoughts, another coloring flashes forth, in short, something Indian (something A la Bret Harte). I am very curious how things will develop."
The letter to Hlavka also included Dvořák's account of his Conservatory schedule. This account, too, was not in accord with the contract's stipulations. According to Dvořák, the schedule was very light:

On Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, from 9-11, I have composition; twice a week orchestra practice from 4-6 and the rest of my time is my own. You see that it is not a great deal and Mrs. Thurber is very considerate as she wrote to me in Europe that she would be.

Comparing Dvořák's account with the one given in the contract, it can be noted that Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays were to have been the days for teaching composition and instrumentation; and, instead of two hours for each class session, the contract had stated three hours. His account of the orchestral duties was, likewise, not in accord with the contract, which stipulated that he rehearse the orchestra three times per week—not twice, as Dvořák stated. The letter did not refer to the one hour of business consultation mentioned in the contract. In this respect, he even implied that administrative duties were completely outside of his domain: Mrs. Thurber "looks after the administrative side herself...."

Dvořák's letter to Hlavka, therefore, was filled with a number of relevant matters pertaining to his duties at the Conservatory. It has been shown, however, that some of the points mentioned are subject to further inquiry because of their inconsistencies with the actual contract.

Only two other documents in Šourek's book contain any reference at all to Dvořák's duties. The first was a

16Ibid., p. 153.
letter from Dvořák to Kozánek, April 12, 1893; one line referred to his work at the Conservatory: "I have not much work at school so that I have enough time for my own work." 17

The other reference occurred over a year later in a letter he wrote to Göbl, February 27, 1894. Again, though, only one line was of relevance; this time, however, the statement implied that his work at the Conservatory was quite demanding of his time: "... In spite of my work at school, I have been fairly diligent." 18

Thus, with the exception of the one letter to Hlávka, November 27, 1892, plus the two sentences extracted from two other documents, no further material on Dvořák's duties can be found in Šourek's Letters; and it should be noted that the one document in particular—the November 27 letter—contradicted the evidence found in the original contract.

Stefan 19 and Robertson 20 agreed that Dvořák taught a two hour class in composition; Robertson, however, failed to mention any Conservatory conducting assignment, whereas Stefan stated that "... twice a week, he conducted the Conservatory orchestra for two hours. ..." 21 Both authors probably obtained their information from the Dvořák-Hlávka letter of November 27, since (1) there was no mention of

17Ibid., p. 156. 18Ibid., p. 175.

19Stefan, op. cit., p. 199.


21Stefan, loc. cit.
instrumentation (as it did appear in the contract) and (2) the "twice a week" statement regarding the orchestral assignment was inaccurate (the contract stated three days each week).

Other books, too, gave either indefinite information or no information at all regarding Dvořák's duties. Šourek's *Life and Work* neglected the subject completely, and Fischl casually dismissed the topic of Dvořák's work at the Conservatory, with the remark: "He was fully occupied with it." This remark was no more casual, however, than Stefan's, who closed his cursory comments on Dvořák's teaching activities by the succinct observation that "Dvořák himself remained, of course, the same sort of teacher he had been in Prague."

The following is an account of Dvořák's teaching activities at both the Prague and National Conservatories. The Prague Conservatory is discussed in the light of Stefan's comment, that is, Dvořák being the same sort of teacher in Prague as he was in America. The accounts were taken principally from two sources: Šourek's *Letters* (regarding the Prague Conservatory), and articles by Dvořák's American pupils (regarding the National Conservatory).

---


24Stefan, *loc. cit.*
On January 1, 1891, Dvořák took on the duties of professor of composition and instrumentation. He was, according to Šourek, "entrusted with the training of the third year students . . . [who were] only specially talented students." (Page 136.) His first year at the Prague Conservatory consisted of the following schedule:

Originally [according to Karel Stecker (1861-1918) a colleague of Dvořák at the Conservatory], he was to teach an hour every day (from 8-9 a. m.); but his lesson not seldom went on the whole forenoon, which upset the rest of our time-table. In the following year, the pupils were divided into three [italics supplied] groups with two hours a week, or two groups with three hours a week. [Šourek, page 136.]

This account was not in accord with Dvořák's schedule (as stated in the contract) of classes in New York, where he taught only one group of students.

Stecker was impressed by Dvořák's unique manner of teaching: "A specially noteworthy curiosity was a symphonietta for small orchestra, an extremely interesting composition worked out on the blackboard at school; . . . [it was] the common spiritual product of twelve pupils." Apparently, this manner of a joint effort on the part of the students to work on one common composition was a favorite method of Dvořák's.

This device of his was also emphasized in an interview25 which the investigator had with Bedřich Vaska, who is

---

25 Personal interview with Bedřich Vaska at Goddard College in Plainfield, Vermont, Aug. 15, 1962. Vaska was a
perhaps the last remaining student of Dvořák. The inter-
view revealed that Vaska had studied with Dvořák two years
after the composer had returned to Prague—hence, in 1897.
Vaska, who was sixteen years old at the time, was in a class
at the Conservatory consisting of approximately eight or nine
students who met on Wednesdays and Saturdays from 4:00 P. M.
to 6:00 P. M. or from 4:00 P. M. to 7:00 P. M. Each of the
students, Vaska added, was required to write a part of a
sinfonietta. This statement, it is interesting to note, is
in direct accord with Stecker's remark, noted above, implying
therefore that Dvořák employed this method of teaching while
at the National Conservatory. In regard to the sinfonietta,
Vaska said that the students "criticized each other" by
passing their contributions to the composition "down the line."
Orchestration "came together with the melody." When asked
whether Dvořák's American sojourn had influenced the composer
to revise his method of teaching, Vaska replied: "I do not
think that he changed much in his teaching."

Joseph Michl's "A Year Under Dvořák" elucidated on
Dvořák's hesitation to make actual alterations in the students'
compositions; according to Michl, who was Dvořák's student

member of the Sevcík String Quartet in 1911, and he became a
member of the New York Philharmonic and the Metropolitan
Opera. He presently teaches cello during the summer at
Goddard College; in the winter, he has a private studio in

At the time of the interview, Vaska suggested the
possibility of there being other Dvořák pupils still alive:
Alois Reiser (California?) and Zamerník (St. Louis
or Cleveland).

at the Prague Conservatory, corrections were very rarely made by Dvořák himself. Michl said:

And here we strike on the most typical feature of his method: If he found something (and that happened very often) with which he did not agree and which he wanted to have differently and better written, he forced us to think about it and did not give in until we had found a better way.

Michl concluded his remarks by quoting Dvořák himself on this subject: "'Anybody who wants to compose must get accustomed to think and work independently.'"

Dvořák was pleased, according to Josef Suk (1874-1935), "when he saw among his students a striving after new and independent expression." Suk, who was Dvořák's pupil and son-in-law, found that Dvořák was generally interested in all styles of music. This fact was corroborated by Vítěslav Novák (1870-1949), who asserted that "Dvořák's taste was by no means one-sided." (Sourek regarded Novák, "along with Suk, [as] the most outstanding student of Dvořák's school of composition. . . ") To the question of Dvořák's opinion of the recognized masters, Novák replied: "He paid hommage to Beethoven whom he continually held up to us as an example. . . ." The names of Wagner, Berlioz, Brahms, and Schubert--the last to whom he had a spiritual kinship--were

28 Ibid.
29 Ibid.
30 Ibid., p. 139.
31 Ibid., p. 137. Šourek considered Suk (1874-1935), Novák (1870-1949), Rudolf Karel (1880-1945), and Oskar Nedbal (1874-1930) as having been the pupils who "formed a marvelously successful continuation of Dvořák's own great art, which, thanks to them, was again passed on to further generations." (Šourek, Life & Works, p. 30).
also mentioned by Novák. Although Mozart's name was not included, another article by Michl in Šourek's *Letters* placed Mozart in a position of high importance. Michl related an incident recalling Dvořák's asking his class to define "Mozart"; having received no adequate reply, Dvořák pronounced this significant sentence: 'Well, remember: Mozart is sunshine!'

The foregoing has been a discussion of Dvořák's work at the Prague Conservatory as evidenced by his pupils' discourses on the subject. It is interesting to note the many comments to the effect that Dvořák favored the classic composers as models for his students. No mention of anything pertaining to nationalism was found in these writings. Therefore, Stefan's remark, of Dvořák's having remained the same sort of teacher he had been in Prague, is questionable: the emphasis given to the subject of nationalism during Dvořák's sojourn would lead one to suspect that the values which Dvořák placed on the Classic composers were greatly revised while he was in America. Hence, his teaching methods must have gone through some major revisions.

Regarding possible changes manifested in his teaching methods at the Prague Conservatory as a result of his American tenure, Robertson said: "On his return . . . he intensified the democratic character of his class. Everyone in it was to be equal. He insisted on hard work, 'many sketches and long developments, otherwise you are no composer.'"

---

32 Ibid., p. 140. 33 Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
though, failed to explain the meaning of the terms "democratic" and "equal." Did Robertson mean to imply that there had been inequality in Dvořák's method of teaching? This conclusion would be untenable from the evidence of the pupils' discourses. Dvořák might have been very autocratic in his demands, but there was no evidence to show that some pupils had been favored over others. The only possible explanation of Robertson's comment would be a statement--also by this author--that Dvořák not only gave advice but also received it. This statement, however, was made in the same paragraph with Robertson's discussion of the Prague pupils, and therefore it is not clear whether Dvořák had this mutual exchange of ideas before or after his trip to America.

The National Conservatory

This discussion is based primarily on materials taken from the discourses of Dvořák's students at the National Conservatory. It should be noted that the major biographers --Šourek, Stefan, Fischl, and Robertson--neglected to use these documents in their accounts of Dvořák's teaching in connection with the Conservatory.

Among the American composers who studied with Dvořák were Rubin Goldmark, Harvey Worthington Loomis, William Arms Fisher, Henry Waller, Harry Rowe Shelley, Harry T. Burleigh, and Will Marion Cook--all of whom, according to Finck, "soon achieved national distinction." Finck, who died in 1926,

34Ibid.

substantiated the claim of national distinction by citing their contributions: Rubin Goldmark wrote the "sensationally successful opera" The Queen of Sheba; Henry Waller wrote "a charming operetta" The Ogallallahs; Harvey Loomis wrote excellent songs that will eventually be better known; Harry R. Shelley wrote Romeo and Juliet; William A. Fisher has "developed into a first class writer of songs, some of which are far better than most of the new German and French songs imported." Finck also noted Fishers's meritorious work as an editor: "As editor-in-chief of the Oliver Ditson Company, he did useful work in separating the chaff from the wheat." Burleigh was mentioned as "undoubtedly the leader among America's colored composers. There is more white than black in his excellent songs ... yet they reflect great credit to his race."36

Finck's position as a music critic gave him full authority to voice his approvals. It must be remembered, however, that these commentaries were written in 1926--too early, perhaps, for a true and objective evaluation. As recently as 1955, in fact, reflections on this subject were not nearly so favorable. Gilbert Chase (critic, journalist, and musicologist) singled out a few of the pupils--Fisher, Goldmark, Loomis, and Burleigh--and asserted that "anyone disposed to minimize Dvořák's influence might point out that none of the men proved to be creative artists of exceptional stature."37 Chase at least did not consign the pupils to

36 Ibid., pp. 278-79.
complete obscurity; the use of the adjective "exceptional" could imply that although the pupils were not in the same category with Dvořák, they were, nevertheless, of some significant, if not exceptional, stature.

Chase's remarks were probably closer to the truth than Finck's, if evaluation were based solely on the merits of the pupils' compositions; for it can be seen that present day books on music history or appreciation contain little, if any, reference to Dvořák's American pupils. It could also be noted that the inclusion of their works on concert programs of the present day would indeed be a rare occurrence.

On the other hand, standards of evaluation need not rest entirely on the basis of compositional output--quantitative or qualitative, but could also be judged on the more subtle changes that transpired since Dvořák's sojourn. The pupils, who in turn became teachers, doubtless kept alive the tradition which Dvořák had started. One need only cite Rubin Goldmark (1872-1936) who, as director of composition at the Julliard Graduate School, "exerted a wide influence and trained many of the younger generation of American composers. . . ." Among Goldmark's pupils were such names as Aaron Copland, George Gershwin, and Frederick Jacobi (1891-1952). Jacobi, too, taught composition at the Julliard

---

38 In this respect, one further fact may be added: the Schwann Record Catalog (August, 1964) contained no listing of these composers.

Graduate School. Both Goldmark and his pupils investigated, to some degree, the possibilities inherent in American music. Examples which may be cited are: Goldmark's *Hiawatha* (1900), Jacobi's *Indian Dances* (1928), Gershwin's *Porgy and Bess* (1935), and Copland's *Billy the Kid* (1938).

It was previously mentioned that the major biographers --Sourek, Stefan, Fischl, and Robertson--neglected to use materials taken from the discourses of Dvořák's American pupils; therefore, a gap has existed in regard to factual data on Dvořák's teaching methods at the National Conservatory. The following information was taken from these hitherto neglected documents--primarily periodical literature written by Fisher, Camille Zeckwer, and Shelley.

Perhaps the most valuable of these documents was the one by Harry Rowe Shelley (1858-1947), composer and organist, who gave an inclusive account of Dvořák's handling of the composition class: "Few studied with him," wrote Shelley. "Many wished to, but their ignorance and lack of preparation erected a high wall of impossibilities. He knew but little of ordinary teaching methods."40 The class itself was very small --a "little band of students clustered around the man at the piano"--and it was driven with relentless energy three times a week for forty consecutive weeks in the year. Each student, Shelley explained, was required to submit new portions of compositions at every lesson; Dvořák never permitted a slackening of speed. If a student wished to consult with him outside of the planned lesson time, this was always granted in order...

"to insure constant progress."

Dvořák advised his pupils, Shelley said, to be thoroughly acquainted with the styles of all the classical composers; this was to be achieved by "playing orchestral scores at an instrument, [thereby] seeing and finding ways of workmanship" of these masters. Shelley reported that Dvořák "would say, 'If one does not know what the others compose, he may be copying them without knowing it.'" The composers mentioned by Shelley were Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, and Brahms. Noting the absence of Bach, Shelley quoted Dvořák's explanation: "'It is easy enough to write music [fugues] like that; all that is necessary is the theme, then say it as many times as you wish. It tires me to hear it so often.'" Shelley did remark, though, that Dvořák had a high regard for Bach's arias and cantilenas. Shelley's failure to allude to "modern" composers was a tacit admission that this particular style was not stressed.

Dvořák's method of teaching was to require the pupils to write a melody with an accompanying development. "'Don't trouble to write out all the notes that come to you. Just a few; I shall see what you mean.'" Although Dvořák never gave or suggested a theme to a pupil, he did offer advice on matters pertaining to the medium appropriate for the particular theme which the pupil had composed: "The content of the theme decided the form it was to take," according to Shelley's recollections.

Shelley stressed the emphasis which Dvořák had given to the study of the development section of compositions by Beethoven, Haydn, Mozart, and Brahms. The pupils themselves
spent forty weeks on the subject of the Durchfuehrung or thematic development of the symphony; observing every detail of a student's composition, Dvořák insisted that there be "'no bad notes.'”

The following passage, by Shelley, implied Dvořák's inability to cope with the mechanics of teaching; Shelley said:

After listening to a few bars of sketched music, the pupil would be pushed away and without a word or comment the master would take the seat at the piano where he would gaze and wonder at the sketch brought for inspection. Minutes would pass, sometimes as much as ten minutes, without a spoken word or played note; meanwhile, the content had entered into the brain and had become part of the being of the Judge-Absolute, then one heard a dialogue like this: "No!" "Why?" "No why, just no." "But what is wrong?" "It is all bad except that which I had before seen." Then might ensue a category or comparisons of the music before him, with other phrases well known in music, which had unconsciously crept into the supposedly original work.41

Apparently, there were no concrete suggestions other than stating that the work was not original. In another article, Shelley commented further on this flaw; to the question of why Dvořák had "discriminated against certain portions" of the student's compositions, Shelley reported Dvořák's reply: "'I don't know. . . .'". Shelley explained that Dvořák "had neither time, desire, nor academic equipment to go into the mathematics of music."42

William Arms Fisher (1861-1948), editor, composer, and arranger ("Goin' Home"), studied composition and orchestration under Dvořák. His article was of limited importance regarding

41 Ibid., p. 542.

42 Harry Rowe Shelley, "Dvořák as I Knew Him." The Etude, XXXVII, No. 11 (1919), 694.
Dvořák's methods of instruction. In agreement with Shelley, he stated that Dvořák thought very highly of Beethoven and Schubert. Fisher, however, stressed the point that Dvořák was broadminded to all types of music: "He habitually stopped to listen to every itinerant street band, ... to every hurdy gurdy," and "to the tunes whistled by boys. ..." According to Fisher, Dvořák was drawn primarily to the inherent possibilities of Negro spirituals. Whether or not matters such as this were spoken of in class was not made clear in the article. It should be noted that Fisher was also Dvořák's colleague, having been an instructor in theory during Dvořák's tenure. Negro spirituals, Fisher quoted Dvořák as saying, "'are the most striking and appealing melodies that have yet been found on this side of the water.'"

The next pupil's discourse on Dvořák's teaching was taken from the composer's obituary notice in the *Etude*, wherein Zeckwer gave both corroborating as well as conflicting evidence in relationship to the commentaries previously mentioned. Camille W. Zeckwer (1875-1924), pianist and composer who later became both teacher and director of the Philadelphia Academy, had studied with Dvořák from 1893-95; these years, according to Zeckwer, were unhappy years for Dvořák, who frequently came to the lessons in tears exclaiming that although he was earning $15,000 a year, he was "happier fifteen years before, when he was starving." In the short space devoted

---


44"Antonín Dvořák," *The Etude* ([June], 1904), p. [?].
to his reflections of Dvořák's teaching, Zeckwer unknowingly imparted some interesting and relevant facts. One statement in particular mentioned a Schubert composition (a march) which Zeckwer was required to orchestrate. This would imply that Dvořák had treated the subject of instrumentation in a manner independent of composition. The remainder of Zeckwer's remarks revealed some discrepancies as compared with previous views on the subject of Dvořák's opinion of other composers. Dvořák regarded Chopin as "the greatest writer for the piano who had ever lived or ever will live," and he thought more highly of Bach than of Wagner, especially in regard to the handling of modulations.

Finally, Zeckwer commented on Dvořák's views of American musical education:

He was not in sympathy with the methods of American conservatories so far as he was acquainted with them. They were all money-making schemes. . . . In regard to American pupils, he once expressed himself in their favor as very talented. In his opinion, in a hundred years America will be the musical center of the world.⁴⁵

These views represent a unique instance of a claim that Dvořák was dissatisfied with the National Conservatory's methods. Also, a careful analysis of the statement about American pupils reveals that Dvořák was not too prone to encourage his pupils. It is interesting to note, from Zeckwer's final comment above, that Dvořák presumably expected America to reach a point of musical superiority in a hundred years. Although this remark could be discouraging to his pupils, it did reveal that Dvořák had some far-sighted ideas. Although

⁴⁵Ibid.
America, today, has already attained a musical accomplishment second to none—at least in the areas of performance and education—the field of composition has yet to attain an internationally recognized superiority. Was Dvořák thinking in terms of an eventual governmental subsidy in order to give talented Americans the opportunity to create (as he himself had experienced)? This matter is discussed further in chapter vi.

Another article by Zeckwer appeared in 1919; in this instance, his views were more conforming, stressing the importance of Beethoven and Schubert in Dvořák's teaching.

Concerning Beethoven:

I was launched into the composition of a trio for piano, violin and 'cello. I was made to write nine different developments of the first movement, modeled upon Beethoven's piano sonatas, even to the extent of adapting my own themes to Beethoven's precise modulations and number of bars. My first draft of the slow movement was similarly molded upon the Adagio of the Sonata Pathétique.46

Upon completion of this step, Zeckwer added, "my imagination was given freer rein, and I was permitted to write an original slow movement."

Zeckwer wrote that textbooks were avoided; in their place "were the living scores of the great masters," among whom Schubert was the supreme. Zeckwer noted the paradox of Dvořák's belief that the music of the future could be found "only by going back into the past—to Schubert . . . by expanding his musical ideas into modern melodic form."47

46 Camille W. Zeckwer, "Dvořák as I Knew Him," The Etude, XXXVII, No. 11 (1919), 694.

47 Ibid.
Zeckwer also referred to Brahms and Wagner, but he omitted mentioning such composers as Bach and Chopin, as he had done in his previous commentary.

It can be seen from the foregoing that the subject of orchestration was mentioned only briefly by the pupils. What follows, then, will be a discussion of this topic—orchestration—as revealed in the writings of another of Dvořák's pupils, Harry Patterson Hopkins. It should be noted, however, that this American pupil did not study with the composer in America, but rather studied in Bohemia upon Dvořák's return in 1895. Hopkins was not admitted to the Prague Conservatory because of his Czech language deficiency; he studied with Dvořák privately in Vysoká, being among the comparatively few Americans who studied with the composer in Bohemia.48

Hopkins' articles (he wrote two of them and was quoted in another) revealed that Dvořák was quite outspoken in matters of orchestration, particularly regarding the dangers of blantancy: "You Americans are a noisy lot." 49 Hopkins, (who commented that his lessons were given in a relaxed atmosphere—"coffee and a good cigar") stressed this same point in another article in which Hopkins' observations were quoted by Olin Downes. 50 To remedy the annoyance, Dvořák reportedly suggested having "plenty of rests throughout

49 Ibid., p. 327.
the piece,' that is, having sections of the orchestra resting at times, and refraining from many tutti passages—"Just keep to the plain, simple ideas, which is far the best way.'"

Orchestration was not commenced until after the melody and development had been worked out.51 Another suggestion was to refrain from the use of the upper register whenever possible; Dvořák observed that all the modern composers were using this "register, loud and piercing.'" To overcome this shortcoming, Dvořák urged that the low notes of the flute be utilized more; in this respect, Hopkins pointed out that Debussy's L'Après-midi d'un Faune had not as yet been written.52

Hopkins learned through "blunt criticisms" that each instrument possessed a character of its own:

I had part of the harmony written for the oboes, through which he ran his pen giving it to the clarinets. "It is more dramatic," he explained; and then after a pause, "What can be more funereal than the low notes of the clarinet?"53

Hopkins also cited another example of Dvořák's penchant for low notes: "A rather sinister effect may be obtained by adding [a] low tympany roll; the tympany is a tragic instrument . . . when properly used."54

"Long before orchestration was discussed," Hopkins asserted, the melody along with its development was reworked until final approval had been granted. Above all, the melody was the most important factor in the evolution of a composition:

51Ibid. 52Ibid. 53Hopkins, op. cit., p. 327. 54Ibid., p. 328.
"I had to write and rewrite the sketch upon which I was working many times, before he granted final approval. . . . The orchestration was commenced as the last thing. . . ."55

Nowhere in Hopkins' discourses was there an allusion to the classic masters; on the contrary, Dvořák's advice was to "key your ideas abreast of those who are up and doing today." Hopkins rejoiced at the idea of omitting the "study of dry scholastic works which I had been fed up at home" [at the Peabody Institute of Music], and instead was given a "menu" of works by Wagner, Liszt, and Moussorgsky.56 Hopkins' omission of any allusion to a classic composer was, perhaps, unique among the discourses by Dvořák's pupils. An explanation for this, however, might relate to the fact that Hopkins was a post graduate student--having had a previous exposure to those "dry scholastic works."

With the exception of this last noted inconsistency, most of the pupils concurred on the majority of issues pertaining to Dvořák's teaching methods. Composition and orchestration were taught as a unit. The class, which was small in number, would meet for two hours, three times per week. The construction of a melody, along with its development, was the main point of a lesson; orchestration was of secondary importance. Although there were some conflicting claims as to the stress accorded the modern composers, there was general agreement that the workmanship of the classic composers was the ideal to which the pupils were to strive.

55 Downes, loc. cit. 56 Ibid.
The tacit denial of any reference whatsoever to the subject of nationalism was, however, the most noteworthy disclosure pertaining to these discourses. Not once was the subject of the potential inherent in Negro and Red Indian melodies mentioned as having been a part of his class teaching; therefore, although the subject of nationalism was greatly emphasized during and after his American sojourn, Dvořák avoided direct reference to this issue in his class. It is interesting to note, in this respect, that the emphasis given to orchestration--another of Dvořák's stronger characteristics--was also at a minimum.

Dvořák's Conducting Activities

The number of references to this topic has been more negligible than those regarding his composition class. Perhaps even more significant was the fact that the Conservatory itself, which always took advantage of any added publicity, made scant mention of any Dvořák accomplishments in this field. This fact was implied in a pamphlet "The National Conservatory Orchestra" (Judge Bayes' papers), which presented a history of the Orchestra from 1898-1901. The most salient point of the pamphlet was the omission of any reference whatsoever to Dvořák's name. The pamphlet also established that the series of orchestral concerts had begun in 1898 (which was three years after Dvořák's permanent departure from America).

It should be noted, however, that the dearth of evidence regarding Dvořák and the Conservatory Orchestra is
explained by the fact that public concerts by the Orchestra were prohibited during his tenure, "owing to the restrictions of the Musical Mutual Protective Union." The Union stated that no union members (professional musicians) were allowed to perform with non-union members. Dvořák had to cope with an amateur orchestra, devoid of any outside assistance. Therefore, it was probably a matter of expediency that prevented Dvořák from conducting the proposed number of concerts stipulated by the contract, since the pupils, having been comparatively young, were doubtless incapable of a performance worthy of their director.

A memorandum written by Mrs. Thurber reported that Dvořák's conducting duties were a financial failure. Mrs. Thurber wrote:

In addition to Dvořák's Conservatory salary of $15,000 annually, he wished to conduct six concerts, the receipts of which he thought would help meet his salary which was considered exorbitant by the Trustees. He gave one concert which was not a success financially. Fearing that he might not wish to return, it was decided to give up the other concerts. . . . [Mrs. Forell's papers.]

The document bore no date, but there is a strong indication that it was written around the time approximating the signing of the second contract (April 28, 1894), for the second contract contained two major differences as compared with the first agreement: (1) the salary was considerably altered

---

57 Notice of these restrictions were given in a letter of Nov. 27, 1897, from a committee of four to the President of the Union. This letter, requesting that an amendment be made, was reprinted in the Conservatory's catalog and pamphlet for the years 1912 and 1916, and also appeared in the pamphlet of the Conservatory's Orchestra, mentioned above. The letter noting the amendment was also reprinted and included in these sources (Judge Bayes' papers).
from $15,000 to $8,000; (2) the item regarding the six concerts was deleted from the second contract.

In other words, the item pertaining to Dvořák's conducting six concerts originated under the assumption that these concerts would be financial successes; since there had been no public orchestral concerts prior to Dvořák's tenure, the Conservatory was unaware that the Protective Union prohibited professional musicians from performing with non-union members (the Conservatory's pupils). Thus, the Conservatory was greatly hampered in taking full advantage of Dvořák's name in the area of conducting.

It should be noted, though, that the catalog of 1894-95 did contain a program in which Dvořák's name appeared in connection with the Conservatory Orchestra. The catalog stated: "Following is a specimen program of the Conservatory concerts, several of which take place every year."

The program was then given (see page 278). This same program was also included in a pamphlet for 1916 in order to show a "specimen of the concerts given by the . . . Orchestra under Dr. Dvořák."

It can be seen that the program itself was not especially noteworthy in regard to the composition or compositions conducted by Dvořák at that concert (there is some ambiguity as to whether the works other than the Haydn Symphony were under Dvořák's direction). If Dvořák had conducted other concerts, Mrs. Thurber doubtless would have included other specimens of programs. It must be remembered that as late as 1915,
this program was used as an example of a concert directed by Dvořák.

It is interesting to note that Mrs. Thurber did not include another of Dvořák's concerts—the one in which he conducted the Orchestra and a chorus in the first performance of his own arrangement of "Old Folks at Home," January 23, 1894. The significance of this program was the all-Negro chorus. (This program will be discussed in chapter vi). Thus, with the exception of this concert, Dvořák's appearances as conductor of the Conservatory Orchestra were of limited significance and would account for the apparent neglect which Mrs. Thurber had given to this area of Dvořák's accomplishments.

There is, however, evidence suggesting that Dvořák was, in fact, a failure as a conductor. Shelley, who spoke in such favorable terms when describing Dvořák as a teacher, was brutally critical of his conducting abilities. Shelley said:

... He was an abominable orchestral leader. Really very bad. No beat. No individuality. He was led hither and thither by the sounds, created by himself to charm, into bodily antics which would never be permitted the man between the orchestra and the audience. 58

In the interview with Bedřich Vaska, spoken of earlier in this chapter, the subject of Dvořák's conducting was discussed. Vaska carried the best credentials to qualify as a judge of conducting procedures, having been a cellist with the New York Philharmonic and the Metropolitan Opera Orchestra, as well as

58 Shelley, "Dvořák" (Aug., 1913), op. cit., p. 542.
a member of the Prague Conservatory Orchestra under Dvořák. Vaská, too, gave a very unfavorable report, explaining, in effect, that Dvořák never took his eyes away from the music.

Finally, it should also be remembered that Dvořák was very naive; for example, among his first impressions upon arriving in America was, as previously noted, a feeling that the Americans looked upon him as a savior. He apparently did not have the dictatorial nature perhaps necessary for leading a large orchestra; he was too pure of heart, as Ladislav Dolanský (1857-1910)—Czech music critic—reflected. Dvořák's soul, according to Dolanský, "was so crystal clear in its purity . . . that he stood like a giant. . . ." His character was stamped, Dolanský added, by "lofty simplicity, sincerity, and honesty which is the hallmark of spiritual nobility."59

It would appear, therefore, that Dvořák's lofty spirit and a lack of conducting mechanics were not adaptable to the needs of the amateur pupils of the Conservatory; knowledge of this, along with the fact that professional musicians were prohibited from participating in the Conservatory Orchestra, would explain the relative failure of Dvořák as a conductor.

From the foregoing, it may be concluded that Dvořák's influence on the growth of the Orchestra was very limited. While it is true that the Orchestra did not begin its series of concerts until 1898—three years after Dvořák had left America—it should also be recognized that his coming to

59 Sourek, Letters, p. 17.
America did, in fact, prompt the Conservatory to establish an orchestral class, which hitherto had been nonexistent. The orchestral class was advertised as offering "instruction free under the direction of Dr. Antonín Dvořák."60

Dvořák did, however, conduct several concerts with groups other than the Conservatory Orchestra. These concerts—devoted primarily to his own compositions—served a double purpose: to spread his own fame as a composer and also to spread the fame of the Conservatory, which indirectly benefited by Dvořák's identification as the director of the Conservatory. The following is a summary of his conducting engagements, including the time, the place, and the works performed:

1. His first public appearance in America as a conductor took place, as previously noted, in New York City, October 21, 1892. The all-Dvořák program consisted of the Te Deum and the three Overtures (Op. 91-93): In Natures Realm (V Přírodě), Carnival (Karneval), and Othello. The orchestra, according to Šourek, was the Boston Symphony;61 however, a news item (as previously mentioned) reported that the performing group was to be the Metropol Orchestra of eighty members and a chorus of three hundred.62 The orchestra was probably the Boston Symphony, since the welcoming speech at the performance was given by Colonel Thomas W. Higginson, founder of the Boston Symphony Orchestra.

---

60 Advertisement in all newspapers, Oct. 29, 1892.
61 Šourek, Letters, p. 150.
62 News item appearing in all papers, Oct. 9, 1892.
2. The second engagement was on November 17, 1892, when he conducted the Philharmonic Society of New York, in his Symphony in D major, Op. 60 (1880). This work, known as his Symphony No. 1 (because it was the first published), was actually his Sixth Symphony.

3. The third engagement was in Boston, November 29 and 30, 1892, when Dvořák conducted the Requiem, Op. 89 (1890)—"for the workers" (November 29) and "for the wealthy and the intelligentsia" (November 30). The performing group was the musical society "Cecilie" in Boston.\[63\]

4. The fourth engagement was in New York on April 6, 1893, conducting the Philharmonic Society in the Hussite Overture (Husitká), Op. 67 (1883), and a dramatic cantata The Spectre's Bride (Svatební Košile), Op. 69 (1884). The cantata, written for solo voices, chorus, and orchestra, was based on the text of the ballad of the same name by Karl Jaromír Erben (1811-1870), whose many ballads were to be used by Dvořák during the last few years of the composer's life.

5. Dvořák's fifth public appearance was in connection with the Czech Day celebration taking place at the Columbian World's Exhibition in Chicago on August 12, 1893. Dvořák had spent the summer of 1893 in Spillville, Iowa (a Czech colony), and he decided to join in the Chicago Czech Day festivities. On that day, he conducted the Festival Orchestra of 114 members in a performance of the Symphony in G major, Op. 88 (1889); Slavonic Dances (6, 2, and 3), Op. 72; and his overture My Country (Domov Můj), Op. 62 (1882).

Although it can be seen that his engagements did stress nationalism (at least insofar as Czech nationalism was concerned), there was nevertheless a notable absence of American works on the programs. It should be noted, in this respect, that the Symphony *From the New World* never received a performance in America under the composer's direction.

**Administrative Duties**

With the exception of his duties as adjudicator for the numerous prize competitions, Dvořák had very few responsibilities regarding policy making at the Conservatory. Several facts substantiated this claim: (1) In a letter to Hlávka, as mentioned previously, Dvořák wrote that Mrs. Thurber "looks after the administrative side herself."64 (2) The contracts did not contain any reference to administrative duties. (3) The contract specified that Dvořák was in no way responsible to the Conservatory during vacation periods, therefore reducing possible opportunities for Dvořák to confer with the Conservatory's officers and trustees. (4) Finally, the "Minutes" of the Conservatory's trustee meetings, which took place during Dvořák's tenure, were examined by the investigator; these records showed that Dvořák never participated at any meeting, and, for that matter, his name was never mentioned. (Judge Bayes' papers.)

His duties as adjudicator of the prize competitions were accomplished quite rapidly, according to Dvořák, who

64 Letter from Dvořák to Mr. & Mrs. Josef Hlávka, Nov. 27, 1892, from Šourek, *ibid.*
explained that, although numerous compositions were submitted to him, he needed only to look at the first page to determine the worth of the entry. The catalog of 1894-95 (Judge Bayes' papers) gave an account of the first year's awards. The four recipients along with their respective compositions were the following: Henry Schoenefeld (Rural Symphony), Joshua Phippen (Piano Concerto in C minor), Frederick Bullard (Suite for String Orchestra), Horatio W. Parker (Dream King and His Love, a cantata).

It can be seen that there were no awards given in the media of grand opera or opera comique—both of which were included in the numerous composition categories of which Dvořák was the main judge. (App. A, 271.) The catalog also quoted a New York Evening Post editorial which, noting the absence of an opera award, added that the opera prize was to be the competition's main concern during the following year. It should be noted, however, that an award was given for the best libretto during the first year; this prize was awarded to Marguerite Merrington for her Daphne text. Mrs. Thurber mentioned this particular libretto in an undated letter (probably 1894) to Dvořák. (App. B, 306.) She requested that Dvořák examine only the music which had been written to Daphne and disregard the text. This implied that Dvořák was in no way connected with the category of libretto judging, and thus contradicted the catalog's statement—namely, that Dvořák was head of the jury, for the libretto prize. It would

65 Ibid., p. 152.
indeed be difficult to consider Dvořák being capable of judging a libretto in English, since his own English was comparatively poor. In this respect, it was pointed out (in chapter ii) that his own operas, too, suffered from poor libretti.

The 1894-95 catalog referred to the second year of the competitions, stating that the same conditions which had prevailed for the first contest would be in effect for the second year's awards. There was, however, only one prize noted in the catalog; this was for the best symphony—to George W. Chadwick.

One of the few noteworthy documents of the Dvořák-Thurber correspondence, specifically referring to his work at the Conservatory, was a letter to Mrs. Thurber suggesting some changes in the prize competitions. (App. B, 305.) Although the letter was undated (probably an interoffice memorandum), it may be assumed that it was written at least after his first year's tenure, since the letter began with a reference to the preceding year's work at the Conservatory. The letter revealed that he held an unfavorable opinion regarding the opera entries; he was even inclined to omit this award entirely from the competition. He also suggested that revisions be made in the prize money: "The prices [prizes] for symphony would be $400; for overture--$250; for concerto (piano or violin)--$300." Finally, he suggested that the "latest day for the competition would be December 15," instead of October 15, which previously had been the latest date when manuscripts were still accepted. This request was
to permit Dvořák the opportunity of devoting more time to ex-
aming the entries.

The 1894-95 catalog contained the conditions for the 
competition of 1894-95; these clearly revealed that Dvořák's 
letter, quoted above, was instrumental in the revised list 
of awards for the third year of the competitions. In agree-
ment with his letter, the competition excluded all categories 
except symphony, overture, cantata, and concerto. Although 
the new prizes were not in exact accord with the figures 
suggested by Dvořák, there was enough similarity to warrant 
a conclusion that Dvořák's suggestions were influential in 
the newly revised statement which read "For the best symphony 
--$300; for piano or violin concerto--$200."

Aside from Dvořák's requesting that the categories 
be limited and that the prizes be reduced (except for the 
concerto), another factor regarding the revisions for the 
1894-95 competitions could relate to the Panic of 1893 in 
which Francis B. Thurber (Mrs. Thurber's husband) lost his 
entire fortune. It was reported that he "never recovered 
from that loss and was forced to sign a petition of bank-
ruptcy in 1901, his total liabilities being more than 
$250,000."66 The Panic of 1893 might also account for the 
many other problems which beset the Conservatory during 
Dvořák's tenure, and it could easily account for the finan-
cial difficulties which Dvořák had with the Conservatory.

66 Obituary notice of Francis B. Thurber, *New York 
Daily Tribune*, July 5, 1907.
These financial problems will be discussed later in this chapter.

The general conditions for the third competition (1894-95) remained essentially the same as they had appeared in the first competition. The final date of acceptance of the manuscripts, however, was changed from October 15 to November 15 (one month earlier than the date that Dvořák had suggested).

Later catalogs and pamphlets (1912 and 1916) alluded to the subject of these competitions, but referred only to the first competition. Apparently, the competitions were eventually discarded because of lack of finances. It may therefore be assumed that Dvořák's work in regard to these competitions was of no special significance. The disclosures, however, revealed that (1) he apparently disliked American operas, and (2) none of his pupils received an award.

Other Conservatory Changes Manifested During Dvořák's Tenure

A noteworthy occurrence at the Conservatory from 1892-95 was the increased enrollment of Negro students. On May 16, 1893, a "Letter to the Editor" written by Mrs. Thurber appeared in several newspapers announcing that the Conservatory would "enlarge its sphere of usefulness by adding to its department a branch for the instruction in music of colored pupils of talent, largely with the view of forming colored professors of merit." This letter was reprinted in the 1894-95 catalog. Mrs. Thurber also mentioned that Dvořák was very enthusiastic regarding this idea, and that he would
"assist its fruition by sympathetic and active co-operation."

After quoting the letter of May 16, 1893, the catalog added that the "new department is already in a flourishing condition," referring to the 1893-94 school year. It should be noted that Dvořák himself was strongly responsible for the developments in this area as he had not only written the "New World" Symphony and his other American works--based presumably on Negro style--but that he was also very outspoken on this subject of the potential of Negro music; this matter will be discussed in chapter vi ("nationalism"). Suffice it to say that the favorable publicity given to the Negro in connection with the "New World" Symphony was doubtless influential in the Conservatory's positive approach in aiding Negro students.

It should be noted that the Conservatory's statement regarding its policy of acceptance--"to those of every race, creed, and color"--did not appear in the Conservatory's catalogs prior to Dvořák's sojourn. Therefore, James Huneker's statement, "What Mrs. Thurber has done for the Negro alone will, I hope, be credited to her account in any history of the colored race," might have been more applicable if Dvořák's name, as well as Mrs. Thurber's, had been mentioned.

General Considerations Regarding Dvořák and the National Conservatory

The main topic of discussion found in the Dvořák-Thurber correspondence was that of salary payments. Other subjects such as his teaching and conducting duties were

scarcely mentioned. This would imply two conclusions:

(1) Dvořák's major problem during his American sojourn was with the fulfilling of his salary arrangements; (2) his actual work at the Conservatory was relatively inconsequential (insofar as Mrs. Thurber was concerned) regarding what or how he taught. It should be noted that in the discourses written on Dvořák in America, very little attention was given to the topic of the financial problem between him and Mrs. Thurber. In fact, a tacit admission is contained in the discourses that the only significance of Dvořák's sojourn was relative to the subject of nationalism--either manifested by his American compositions or through his own discourses on the subject.

The following discussion, based primarily on the Dvořák-Thurber correspondence, will attempt to show that these financial problems were greatly influential in his ultimate decision to leave America forever in 1895.

It is significant that his first year in America (1892-93) was comparatively happy, although four of his six children had been left behind in Bohemia. According to Kovařík, he was "more free from care" in New York than he had previously been in Prague.68 Dvořák himself wrote, in April 1893, that he was "fit as a fiddle and in good heart and (except for some trifles) very well off."69 There were very few Dvořák-Thurber letters during that school

---


69Dvořák to Dr. Emil Kozánek, April 4, 1893, from Šourek, *ibid.*
year, further implying that his relationship with the Conservatory was satisfactory. Dvořák was primarily concerned with the Symphony *From the New World*, Op. 95, composed between January 10 and May 24 of 1893. Although the Conservatory had established a summer session in 1893, Dvořák did not feel the necessity of teaching during those months, but rather chose to spend some time in Spillville, Iowa.

He had arranged for his other children to come to America in order for him to vacation with them in Spillville instead of in Bohemia. The Spillville venture was highly productive: while there, he completed the orchestration for the "New World" Symphony and also wrote the String Quartet in F major, Op. 96 (June 8 to 23), and the String Quintet in E flat major, Op. 97 (June 27 to August 1). He wrote to Mrs. Thurber, on July 29, that he was grateful for her "kindness and generosity" regarding the arrangements being made for his attending Czech Day at the Chicago Exhibition (App. B, 301: letter of July 29, 1893). The tone of the letter was completely friendly and happy, thus revealing that his relationship with Mrs. Thurber had been comparatively free of any strain. In another letter to Dr. Kozánek, he wrote that his three months in Spillville were very enjoyable primarily because it was spent being "among our own people, our Czech countrymen. . . ."70 This implied that his longing for Bohemia was strongly present, even though his relationship with the Conservatory was satisfactory, and he had his whole

70 Dvořák to Kozánek, Sept. 15, 1893, from Šourek, *ibid.*, p. 165.
family in America. Furthermore, his letter to Kozánek mentioned that there was talk of his remaining in America forever; Dvořák quickly dispelled all doubts, with a decisive "Oh no, never!" Although he admitted that he was "very well off here," and that he never would have composed the Symphony, Quartet, and Quintet "just so if I had not seen America," he nevertheless failed to explain exactly why he would not consider remaining in America; strongly implied, though, is the idea that he would miss his homeland.

Finally, a letter to Simrock, dated July 28, 1893 (App. B, 300), clearly indicated that he was totally satisfied with his working arrangements at the Conservatory: "Thank God I can compose for my own pleasure. I am almost independent. I make 60,000 marks ($15,000) so that I am permitted lots of time to compose."^71

The above documents, therefore, imply that Dvořák was well satisfied with his American venture, at least during the first year. The second and third years of his visit were not nearly so productive nor satisfying. Contrary to Kovařík's assertion,^72 Dvořák's second year was not the happiest year of his life, since it was a period of many frustrations, primarily regarding his salary payments.

In the Dvořák-Thurber correspondence (including letters and inter-office memoranda), there was an extended

---

^71 Original letter from Dvořák to Simrock written in German. This document is also found in Šourek, *ibid.* (in the English translation only), p. 162.

succession of letters regarding the salary problem; practically every letter written between March 19, 1894, and September 4, 1896, pointed to this issue. In noting the following letters, the reader should be cognizant of the circumstances underlying these financial problems. It should be recalled that Mr. Thurber (the main financier of the Conservatory) had suffered a sharp financial setback in the Panic of 1893. As early as November 15, 1893, he wrote to his lawyer, Judge Choate, that "one of my griefs has been that I have just been trembling on the brink of bankruptcy for months...." (App. B, 302: letter of November 15, 1893.) This would account for the delay in Dvořák's salary payments.

Mrs. Thurber's letter of March 17, 1894 (App. B, 303), implied that Dvořák was aware that the country was in the midst of a depression, and that he would understand the delay in his salary payment; she wrote: "You doubtless know that owing to the hard times, everyone has had more or less difficulty to meet their obligations. This explains the delay in the prompt payment of your salary this season." She added that in compensation for this delay, he would receive six per cent interest; the delay would take until October 15, 1894. In other words, Dvořák apparently had not received any of the monthly payments for his second year of teaching, that is, he had not received the $7,500 to be paid in eight monthly payments; the other half of his salary was paid before the start of the school year of 1893-94.

Dvořák's reaction to Mrs. Thurber's request was of a highly indignant nature and suggested that he could no longer
tolerate this situation; his letter of April 4, 1894, to Mrs. Thurber was as follows (grammatical and spelling errors not corrected):

Dear Madame Thurber,

I have waited till now but I am exceedingly sorry that circumstances force me to write to you, I must inform you I cannot wait no longer.

I love the American people very much and it has been my desire to help Art in the United States, but the necessities of life go hand in hand with Art, and tough though I personally care very little for worldly things, I cannot see my wife and children in trouble. If circumstances are such that I cannot receive my salary according to the Contract I shall submit the case to the "Board of Trustees" and if I cannot have immediate attention from them I will publish my situation to the world.

Without any other feeling than that of profound regrets,--I beg you to give this your immediate attention, as it is absolutely impossible for me to wait any longer. A delay will force me to publish the situation which I would like to have kept secret. 73

This letter is interesting in many respects. It confirms the belief that Dvořák had been terribly disturbed during his second year (contrary to Kovářík's assertion). It should be noted, in this respect, that this discord was kept silent. He not only refrained from publishing this financial difficulty, as he threatened, but he also refrained from divulging this anxiety to his friends. This would imply a sincerity regarding his feeling of profound regrets; moreover, he had the desire to further, or at least not damage, the cause of art in the United States. One further item of interest was his disregard for all worldly things except his own family; this is in accord with an earlier suggestion that Mrs. Dvořák

73A copy of this letter was made by Dr. Clapham, who had located it in Prague among the papers in possession of Mrs. Julie Dvořáková, Dvořák's daughter-in-law.
handled the family finances.\textsuperscript{74}

Mrs. Thurber partly complied with Dvořák's request, on April 20, 1894, when she sent $2,000 in part payment. (Letter of April 20, 1894.\textsuperscript{75}) His response was still one of disappointment mixed with threats to expose the situation. (Undated letter.) On April 21, Mrs. Thurber replied, "I think your answer is rather unkind." This letter also referred to the contract (of April 28, 1894), which was not to be discussed until a settlement was made concerning Dvořák's grievances. On April 28, the day the contract was signed, Mrs. Thurber wrote to Dvořák assuring him that the 1893-94 salary would be remitted "on or before October 8, 1894"; if the salary were not paid, the new contract could be annulled if Dvořák so desired. (App. B, 304: letter of April 28, 1894.)

Dvořák received another $1,000 on May 15 (letter of May 15, 1894), four days before he was to depart for Bohemia, where he spent the summer of 1894. It should be noted here that his longing for Bohemia had grown quite intense, even though he had all his children in America at that time. As early as February 25, 1894 (before the financial difficulties had come to the surface), Dvořák was reported to have yearned for Bohemia. This fact was revealed in a letter from Dvořák's sister-in-law, Mrs. Terezia Koutecká, who accompanied Dvořák's

\textsuperscript{74}This finding was established by Dr. Clapham, who wrote that he had learned of this fact from Prague sources. Personal letter from John Clapham, July 10, 1964.

\textsuperscript{75}This letter as well as most of the ensuing documents in this section, unless otherwise stated, are in the possession of Dvořák's heirs.
children to America in May 1893. Mrs. Koutecká wrote to Alois Göbl, an intimate friend of Dvořák, that: "In spite of his splendid position and material prosperity, he is terribly homesick for his country. . . . On my departure from New York . . . Dvořák broke into tears and said 'If I could, I should go with you. . . .'"76

Dvořák was in Bohemia from May 30 until October 16, 1894, when he, his wife, and his son, Otakar, left once more for New York. Most of that summer was spent "peacefully in the summer retreat at Vysoká."77 Mrs. Thurber kept in constant touch with Dvořák during that time. On August 2, 1894, she wrote one of the few letters which did not allude to the salary problems. Enclosed in her letter was a copy of the Illustrated American (August 4, 1894), which lauded the name of Dvořák and spoke of the great work that the Conservatory was accomplishing. One particularly interesting point was to assert that America was still prone to believe that a good musical education necessitated studying abroad; the article said: "We are still children in America, still in awe of Europe. Let Dvořák live in Prague, and we are all mad to study under him. Bring him to New York, and lo, we must go to some inferior mind in Europe."78 Another paragraph of the article was sure to please Mrs. Thurber and was bound to

76Letter from Terezia Koutecká to Alois Göbl, Feb. 25, 1894, from Sourek, Letters, pp. 174-75.

77Ibid., p. 180.

influence Dvořák's anticipation for his return sojourn, besides reminding him of the problems which beset the Conservatory. The paragraph declared that Dvořák's main purpose for staying in America was, according to Dvořák, his belief that "I was engaged in a great national work. . . ." He was reported to have stated the following:

"I have no right to waste the influence of my name. It is a matter of great regret to me that the American form of government does not permit Congress to provide for the support of the National Conservatory. It is a great burden for private enterprise to carry. While the work is conducted on a high and pure plane, for the sake of art alone, the Conservatory must always be supported by wealthy friends of music. The magnificent corps of professors and teachers is the result of a generous policy that could not be pursued by a college of music organized as a business scheme for profit. I stay in America because I recognize the National Conservatory as one of the foremost schools of the world, and I am proud to be at the head of it."79

This would imply that Dvořák was informed on all important matters regarding the Conservatory, including its means of financial support. Mrs. Thurber apparently had him well indoctrinated into believing that government support of the Conservatory was the only means of running a music school, and further that all other music schools were primarily business schemes. In any case, the article was sent to Dvořák in the hope that it might possibly ease his anxieties over the still-pending salary problems.

Mrs. Thurber sent a telegram on August 9, 1894, stating that the balance of his 1893-94 salary would be paid by October 6, 1894. Dvořák answered this cable, as well as her letter of August 2, by a long discourse on his fear that

79 Ibid., p. 137.
not only would his salary for 1893-94 remain unpaid, but that his salary for the 1894-95 year would cause a similar conflict.\textsuperscript{80} The letter contained a further remark on his threatening to expose this untenable situation to the world; Dvořák said: "Believe me that prosperity and success of the National Conservatory is of much consequence to you as well as to me, and I never should like to take such measures which would suffer any damage to the good reputation of the National Conservatory." He acknowledged having received the \textit{Illustrated American}, as well as the telegram of August 9; thus, the date of this undated letter was probably immediately after the telegram arrived, that is, around August 9 or 10.

On September 7, Mrs. Thurber wrote that Dvořák would receive the balance of his last year's salary before he was to sail (October 16); on September 26, she wrote that "part of the $7,500" would be sent by October 8, and that "the other part not later than October 16." Dvořák, however, answered this by a telegram of October 12, stating that there was still a possibility of his not coming "without receiving all."

No further correspondence (prior to the date of his sailing) was uncovered. A letter of November 1894 (exact date not given) implied, however, that his total salary for 1893-94 had still not been paid, since a notation at the bottom of the letter stated: January 15--$2,000 of 1893-94. This meant that he would receive the balance of last year's (1893-94) salary on January 15, 1895.

\textsuperscript{80}Letter--Dvořák to Mrs. Thurber, Aug. [10], 1894 (Dvořák's heirs).
Thus, it can be seen that Dvořák was continually frustrated in regard to his salary payments during the second and third years of his American sojourn. Although it is true that his whole family was with him during the second year (perhaps softening to some extent the financial anxieties which constantly nagged at him), that second year could hardly be considered the happiest, in the light of the foregoing evidence.

Furthermore, his compositions of 1893-94 and 1894-95 were perhaps of lesser significance than the first year's (1892-93) output, which had included such works as the Symphony From the New World, Op. 95; the Quartet, Op. 96; and the Quintet, Op. 97. There follows, below, a short account of the compositions written during his last two years in America. The works (arrangements not included) are listed in chronological order; the opus numbers were not in accord with the actual order in which the works were composed: Sonatina in G major (for violin and piano), Op. 100, composed between November 19 and December 3, 1893; Suite in A major (for piano), Op. 98, composed between February 19 and March 1, 1894; Biblical Songs (for voice and piano), Op. 99, composed between March 5 and March 26, 1894.

It is interesting to note, at this point, that there were no further works written until the summer of 1894, when Dvořák was back in Bohemia. Therefore, the period from early

---

81 All dates in this section were taken from Jarmil Burghauser, Antonín Dvořák: Thematic Catalogue (Prague: Artia, 1960).
April until the end of that school year—the period which witnessed the outward manifestations of his salary entanglements—also witnessed a gap in his composition output. This would further solidify the assumption that his second year of tenure was not particularly satisfying.

There was only one new work composed during his third year in America: Concerto for Violoncello and Orchestra, Op. 104, November 8, 1894—February 9, 1895, and later revised, July 11, 1895. (It should be noted that Op. 102 was The American Flag, and Op. 103 was the Te Deum—both of which were written before his American sojourn.)

The other works composed during those two school years were not new as such, but were arrangements: "Rondo in G minor," Op. 94 (for violoncello and orchestra), composed between November 16-22, 1893; "Silent Woods," Op. 68 \[sic\] (for violoncello and orchestra), November 28, 1893; Biblical Songs, Op. 99, was set to voice and orchestra, January 4-8, 1895; Suite in A major, Op. 98b, was arranged for orchestra, January 19—February [?], 1895. One other work was at least started in New York: the first movement of the String Quartet in A flat major, Op. 105, written in March of 1895; the work was completed in Bohemia on December 30, 1895.

The foregoing is a list of the total compositional output for the second and third years of Dvořák's American sojourn. It can be seen that his first year, 1892-93, produced the most significant works of his American sojourn, and thus coincided with the satisfying working arrangements he had with the Conservatory. On the other hand, the last two years
of his compositional productivity equally reflected the comparatively poor relationship between him and the Conservatory.

**Why Dvořák Would Not Return to America After 1895**

The second contract (App. A, 273: Agreement of April 28, 1894) stipulated that Dvořák was to continue his post at the Conservatory throughout the 1895-96 school year; however, at the completion of the 1894-95 season, Dvořák returned to Bohemia and chose never to return to America. Several reasons accounted for this decision.

During his third year of residence in America, he had only his wife and younger son, Otakar, living with him; the other five children remained in Prague. Thus, he was naturally despondent over the distance separating him and his children. He also did not experience the creative urge that he would have wished; for example, when he was completing the Finale to the Violoncello Concerto in January, 1895, he wrote to Josef Boleška (a composer in Prague) that the Concerto "would have been finished long ago" if he had been in Vysoká—"free from cares." He added that his work at the Conservatory prevented him from composing as much as he would have liked, and also that he frequently was not "always in the mood" to compose. This further explains the relatively few new works written during this period. In other words, Dvořák was dissatisfied by things in general during the last months of

---

82 Sourek, *Letters,*
his third year in America. Separated from his children, he was doubly unhappy because the Conservatory work did not afford much time or inspiration for his own creative efforts.

It should be noted that although Stefan mentioned the topic of Dvořák's reluctance to return to America, he failed to note, or, for that matter, was completely unaware that the second contract had contained the clause relevant to the supposition that Dvořák was to return for the 1895-96 school year. The following account, therefore, was based primarily on previously unresearched data; it is supplemented by evidence collected by Stefan.

It appears that Mrs. Thurber was optimistic in regard to Dvořák's return for the 1895-96 season, since she sent a telegram, dated approximately July 10, 1895, stating that reservations had been made on the Augusta Victoria leaving from Hamburg on October 14. Following this, she wrote a letter of July 18 (Dvořák's heirs), confirming the telegram of "last week"; however, the date of the departure was to be October 17. The letter also referred to Dvořák's having made arrangements with Adele Margulies (Conservatory piano teacher who previously had been the intermediary when Dvořák was chosen in 1891 to come to America). Mrs. Thurber, according to the arrangements, was to send $3,700 on September 15 and $4,000 on October 15. These figures were not in accord with the contract (App A, 273) which stated that $5,000 was to be the amount paid in advance of his salary for 1895-96;

83 Telegram from Mrs. Thurber to Dvořák [n. d., approximately July 10, 1895]. (Dvořák's heirs.)
evidently, there was either an increase in the salary (instead of $10,000, the salary was to be close to $15,000), or else Dvořák had not received his entire salary for 1894-95. The fact that Dvořák had contemplated returning to America would perhaps offset the likelihood that his past year's salary had not been paid in full.

Dvořák apparently was reluctant to speak of the possible return to America, at least until a definite decision could be made. On August 13, 1895, he wrote to Dr. Tragy, director of the Prague Conservatory, requesting a meeting to discuss the matter. It is interesting to note Dvořák's denial of having heard anything in regard to a departure for America on October 17; he wrote that he was surprised to learn from the newspapers that he was going to New York by the ship Augusta Victoria on October 17, since the report had "no foundation." In fact, he also indicated that a decision had been made: "Just now, I can simply tell you that I and my wife, having discussed it with Councillor Hlavka, have resolutely agreed that because of family reasons we cannot go to America again." Apparently, the news item publicizing Dvořák's return to America forced him into a decision-making position. He realized that there was now a possibility of antagonizing Dr. Tragy, his employer in Prague, if the situation were not quickly settled (hence, the letter to Tragy).

Soon afterwards, he wrote to Mrs. Thurber announcing his decision not to return. This letter from Dvořák to

---

84 Otakar Šourek, Antonín Dvořák Přátelům Doma (Prague: 1941), p. 205. [Trans. from the Czech by Miss H. Neumannová.]
Mrs. Thurber, dated August 17, 1895 (App. B, 307), was extremely important because: (1) the reason governing his decision was fully explained, and (2) further insight into the relationship between Dvořák and the Conservatory, as well as Dvořák's regard for the Conservatory, was implicit. The letter corroborated what Dvořák had written to Dr. Tragy, that is, family matters prevented his returning to America: both he and his wife were reluctant to be separated from their children again, and, because of illnesses and schooling, it was deemed advisable to keep the children in Prague. Much of the letter was a detailed account of the various illnesses affecting the Dvořák children at that time.

The final paragraph revealed Dvořák's apparent admiration for Mrs. Thurber: "... You know well how much I value your friendship, how much I admire your love for music, for its development you have done so much...." He added that he hoped Mrs. Thurber would agree that his reasons for refusing to return to America were valid. The letter ended "with highest esteem," and was co-signed by Mrs. Dvořák as well as by Dvořák himself.

The letter also referred to Dvořák's having had a meeting with Miss Margulies at Vysoká on June 17, 1895. Apparently, Dvořák had given encouragement to the idea of his return during that meeting, since most of his remarks pertained to the events after June 17. In effect, Dvořák was optimistic—at least until June 17—in regard to his return. From the general tone of the letter, as well as from its salient points, it may be assumed that the relationship
between Dvořák and Mrs. Thurber improved substantially over what it had been the preceding year.

There is, to the writer's knowledge, nothing extant to show that Dvořák was actually released from fulfilling the second contract which had stipulated his continuing service to the Conservatory through the 1895-96 season; therefore, it might be reasoned that his letter was purposely constructed in a conciliatory tone in order to have this release from the contract. In other words, it can be argued that if Dvořák had taken an antagonistic position in regard to his unwillingness to return, a possibility existed of his being forced to fulfill the contract. Although Mrs. Thurber complied with Dvořák's implied wish of being released from the contract--at least for the 1895-96 season--she nevertheless continued her hold on him for the next two years: preceding both the 1896-97 and the 1897-98 school years, Dvořák was implored to resume his duties in America.

According to the available evidence, more than one year elapsed before Mrs. Thurber renewed her efforts for Dvořák's return. In a letter of September 4, 1896 (App. B, 309), she assured him that America was recovering from the depression which had struck in 1893, and that "the country will again be prosperous. . . ." She reasoned that with the coming election of a Republican president (McKinley), "which now seems assured," prosperity would certainly follow, thereby permitting "support of our educational work which will enable us to proceed on a scale worthy of the country and you." It is significant that the issue of America's recovery
was stressed; this would imply that Mrs. Thurber was cognizant of Dvořák's apprehension (if such a fear actually did exist) concerning salary payments. It is also worthy of note that no acknowledgment was made regarding Dvořák's family matters, a topic which ostensibly had been the primary reason for his refusal to return in 1895.

Mrs. Thurber's letter was rather patronizing, stating: "The good deed sown by you during your stay with us has born fruit; the musical feeling in America is fast developing and, under truly great direction, great results must follow." Identifying Dvořák as the one person who could "direct this evolution," she asserted that Dvořák had "earned the respect, admiration, and love of the musical masses in this country."

Dvořák replied that he still maintained the "greatest interest in the development of music in the United States and especially in the broad and intelligent work of the National Conservatory." (App. B, 310: unsigned and undated letter from Dvořák to Mrs. Thurber in answer to Mrs. Thurber's letter of September 4, 1896.) Referring to the prize competitions, he pointed out that this area in particular was the most interesting, and that it needed to be carried forward; this would be his principal work. No mention was made to a possible return in 1896, but he thought arrangements could be made to permit resumption of his duties in 1897; he added: "In the meantime, you are at liberty to use my name as director. . . ."

It can be seen that there was a mutual accord in the projected plan for Dvořák's return in 1897.
On January 4, 1897, Mrs. Thurber wrote that the New York Herald of January 2 had quoted an article from the Tagblatt (Vienna newspaper), declaring that Dvořák had definitely accepted the position for the 1897-98 season. (App. B, 311: letter of January 4, 1897.) Noting that this statement "could only have come through you [Dvořák] or your friends in Prague," she "was obliged to confirm the statement." Apparently, definite arrangements had yet to be achieved, as witnessed by her request: "Kindly let me know about your contract...." In regard to this contract (possibly the one of April 28, 1894), Mrs. Thurber further requested that its contents be kept secret. Since there is a gap in the available evidence following this letter, the exact nature of the contract to which this letter referred cannot be ascertained.

It is interesting to note that this letter of January 4, 1897, according to extant evidence, was perhaps the last direct communication (with the exception of a telegram) between Mrs. Thurber and Dvořák. The final negotiations, which occurred during the summer of 1897, were between Dvořák and Adele Margulies, who once again acted as an intermediary between the two parties.

During that summer, Dvořák wrote no less than five letters to Miss Margulies. The letters continued to vacillate between acceptance and rejection of the proposed return;

85These letters, covering the period from July 29 to Aug. 20, were uncovered in 1937 by Paul Stefan, who had them translated (presumably from the German) and reprinted in an article: "Why Dvořák Would Not Return to America," Musical
Dvořák himself humourously recognized this characteristic of indecision, writing on July 10 that:

The greatest difficulty lies in my indecision—for I dread the journey to America more than ever! (on account of the children). It is really laughable, but I am like that and in this respect almost incorrigible; yet I will not give up all hope.  

In accordance with the advice of Dr. Tragy, Dvořák wrote (on July 18) of his willingness to return, with the stipulation "that in consideration of my family, I can undertake the journey for only two months." The letter also referred to his wish to be "released... from all bonds of the second contract," as well as a request that this matter under discussion be kept secret; if this information were published in the newspapers before all the arrangements were completed, Dvořák added, "I would not care to negotiate further."  

It would appear that Dvořák was inclined to return, but his next letter (July 30) revealed once again the mood of indecision: "As I already said, I am ready to go, but I cannot make up my mind definitely." He cryptically referred to an


87 Ibid.
imminent trip to Vienna: "Much depends on the trip . . . of which I shall inform you later." No further mention was made of this trip, according to the available evidence. In fact, the next letter (August 20), the final one of the group, not only omitted any reference to the outcome of the trip, but also failed to explain his ultimate decision not to return. The letter did, however, imply that Ďvorák had become very irritated:

It is enough to drive one to despair, the way you [Miss Margulies] want to drag me in! I have already told you that you may announce [perhaps he meant "use"] my name, but I do not want to be under any obligations to the public and Mrs. Thurber as a result! If you absolutely insist on coming, I could perhaps meet you in Budweis. . . .

At the time of the interview with Stefan (in 1937), Miss Margulies was reportedly "unable to recall . . . whether this meeting [in Budweis] actually took place." This letter was the last of the documents which Stefan had uncovered relative to Ďvorák's refusal to return. It can be seen that this final letter failed to reveal any further clues into the matter; in fact, the letter served rather as an abrupt ending, or, for that matter, it left the situation still unresolved. The only remaining data on the subject was a direct communication from Ďvorák to Mrs. Thurber (telegram of August 25, 1897), stating, in Ďvorák's words, "YES CAN USE MY NAME AS DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL CONSERVATORY." (App. B, 312.) The message was cabled from Budweis, the city of the proposed meeting between Ďvorák and Margulies.

88Ibid.
Although the letters which Stefan had discovered were relatively worthless regarding the causes for Dvořák's refusal to return, the documents were valuable in revealing that Dvořák had shown continued interest in the Conservatory as late as the summer of 1897. Also of interest was the discovery that Dvořák had strongly considered a two-month tenure.

However, without having had access to the documents in the period between the summer of 1895 and the summer of 1897, Stefan could not possibly have drawn any conclusions. On the other hand, since the letters of the summer of 1897 continued to refer to family matters, corroborating the letters between 1895-97, a definite conclusion could be drawn that Dvořák's refusal largely stemmed from the family matters mentioned in his letter of August 17, 1895. Finally, it is perhaps most significant that the letters indicated only small traces of Dvořák's antagonisms which previously (during his second year in America) were strongly evident. With this fact in mind, along with the fact regarding permission to use his name as director, one further conclusion may be drawn: The financial problems between Dvořák and the Conservatory had eventually been settled, thereby removing a barrier--apparently the only one--which dissuaded Dvořák from having the highest regard for the Conservatory.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Dvořák's American sojourn lasted from September 1892 until April 1895. With the exception of a visit to Bohemia during the summer of 1894, the three years were spent on
American soil, particularly in New York City, where he was director of the National Conservatory. This chapter attempted to establish the extent to which he influenced American musical thinking as manifested by his duties as educator (teacher of composition and orchestration), conductor, and administrator. It has been pointed out, in this respect, that biographers have neglected these segments of Dvořák's activities, having devoted their attention primarily to Dvořák's American compositions. The present study assumed, however, that there was a considerable amount of significance to be found in these neglected areas.

Although there were instances of Dvořák's having wielded some influence in each of these duties, most of the evidence pointed to the conclusion that his influence was, in fact, rather negligible, particularly in respect to the issue of nationalism. The following is a summary of the findings in each of the areas.

**Teacher**

Composition and orchestration were combined in one unit with the main emphasis given to the former, while orchestration was treated in an understated manner. The construction aspect of a melody, along with its subsequent development, was of primary importance. In this respect, emulation of the classic composers—Beethoven and Schubert in particular—was the channel of approach employed in imparting the concept of
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89 The influence resulting from his American compositions as well as his discourses on the subject of American nationalism will be discussed in chapter vi.
melody and development. No reference was made to the subject of nationalism, and very little attention was given to contemporary composers. It might be surmised that Dvořák stressed the classic over the contemporary because of his own similar learning experience. His class (there were no private lessons) was small and included, in keeping with his own wishes, only highly talented students, none of whom subsequently rose to a level of major importance in the field of composition.

Conductor

Public concerts of the Conservatory Orchestra itself were very limited due to a restriction which prohibited professionals (the Conservatory's faculty) from engaging in performances with amateurs. Therefore, Dvořák was handicapped by having to work with amateurs who were not up to the level of proficiency to enable public performances worthy of Dvořák's leadership. However, it was shown that Dvořák himself lacked the necessary requisite of good conducting mechanics; moreover, his temperament was not of a dictatorial nature, but rather was characterized by purity and gentleness coupled with a child-like naivété. It might be said, therefore, that these characteristics actually hindered the development of the Orchestra. Most of the works conducted by Dvořák were his own; however, these compositions were written prior to his American sojourn. In this respect, therefore, a significant gap was revealed, since he neglected American composers; in fact, with one exception (his arrangement of "Old Folks at Home"), none of his own American works was conducted by him while he was in America.


**Administrator**

Although Dvořák was the director of the Conservatory, neither his contract nor his actual activities warrant a conclusion that he had an important role in administrative policy-making. He did have some suggestions to offer regarding the prize competitions, but these recommendations were negligible and of no special significance. The Conservatory's curriculum manifested no significant changes during his tenure, and, in this respect, it might be pointed out that Dvořák fully endorsed the Conservatory's educational structure. Indirectly, he may have been responsible for encouraging the emphasis given to the admittance of Negroes (both as students and teachers) to the Conservatory.

**General Considerations**

Of the three years in America, the first year was the most satisfactory, both in regard to his productive output as well as his relationship with the Conservatory. The final two years were filled with discord because of the Conservatory's failure to fulfill its promised salary commitments, owing to the Panic of 1893. Although the second contract (April 28, 1894) stipulated his returning to the Conservatory for the 1895-96 season, Dvořák requested a release from this commitment, explaining that family problems (illness and schooling for his children) had caused this decision. It might be conjectured, however, that his insecurity in regard to finances also greatly influenced his decision. Therefore, it is conceivable that Dvořák might have chosen to remain in
America, if the economic conditions had not taken that downward turn. Finally, it should be noted that he evinced a particular interest in guiding the future development of the Conservatory's prize competitions; for this reason alone, he regretted leaving America.

The Problem Aherent in the Term

"Nationalism and Folk Music"

The terms "nationalism" and "folk music" are frequently used interchangeably. Farwell noted that ninety-nine per cent of the books catalogued under "nationalism" in the New York Public Library's music catalog were in reality devoted to folk songs, and "none at all to national influence in the absence of folk songs." According to Farwell, considered this subject as "dangerous," because it inevitably would lead to disagreement between two principal factions: (1) those who believe that music is a "universal language" and knows no country, and (2) those who believe that music which has musical worth "strikes root deeply in its proper national soil." Farwell himself favored the first faction and subsequently divided nationalism into five groupings which he called "orders," ranging from the most primitive to the most advanced usage.


2Ibid., p. 1234.
CHAPTER VI

NATIONALISM IN AMERICA

The Problems Inherent in the Terms "Nationalism" and "Folk Music"

The terms "nationalism" and "folk music" are frequently used interchangeably. Farwell noted that ninety-nine per cent of the books catalogued under "nationalism" in the New York Public Library's music catalog were in reality devoted to folk songs, and "none at all to national influence in the absence of folk songs."¹ The other one per cent, according to Farwell, considered this subject of nationalism "dangerous," because it inevitably would lead to disagreements between two principal factions: (1) those who believe that music is a "'universal language' and knows no country," and (2) those who believe that music which has musical worth "strikes root deeply in its proper national soil."² Farwell himself favored the first faction and subsequently divided nationalism into five groupings which he called "orders," ranging from the most primitive to the most advanced usage.


²Ibid., p. 1234.
His five "orders" were as follows: (1) Primitive--Eskimos or African blacks--wherein there was an absence of the completed song form. (2) "The folk songs of the peasantry of the countries which have established a cultural life." (3) The "composed work embodying folksongs." In this category, Farwell said that there were two ingredients added to the original folk song: (a) the "expansion of the emotional factor, for which there is no room in the brief folk song"; and (b) the addition to the folk song of "something of the quality of the composer's thought." Composers mentioned in this category were Grieg, the Russian Five, Tchaikovsky, Grainger, and d'Indy. (4) Music which has been based on "freely invented melodies which more or less closely reflect the character of the folk songs of their respective nations." Farwell stated that this was "nationalism of the highest type," and he included such composers as Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, who "transfigured and beautified the national soul, and have given it to us in its most exalted aspect." He noted the erroneous usage of the term "universal" music and asserted, in effect, that this fourth level of nationalism was in reality that to which the term "universal" applied. (5) The final level, or order, would include composers who do not echo folk songs in any degree, but rather "consciously or otherwise ... incorporate in their works something of the characteristics or spirit of their nations." Sibelius was cited as having reflected the characteristic "gloom and
somberness of his country... in all his greater" works.3

Farwell omitted any reference to Dvořák; however, in discussing the third and fourth levels, he did point out that most of the composers who wrote in a folk style could be placed in either of these divisions "to a greater or less extent." It might be argued, in this respect, that Dvořák belonged to none of the five categories in particular, since, as was shown in chapter ii, his music exhibited rare instances of a style resembling Rimsky's use of folk song (the original kept intact), and his music occasionally reflected that "universal" style (a questionable "order"). The fifth category is probably as appropriate as either three or four since it was also pointed out that Dvořák wrote in the style of the Dumka which, in effect, was more of a mood than an actual dance (the dance being the primary basis upon which the folk songs emerged). Placing Dvořák into an exact category, therefore, poses a problem, since it can be shown that he encompassed, at times, Farwell's third, fourth, and fifth orders.

It can be seen from the foregoing that several problems exist whenever a discussion of folk music is attempted. The topic of American folk music also presents a similar difficulty. The heterogeneous mixture of numerous racial strains makes any study regarding the folk songs of America "unusually puzzling and complicated," according to Reed Smith.4

In his article on "Folk Music in America," Smith segmented

3Ibid., pp. 1237-38.

4Reed Smith, "Folk Music in America," Thompson's Cyclopedia, p. 584.
American folk music into no less than nine major subdivisions which were to be treated as separate units, including such topics as Negro, Indian, Creole, Anglo-American, and Cowboy. With the exception of the folk music of the Indian Tribes, all the other so-called "American" music, according to Smith, had been transplanted from foreign lands. He emphasized the point that Negro music is not a category which might be defined as indigenously American. Therefore, one might assert that the entire issue surrounding Dvořák and his promulgation of Negro music is pointless if the ethnological factor is to be the main consideration. In other words, Dvořák's thesis that an American school of composition could be based only on Negro or Indian music was wrong in the ethnological sense. Louis C. Elson (1848-1920), American music critic and author of books on American music, argued that if America did have a folk tradition, the folk songs were sectional rather than national: "Only the South . . . has developed something akin to an especial folk song, distinctly different from the music of other nations." In another book, Elson acknowledged Dvořák's attempt to write American music, but questioned whether or not a "distinctly American school can ever arise even amid a host of talented composers"; in the absence of a real folk tradition, Elson explained, American composers would actually be writing in

5Ibid.

an "eclectic" style. Although it is questionable to claim the existence of an American Negro folk music, it can justifiably be stated that the American Indian tribes have a valid folk tradition, which Elson failed to emphasize. Even as regards the American Negro, one could argue that a certain tradition has evolved over a period of time, justifying a conclusion that this tradition, also, is American. In the ethnological sense, however, this assertion could be readily disputed.

**Dvořák's Timely Arrival in America**

The furor and controversy surrounding Dvořák's American compositions were, to a large extent, engendered by Dvořák. The welcoming speech by Colonel Thomas Wentworth Higginson on the occasion of Dvořák's first public appearance as a conductor, October 21, 1892, set the theme that Dvořák was to follow during his three years in America. Higginson's speech, entitled "Two New Worlds--The New World of Columbus and the New World of Music," expressed the hope "that our guest of tonight [Dvořák] will ... consent to transplantation and may help add the new world of music to the continent which Columbus found." The speech also noted the strong German and Italian musical influence on America, and implied, in effect, that Dvořák was to dispel this phenomenon by investigating a new channel of approach. Dvořák himself drew some

---


conclusions from this speech; in a letter to Josef Hlávka, he wrote: "The Americans expect great things of me, and the main thing is, so they say, to show them to the promised land and kingdom of a new and independent [italics supplied] art, in short, to create a national music."⁹ Higginson's remarks were doubtless inspired by the occasion of the four-hundredth anniversary of Columbus' discovery of America. Therefore, Dvořák's arrival was timely, since Americans were then very conscious of their nation's heritage.

Americans were inclined to feel that Dvořák would discover a similar folk style for Americans to follow. It should be emphatically noted, however, that with very few exceptions, Dvořák's compositions prior to his American sojourn were original. Chapter ii, exploring his so-called "Bohemian" compositions, concluded that unlike other nationalistic composers such as Smetana and Rimsky, Dvořák altered the original folk songs, consequently composing in a style which could be defined as employing the spirit of his native folk music. This issue—of utilizing actual folk melodies or writing in the spirit of this music—became, during his American tenure, greatly magnified in the minds of authors and critics, and perhaps it clouded one of Dvořák's primary accomplishments: his instilling in the minds of Americans the potential which had lain dormant regarding American folk music.

This chapter will concentrate essentially on Dvořák's own discourses which, to a large degree, prompted American composers to direct their attention towards music indigenously American. Although, as it will be shown, Dvořák was not the first to investigate this channel of approach, he was responsible for enlarging upon and bringing it to the attention of the vast majority of American composers.

**Negro Melodies as the Basis for an American School of Music**

Dvořák had completed the Symphony in E minor *From the New World* on May 24, 1893. Three days before, on May 21, an article of major significance appeared in the *New York Herald* -- a newspaper which was highly sympathetic towards both Dvořák and the National Conservatory. The unsigned article was entitled the "Real Value of Negro Melodies" and contained an extensive discourse (obtained through an interview) by Dvořák on this subject.¹⁰

Dvořák stated that his interest in Negro music had grown deeper during his first year in America, and that he now firmly believed that "the future music of this country must be founded upon what are called Negro melodies. This," he continued, "must be the real foundation of any serious and original school of composition to be developed in the United States." He considered these "beautiful themes" to be "products of the soil" and expressed the desire to know more about

He declared that in order for America to "express the true sentiment of the people," the folk songs of the American people would have to be examined. Regarding the employment of folk music as a source of inspiration, Dvořák referred to Beethoven as a composer who did not hesitate using this device. The composer must probe deeply into the forgotten tunes of his country's past in order to arrive at inspirational hints. In this way, the composer "gets in touch with the common humanity of his country." Dvořák spoke from a deeply personal viewpoint, considering that his own success as a composer was largely the result of his having reverted to a natural style of writing, that is, a style which had been rooted in the music he had heard in his childhood. It should be noted, in this respect, that Bohemia was still under foreign domination, and therefore Dvořák considered nationalism or folk tradition to be of utmost importance in revealing the true identity of a nation.

At the interview, Dvořák supplemented these ideological comments with concrete evidence to support his contention that there were contained within Negro melodies "all that is needed for a great and noble school of music." Regarding these melodies, he said:

They are pathetic, tender, passionate, melancholy, solemn, religious, bold, merry, gay or what you will. It is music that suits itself to any mood or purpose. There is nothing in the whole range of composition that cannot be supplied with themes from this source.

11Ibid.  12Ibid.  13Ibid.
Dvořák had apparently considered these melodies as having the power to provoke a large degree of sentiment within the American people as a whole, for he naively asserted that: "The American musician understands these tunes, and they move sentiment in him. They appeal to his imagination because of their association." How, it might be asked, did the American composers understand this type of music when, as it was pointed out, Negro music was a particular characteristic of the South? It could be argued that this type of music could evoke an association of America's tradition; however, this stimulus would pertain only to a particular section of the United States. Outside of the South, Negro music was comparatively unknown at the time of Dvořák's statement; in fact, it is questionable as to the amount of actual exposure Dvořák had regarding these Negro melodies. Dr. Clapham, writing on the subject of "Dvořák and the Impact of America," questioned Dvořák's actual knowledge of American music, stating that Dvořák's information was "very restricted at that time."14

Dvořák also discussed England's failure to recognize the potential inherent in their own Scotch and Irish tunes, and along with this he expressed the wish that America would not follow England's example: "I hope it will not be so in this country [America], and I intend to do all in my power to call attention to this splendid treasure of melody [Negro music] which you have."15 He reasoned that America's


15"Real Value of Negro Melodies," loc. cit.
reluctance to use this means as a source of inspiration lay in the attitude that this type of music was not worthy of serious composition. With the exception of one pupil (whose name was not revealed), his pupils "seem to think that it is not good taste to get ideas from the old plantation songs, but," Dvořák continued, "I have tried to impress upon their minds the fact that the greatest composers have not considered it beneath their dignity to go to the humble folk songs for motifs." This statement implied that Dvořák laid great stress on promulgating these concepts to his pupils; at the same time, chapter v revealed, through his pupils' discourses, that Dvořák, in fact, emphasized the technique of composition (melody and its subsequent development) in his teaching. If, as Dvořák implied, he did try to impress the unlimited potential inherent in Negro music, it was never alluded to by his pupils who were, on the contrary, confined to writing composition exercises in the style of the classic masters. If Dvořák had really stressed the value of Negro melodies in his actual teaching, some of the pupils' discourses would have alluded to this fact. On the other hand, as Dvořák himself commented, the pupils were reluctant to investigate this channel of approach. Despite the opposition from his pupils, Dvořák was determined to continue that segment of his work which was of particular interest to him, namely, as he stated at the conclusion of the Herald's interview: "... to discover what young Americans had in them and to help them to express it."16
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Having concluded the remarks by Dvořák, the article then reported that the Herald was authorized, on behalf of the National Conservatory, to make an announcement of major importance: "The Conservatory over which Dr. Dvořák presides is to be thrown open free of charge to the Negro race."

Apparently, then, the Negro race was not well represented by the Conservatory prior to the announcement. This assertion is validated by a further statement which "had the authority of Mrs. Thurber herself," according to the Herald, which reported that the Conservatory "has determined to add to the six hundred white [italics supplied] students as many Negroes of positive talent as may apply. There will be absolutely no limit." Dvořák was given full credit for having initiated this move by his declaration, the article stated, "that Negro melody furnishes the only sure base for an American school of music." 17

The Herald supplemented its news article with an editorial commending Dvořák for his support of the Negro race. His comment on the part which American composers should follow was, the editorial stated, "a refreshing utterance." 18

It should be noted that the Herald did not mention Indian music, implying an assumption that Dvořák was completely unfamiliar with the subject at that time. Dvořák later claimed, however, that the "New World" Symphony was based on the spirit of Indian as well as Negro melodies. It should be recalled,
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however, that the Symphony was completed on May 24 (three days after the interview). If Dvořák had utilized Indian melodies, he would have referred to the potential of this source; moreover, if he knew anything of Indian music, his knowledge was limited, since it was not until the trip to Spillville during the summer of 1893 that Dvořák actually came in contact with Indian tribal music. On the other hand, he may have been familiar with Indian music before his arrival in America. A critical study had been written in 1882 when Theodore Baker, an American student working for an advanced degree at Leipzig University, transcribed sixty Indian melodies for his thesis Über die Musik der Nordamerikanischen Wilden. This essay, which was "never translated and which is now out of print," was based on the Indian music which Baker noted on his visit to the Seneca reservation in New York State and the Indian school at Carlisle, Pennsylvania.19 Clapham postulated that it was possible for Dvořák to have been familiar with Baker's thesis, although "... there is no positive evidence."20

The sojourn in Spillville, Iowa, during the summer of 1893 produced the String Quartet in F major, Op. 96 (June 8 - 23) and the String Quintet in E-flat major, Op. 97 (June 26 - August 1). Dvořák wrote to his friend Dr. Emil Kozánek, in Moravia, regarding the Symphony, Quartet, and Quintet. This letter of September 15, 1893, explicitly credited America for

20 Clapham, op. cit., p. 204.
having provided the stimulus for these compositions; as previously mentioned, Dvořák said: "I should never have written these works 'just so' if I had not seen America." Therefore, Dvořák himself considered these three works as having been inspired by American stimuli. On the day of the première of the "New World" Symphony, Dvořák was interviewed again. His remarks were perhaps what the Americans wanted to hear: that the Symphony was inspired by Negro and Indian music. The interview also proved that Dvořák was well aware that the Symphony contained American characteristics, which he spelled out and which he felt were similar to Scotch folk music; he said:

... I have been deeply interested in the national music of the Negroes and the Indians. ... The two races bore a remarkable similarity to the national music of Scotland. In both, there is a peculiar scale, caused by the absence of the fourth and seventh, or leading tone. In both, the minor scale has the seventh, invariably a minor seventh; the fourth is included and the sixth omitted.

The "peculiar scale," to which Dvořák referred, was one of the anhemitonic pentatonic scales: c-d-e-g-a, which is not only, as Dvořák himself correctly maintained, characteristic of the Negro, Indian, and Scotch melodies, but is also similar to the Chinese scale.

The remainder of the interview unequivocally represented Dvořák's views on the subject of the derivation of the

---
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themes used in his E minor Symphony. There was nothing of an ambiguous nature in his statement to warrant the controversy that still persists relative to the derivation of these melodies. His knowledge of Indian music was obtained after having "carefully studied a certain number of Indian melodies which a friend gave to me," and, Dvořák added, "[I] became thoroughly imbued with their characteristics—with their spirit, in fact." The use of the word "spirit" strongly reminds one of the similar controversy surrounding some of his Czech works (discussed in chapter ii). In those compositions (for example, the Slavonic Dances) it was shown that the spirit of Czech music was employed, that is, folk melodies were not kept intact. Thus, Dvořák attempted to use a similar device of employing the spirit of American music, for he asserted:

It is this spirit which I have tried to reproduce in my new Symphony. I have not actually used any of the melodies. I have simply written original [italics supplied] themes embodying the peculiarities of the Indian music, and using these themes as subjects have developed them with all the resources of modern rhythms, harmony, counterpoint, and orchestral color.

Comparing the statements made at the two interviews (May 21 and December 15) an obvious inconsistency can be noted. The earlier interview—taking place three days prior to the Symphony's completion—made no mention of Indian music and dwelled upon Negro music; the latter interview was just the reverse. Why did Dvořák fail to comment upon the Indian

25 "Dvořák on His New Work," loc. cit.
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potential at the May 21 interview? This probably will remain a moot point.

In any case, Dvořák indicated that Indian culture had been, in fact, a definite influencing factor in inspiring this Symphony. His remarks also verified that his knowledge of this culture was in evidence before his American sojourn. The following were Dvořák's commentaries, in part, pertaining to the individual movements of the Symphony [italics supplied]:

... The Allegro ... embodies the principles which I have already worked out in my Slavonic Dances; that is, to preserve, to translate into music, the spirit of a race as distinct in its national melodies or folk song. The second movement is an Adagio ... It is, in reality, a study, or sketch for a longer work, either a cantata or opera which I propose writing, and which will be based on Longfellow's "Hiawatha." I have long had the idea of utilizing that poem. I first became acquainted with it about thirty years ago through the medium of a Bohemian translation. It appealed very strongly to my imagination at the time, and the impression has only been strengthened by the residence here.

The Scherzo of the Symphony was suggested by the scene at the feast in "Hiawatha" where the Indians dance, and is also an essay which I made in the direction of imparting the local color of Indian character to music.27 [His comments on the Finale contained no mention of folk elements.]

The most interesting point of Dvořák's analysis was the exclusion of commentaries relevant to Negro music. Thus, from Dvořák's viewpoint, the Symphony owed its inspiration to Indian legend; yet, later discourses by critics and authors were to favor the position that the Negro tradition was the Symphony's stronger characteristic.

Notwithstanding the objections that Dvořák himself subsequently raised in relationship to the supposedly American origin of the Symphony, it can be seen that Dvořák's own
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remarks prompted the controversies over the origin of the Symphony's material. It should be emphasized that his com-
ments—at the May 21 and December 15 interviews—were prior
to the Symphony's first public performance. Furthermore,
not only did he stimulate the public's thinking to the point
of preconceived notions regarding the Symphony, but he also
claimed that the works composed in the summer of 1893 owed
their stimulus to a similar origin: "They [the Quartet and
Quintet] are both written upon the same lines as this Sym-
phony, and both breathe the same Indian spirit." 28

On December 15, 1893, the Symphony received its first
public performance. Kovařík explained, in his "Reminiscences,"
that the phrase, Z Nového světa ("From the New World"), was
written on the title page around the middle of November 1893,
and meant "nothing more than 'Impressions and Greetings from
the New World'—as the Master more than once explained." 29
Kovařík's remarks, however, were penned long after the contro-
versy had set in, and therefore were powerless to dispel the
opinion that the title implied an "American" Symphony.

The review of the Symphony was overwhelmingly inclined
towards viewing the work as indigenously American. A sub-
heading of the review stated that the Symphony was "inspired
by Indian music." 30 The concert itself took place at the
"second Philharmonic rehearsal," which was an open rehearsal,

28 Ibid.

29 Šourek, Letters, p. 171.

30 "Dr. Dvořák's Great Symphony," New York Herald,
that is, the public was invited. Dvořák was not in the
audience for that performance, preferring, it was reported,
to "give his tickets to someone who was desirous of hearing
the work." Although the program included two other works
(Mendelssohn's Midsummer Night's Dream Overture and Brahm's
Violin Concerto), practically the entire review was devoted
to what the critic described as an additional "masterpiece
to musical literature"; a "noble composition" equated with
works of Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, Mendelssohn, Brahms,
and other great composers. The usually tranquil audience was
"enthusiastic to the point of frenzy," because it "appealed
to their sense of the esthetically beautiful by its wealth
of tender, pathetic, fiery melody; by its rich harmonic
clothing; by its delicate, sonorous, gorgeous, ever-varying
instrumentation." Above all, though, the Symphony "appealed
to the patriotic side" of the audience. The critic had doubt-
less taken his cue from what Dvořák himself had suggested at
the interview, the day preceding the concert. It was justi-
fied for the audience to consider this work as patriotic, the
critic reasoned:

For had not Dr. Dvořák been inspired by the impressions
which this country had made upon him? Had he not trans-
lated these impressions into sounds, into music? Had they
[the audience] not been assured by the composer himself
that the work was written under the direct influence of
a serious study of the national music of the North Ameri-
can Indians? Therefore, were they not justified in
regarding this composition . . . as a distinctly American
work of art?31
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On the other hand, the program book for that performance distinctly showed that Dvořák had given credit to Negro as well as Indian sources. Anticipating the controversy which was to ensue after this first performance, the program book published an announcement in order "to facilitate the understanding of the work." The critic himself referred to this explanation as having been "read and reread" by the audience "with an intensity that was rather awe inspiring." Dvořák himself had endorsed this announcement, which is quoted almost in full:

On his arrival in America the composer was deeply impressed by the conditions peculiar to this country and [by] the spirit of which they were the outward manifestations. In continuing his activity he found that the works which he created here were essentially different from those which had sprung into existence in his native country. They were clearly influenced by the new surroundings and by the new life of which they were the material evidence. Dr. Dvořák made a study of Indian and Negro melodies and found them possessed of characteristics peculiarly their own. He identified himself with their spirit, [and he] made their essential contents --not their formal, external traits--his own. As Dvořák had done in regard to Bohemian music in his Slavonic Dances, so he strove in the present Symphony to reproduce the fundamental characteristics of the melodies which he had found here, by means of the specifically musical resources which his inspiration furnished.

The explanatory notes were apparently based on statements which Dvořák had made during the months preceding this first performance; the announcement was not in accord with his December 15 statement, wherein he referred only to Indian music, and it also conflicted with his May 21 statement, which

---

32 Program book for the Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York Concert of March 19 & 20, 1936, reprinting, in full, the program notes for the Dec. 15, 1893, concert.
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avoided any mention of Indian music.

The confusion regarding the origin of the Symphony's material, therefore, comes as no surprise if one is cognizant of the varying claims—issued by Dvořák himself—even before the Symphony's première. Moreover, Dvořák's choice of words was perhaps too subtle at that time when such a concept as the "spirit" of folk music was relatively unknown. It could be said that the public, desirous to discover American traits in the Symphony, chose to overlook Dvořák's own qualified remarks at the December 15 interview when he declared, as previously noted, "I have not actually used any of the melodies. I have simply written original themes embodying the peculiarities of Indian music. . . ."

The reviewer himself perceived the Symphony as containing an ambivalent nature—pulling toward Czech and American characteristics. He admitted having a lack of knowledge regarding Indian music; yet he conceded that if the first movement "breathes the genuine native atmosphere, then certainly the future of music is in the hands of the red men."34 Summarizing his feelings, the reviewer suggested that the work "may be Indian in spirit, but it is Bohemian in atmosphere. . . . Dr. Dvořák can no more divest himself of his nationality than the leopard change his spots." This perceptive viewpoint was to be echoed by other authors for many years to come.

The article also contained a sampling of opinions from others at this first performance; the comments were as

34"Dr. Dvořák's Great Symphony," loc. cit.
divergent as Dvořák's own statements had been. Anton Seidl, the conductor of the Philharmonic at this performance, did not comment on the exact origin of Dvořák's materials, but he did imply that the themes had an American basis: "I think," said Seidl, [the Symphony] "will serve to incite the younger American musicians to work in the lines laid down so successfully by Dr. Dvořák, and which point in the direction of the establishment of a truly national school of musical composition." Pointing specifically to the second movement as being the one which was especially impressive, Seidl remarked that this movement "seems to me so suggestive of the loneliness of the immense prairies of the Far West; . . . it is pathetic with the pathos of homesickness." It should be noted that this idea of homesickness was to become one of the more common interpretations, at least common to those predisposed to the thought that the work was Bohemian.

Walter Damrosch was quoted as having been very impressed with the Symphony, which he considered "a most beautiful composition." To the question—"Is it 'American' or not?"—Damrosch answered reluctantly: "To me, it suggests nothing American. It is Dr. Dvořák. His genius has evolved the work and you can see him in every bit of the work." The article contained other interviews from such people as Victor Herbert, who was not certain as to what influence the work would have upon future compositions in America, and Richard Arnold, the concertmaster of the Philharmonic, who did not consider it possible that a new school of composition would arise out
of the Symphony's stimulus.  

There were, in conclusion, many divergent views immediately after the Symphony's first public performance. It should be noted that the reviewer—who remained nameless—was quite perceptive throughout most of the report. There were several ideas suggested by him and later incorporated into other authors' discourses on the subject. For example, he noted a "curious Scotch effect" primarily due to the "omission of the fourth and seventh notes of the scale," and he perceived a "sadness of the Slavonic temperament which even in the happiest moments of life tinges everything with a gentle hue of quiet, tender melancholy."

On the following evening, December 16, 1893, Dvořák himself was in the audience for the second performance of his Symphony. Apparently, the Herald critic who reviewed the first performance also reported this event. He referred to Dvořák as having "said [that] the Symphony has been inspired by a close study of the native melodies of the North American Indians and the Negro race of this country. This study," the critic added, "resulted in the discovery that in all essential particulars the national music of the races is identical."

The scale was singled out for particular mention; the critic wrote:

The scale is characterized by the absence of the fourth and seventh tones \([c-d-e-g-a]\). The minor scale also has its own individual peculiarities. Instead of
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the seventh being omitted, in the minor it is the sixth tone which is lacking \([a-b-c-d-e-g]\). The fourth tone is also absent in certain forms of the melodies \([a-b-c-e-f-g]\). And the seventh is invariably minor. 37

The reviewer suggested that Dvořák used the above scales as a basis for his thematic material, and thereby "created original themes which partook of the characteristics which he had discovered in the native music." No mention, however, was made of the fact that the scales were not only peculiarly American, but also, as was previously pointed out, indigenous to other peoples--the Scotch and the Chinese, for example.

Dvořák was greatly acclaimed after each movement and received a "genuine ovation" after the Largo. When the Symphony concluded, the applause was unending, as the reviewer reported:

> Even after he [Dvořák] had left his box and was walking about in the corridor the applause continued. And finally he returned to the gallery railing, and then what a reception he received! The musicians, led by Mr. Seidl, applauded until the place rang again.

Thus, the Symphony was launched with the greatest success.

The controversy regarding the Symphony's American basis was to persist and perhaps will continue to persist for as long as the work is performed. Dvořák himself was greatly displeased over this dispute and, as late as 1900, insisted that he "tried to write only in the spirit of those national American melodies." 38

---
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38 Letter from Dvořák to Oskar Nedbal, 1900, quoted as a footnote in Thompson's *Cyclopedia*, p. 484. This letter was used by numerous authors. The exact date, other than 1900, is unknown.
It is interesting to note that repeated hearings of the Symphony finally resulted in the public's attaching a definite Negro basis to the work, while at the same time tacitly denying the use of possible Indian influences. This phenomenon resulted from the similarity between a subsidiary theme (example 1) in the first movement and the Negro spiritual, "Swing Low, Sweet Chariot" (example 2). It can be seen that the obvious resemblance (indicated by brackets) is only momentary, especially regarding rhythm.

Example 1. Dvořák, Symphony in E minor, Op. 95, p. 20, m. 149-51.

Example 2. "Swing Low, Sweet Chariot"

An exhaustive study of the possible Indian influence was made by Clapham, who concluded that "rhythmically and melodically there appears to be nothing specifically Indian in the Symphony; nor for that matter is there anything exclusively Negro."39 After having examined hundreds of

Iroquois melodies, he reasoned that "... these songs are rather too primitive in character to provide Dvořák with much material to work on, and the non-Iroquois songs in Baker's collection [Über die Musik der Nordamerikanischen Wilden] are no better in this respect."

Clapham also exploded the theories regarding Dvořák's other American compositions—the Quartet and the Quintet, Op. 96 and 97—stating that these works as well as the Symphony were not the sole property of an American culture. "Identical types of syncopation occur in Indian, Negro, Slovak, and Hungarian songs..." Furthermore, according to Clapham, pentatonic themes were used as early as his String Quartet in A, Op. 2, written in 1862. Regarding the minor melodies in Dvořák's American works, Clapham noted, "there are an unusual number of flat sevenths, and few leading notes are used." However, as he further pointed out, "flat sevenths are found in spirituals and in Indian song, but are to be found in Moravian and Slovakian folk song and in Dvořák's earlier music as well." After examining Dvořák's American works in relationship to American Negro and Indian music, and comparing these findings with Dvořák's compositions prior to his American sojourn, Clapham theorized that "it is probably true to say that everything..."
he wrote in the United States of America might conceivably have been written by him had he never left Europe."\textsuperscript{41}

Knowing, therefore, that Dvořák's American works exhibited traits common to many races and nationalities, it is no surprise to encounter a number of opinions inclined towards the viewpoint that the "New World" Symphony was indeed Czech. In 1907, Philip Hale, critic for the \textit{Boston Journal}, reported on a study which had been made by William Ritter, an author residing in Prague. Ritter had just concluded a survey in which Bohemians--Dvořák's sons, musicians, and critics--were asked for their opinions regarding the dispute surrounding the "New World" Symphony. Hale summarized Ritter's findings; in part, these were:

Negro airs--not copied, adapted, or imitated--tint slightly two or three passages of the Symphony without injury to its Czech character.\ldots The national Czech feeling in this work, quickened by homesickness, is so marked that it is recognized throughout Bohemia by the learned and by the humblest.\textsuperscript{42}

Ritter's questionnaire was primarily concerned with Negro influence and made no mention of Indian possibilities. In this respect, as previously pointed out, most of the later discourses on the Symphony omitted any reference to a possible Indian influence. As late as 1928, the controversy continued to persist; witness, for example, the numerous "Letters to

\textsuperscript{41}Clapham, \textit{The Music Review}, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 210. See also H. C. Colles, "Antonín Dvořák in the New World," \textit{Musical Times}, LXXXII, No. 1180 (1941), 209-211, wherein Colles also proved that striking similarities existed between Dvořák's American period works and those written prior to his sojourn.

the Editor" of *The New York Times*, wherein nothing was mentioned regarding Indian influence. The letters stressed the issue of whether Dvořák did or did not employ the "Swing Low" theme. In fact, this particularly insignificant issue had reached such a point of confusion that one writer asserted that this theme "is distinctly carried out in the Largo [sic]. . . ."44

Suffice it to say that Dvořák's American works gravitate towards both Czech and American characteristics. Therefore, the dispute over their national origins will remain endless because of this ambivalence. In any case, his American works did accomplish what Dvořák had set out to do; he had proved that by working with elements that were supposedly uniquely American, a work such as the "New World" Symphony could be written.

In this respect, it could be argued that Dvořák was not the first who suggested this channel of approach for American composers to follow. Witness, for example, Louis Moreau Gottschalk (1829-1869), American pianist and composer, who experimented with the music of his native Louisiana. Gottschalk, like Dvořák, wrote in a style which was most natural for him. "It is ironic," Gilbert Chase pointed out, "that American musicians had to wait until 1893 for Antonín Dvořák to tell them about the possibilities of utilizing American Negro music to achieve 'local color,'" when Gottschalk
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began doing that as early as 1845."\(^{45}\) John Tasker Howard, noted American author and composer, also credited Gottschalk with having anticipated by fifty years what Dvořák had suggested. Gottschalk "looms," Howard asserted, "as one of our most significant figures because he was able to absorb and weave into his music the colorful and exotic melodies and rhythms of Creole . . . song."\(^ {46}\) It should be pointed out, however, that the Creole songs owed their origin to both French and Spanish sources, especially in regard to the language which was "almost entirely French patois."\(^ {47}\) Therefore, it would appear that Gottschalk's music was even more confined than was Dvořák's; "confined" in the sense that Dvořák could be accused of not having written genuinely American music. In this respect, as Hale claimed, "the great majority of Americans are neither Negro nor Indian, nor are they the descendants of Negroes or Indians. How then can the folk song attributed to Negro or Indian be distinctly, peculiarly American?"\(^ {48}\) Hale, referring to Dvořák when he made this statement, would certainly have considered it incredible to believe that Gottschalk's music--confined to the inspiration of the Negro population of Louisiana--reflected America. Moreover, Gottschalk succeeded as a

\(^{45}\)Chase, op. cit., p. 319.


\(^{47}\)Thompson's Cyclopedia, p. 601.

\(^{48}\)Hale, loc. cit.
composer only in regard to his short piano pieces such as "The Last Hope" and "The Dying Poet," which have been described as being merely sentimental. Although he did experiment in the larger forms of symphonic composition, the result was no comparison when measured against Dvořák's achievements. In other words, one of the supreme accomplishments of Dvořák's compositions was to prove that the spirit of folk music could be woven into a classic mold with astonishing success. Gottschalk, therefore, must not be regarded as having been a forerunner of Dvořák.

Further Events and Discourses Relative to Dvořák and the Growth of American Music

Dvořák had followed through on the potential of which he spoke during the May 21 interview. The "New World" Symphony had validated his claims; the Quartet and Quintet further substantiated them.

The Quartet, Op. 96, was premiered by the Kneisel Quartet of Boston, the city which was given the honor of this first performance. Other works on the program were the Piano Quartet in G minor, Op. 25, of Brahms and the Quintet in C major, Op. 29, of Beethoven; thus, Dvořák's work was surrounded by notable company. In reviewing the Quartet, Hale was impressed by its "honesty and simplicity," and found it to be relatively attractive on first hearing; however, there was one reproach that could be made, as the noted critic reasoned: "... A too frequent use of the pentatonic
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scale might weary after several hearings. . . ."50 Hale was not, as previously shown, predisposed towards the notion that America should look to the Negro and Indian for a source of inspiration. He therefore did not fail to take the opportunity to insert a cutting imnendo: "The themes are characteristic—but not necessarily or inevitably characteristic of Negro temperament which seems now in certain quarters to be regarded as synonymous with American temperament."51 In this respect, when the "New World" Symphony was premiered in Boston on December 30, 1893, the New York Tribune's reviewer referred to Hale's comments on that work to the effect that the "New World" should not be termed "American," because it has elements of the Old World. The Tribune was against Hale's criticism, and assailed him for neglecting the important issue; the Tribune said:

Musicians have never been so conscious as now of the value of folk song elements. . . . Why these sneers [italics supplied] at the only material which lies to our hand. What matters it if the man who points out the way be a Bohemian scarcely two years in the country?52

The Tribune followed these comments—aimed primarily at Hale's statements—with another perceptive observation; namely, that it was unreasonable to assert that since the "stamp of Dvořák's individuality is upon this score," this would prove that the Symphony "is not American." The Tribune
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argued that a composer could still retain his own individuality and yet write in an American style.53

The Tribune, as can be seen, was strongly sympathetic towards what Dvořák had been attempting to prove. Yet the dispute between the faction represented by Hale's commentaries and the proponents of Dvořák's views did stir the currents of American musical thinking. Even from a sociological point of view, America was strongly taking stock of its own heritage; in this respect, the point mentioned regarding "sneers" was a statement with many insinuating overtones. The question could be asked: Was America prone to regard the Negro and Indian races as beneath the dignity of the white race? And, in this respect, did it follow that music—being the "noble" art that it is—could not attain this measure of nobility if it were to employ characteristics from these "lowly" races? Although it is not within the scope of the study to discuss this particular problem, there has been evidence to warrant a further investigation into the matter of whether it was actually wise for Americans to admit that the Negro race was a source of inspiration. Witness, for example, the statements made by Henry T. Finck (1854-1926)—American music critic, author, and teacher at the National Conservatory. Finck, as previously noted, referred to Harry T. Burleigh as a composer who had "more white than black in his excellent songs—intentionally [italics supplied], no doubt. . . ."54 Moreover,
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when discussing the argument surrounding the inspiration for the "New World" Symphony's Largo movement, Finck made the following absurd analysis:

Nothing could be more ridiculous than the attempts that have been made to find anything black (n[egroid] or red (Indian) in the glorious, soulful melody which opens this movement. . . . Nothing could be more white. . . . Only a genius could have written them.55

Suffice it to say that Finck's statements implied that perhaps the factor of prejudice was involved in the formation of opinions relative to Dvořák's American works.

The Quartet, Op. 96, received no less than fifty performances during 1894. On January 12, this work was coupled to the Quintet, Op. 97, along with Dvořák's Sextet, Op. 48, in a New York concert. Dvořák was at this performance which featured the première of the Quintet. It was reported that after each movement of both the Quartet and the Quintet the applause was "loud, long, and enthusiastic."56 The Tribune did not labor the point of the works' American origin; but the reviewer (no name given) did imply that these works were, in effect, written by Dvořák in such a transparent way "in order that the composers, who may undertake to work on the lines [that is, on the basis of American folk material] which he has marked out, may have the clearest model before them."57

55Ibid., p. 280.
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The third movement (Larghetto) of the Quintet was considered by Šourek as "the crowning glory of the Quintet and one of the most enchanting movements in the whole of the composer's chamber music." The sketch for the theme of this movement, which was in the variation form, was "jotted down in his notebook on December 19, 1892."\textsuperscript{58} Stefan noted that this melody was "the same melody that [Dvořák] had thought of for a new American National Anthem" which was never completed.\textsuperscript{59} Stefan included the notes (example 3) taken from the sketch, which bears a striking resemblance to the main theme (example 4) of the Larghetto. It is also interesting to note the obvious similarity in rhythm between the sketch's first seven measures and the rhythm in the first seven measures of "America."

Example 3. Dvořák, Sketch for possible American National Anthem
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The scope of the present investigation was to present a cross study—encompassing the vast topic of Dvořák in America—in order to gain some insight into the significance of his sojourn. In this respect, the word "significance" was used to refer primarily to his influence on America. Although the study has not attempted to give an inclusive report of America's influence on Dvořák, this view has also been treated in the light of Dvořák's own discourses on the subject. For example, the two interviews—May 21 and December 15—reported on the obvious influence which America had upon him; yet, the interviews were even more important—as were his compositions—in regard to the reshaping of American musical thinking. The remainder of this chapter will omit, for the most part, references to materials pertaining directly to his compositions, and instead will be concerned primarily with other manifestations of Dvořák's visit.

It was pointed out in chapter v that one of Dvořák's few interesting conducting engagements was the January 23, 1894, concert, in which an all-Negro chorus participated. The occasion was a benefit concert (for the Herald Clothing Fund) which had been organized under Mrs. Thurber's supervision. The date of the concert was significant since Dvořák's popularity was at its peak, owing to the premiering of his three important American compositions around that same time. In order to give the concert an added appeal, therefore, the advance publicity announced the première of another Dvořák work, albeit an arrangement of Stephen Foster's (1826-1864) "Old Folks At Home."
A statement by Dvořák appeared in the Herald on the day of the concert. Again he stressed the importance of folk song material; but this time the scope of what he believed were the legitimate boundaries of folk song was widened.

Concerning Foster's song, Dvořák said:

It is a folk song and a very beautiful one, too. The only difference it has from what usually comes under that head is that we know the composer's name; and that is only because he happened to write it at a period [1851] when the art of preserving music by writing it down existed, whereas most folk songs have been handed down from mouth to mouth until in later years they were copied in manuscript by some musician. But by that time the composer's name had been forgotten. American music is music that lives in the heart of the people [italics supplied], and therefore this air has every right to be regarded as purely national. 60

Dvořák was indeed correct in regarding Foster's song as a reflection of the national spirit; John Tasker Howard pointed out that Foster's songs were "probably the most typically American expression that any composer has yet achieved." 61

Howard explained that Foster (a Northerner exposed to minstrel shows, the "singing of Negroes on the wharves of the Ohio River," and the "singing families" who gave concerts throughout the country) was considered by the Southerners as having captured the "authentic expression" of the Southern plantation. 62

60 "Hear the 'Old Folks at Home.'" New York Herald, Jan. 23, 1894, p. 11.
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Dvořák had written the arrangement of Foster's song during December, 1893, and January, 1894—a period when the folk song issue was never more popular. The composition was arranged for solo bass, chorus, and orchestra in which the solo part was rendered by Harry T. Burleigh, to whom the work was dedicated. The Conservatory provided the orchestral forces, while the all-Negro chorus was a group consisting of pupils from the Conservatory (mostly girls) joined with the boys of St. Philips Colored Choir. Dvořák's new work received scant attention in the review, which simply declared that it "was an effective arrangement." The issue of its origin (folk song basis) was completely neglected, therefore implying that this particular experiment with a definitely known folk song was not received with any appreciable success.

Other matters were perhaps of more significance; most important was the fact that the entire program was unique in respect that "each soloist, with one exception, belonged to the colored race." Obviously, the discourses and compositions of Dvořák during that period strongly influenced Mrs. Thurber in her decision to present such a program. The reviewer, though, gave Mrs. Thurber practically all the credit for having provided additional opportunities to the colored race:
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She threw open the doors of her excellently-equipped, musical, educational establishment to pupils of ability, no matter what their race, color or creed. Emancipation, in her idea had not gone far enough. Bodies had been liberated, but the gates of the artistic world were still locked.  

Full credit was given to the Conservatory for having succeeded, as witnessed by this program, in giving the Negro the opportunity of exploring "music's unlimited resources of enjoyment"; for that reason alone, the reviewer added, the Conservatory was accomplishing "a noble work." It should be noted, therefore, that in assaying the Conservatory's history, the fact regarding the Conservatory's educational policy towards the Negro race was one of its most significant accomplishments; and, as was shown in this chapter and in the previous one, Dvořáč shared the credit for furthering this policy.

Another work presented on the January 23 program was a composition by Maurice Arnold, a Negro pupil of Dvořák. The work, American Plantation Dances, was conducted by Arnold, who apparently was the one pupil at that time to follow Dvořák's suggestion of working with folk materials. Again, though, the composition had a limited appeal despite the fact that it was written "upon the lines laid down by Dr. Dvořák." The spirit of the Negro melodies was conveyed by Arnold "with some degree of success," according to the review. The composition as a whole, the reviewer went on to suggest, would be very adaptable to patriotic gatherings. Everyone in the choir "marked time with his head. . . . " Implied, therefore, was

---
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the fact that the piece was not to be taken too seriously; that is, it was almost in a similar vein with popular music.

In fact, Arnold's composition as well as Dvořák's arrangement exhibited some of the shortcomings of Dvořák's theories. The argument is one of aesthetics: Can a work of beauty consist primarily of obvious elements, such as the known tune of "Old Folks at Home" or the unsubtle rhythmic pulse of the American Plantation Dances? Perhaps Dvořák had reasoned that his own success as a composer was due primarily to the wide acclaim accorded his Slavonic Dances, a work based on his own native folk music. Yet, this particular composition and--for that matter--the "New World" Symphony as well, actually detracted from the true worth of Dvořák's entire compositional output.

In this respect, it could be argued that the "New World" Symphony and his other works based on so-called folk sources were primarily responsible for relegating Dvořák to the position of a "second-rate composer." It is only within recent years that much of his music has come out of obscurity. Witness, for example, the resurgence of his string quartet literature (totaling 14) primarily due to the work begun in 1962 by the Kohon Quartet of New York University. In that year, Vox Records had sponsored the Kohon's recording of all the quartets; the project, in turn, gave rise to a series of Kohon concerts which included nine of the fourteen Dvořák quartets. One month prior to the first of these concerts, Harold Kohon gave his own appraisal of this literature, rating Dvořák as "the greatest second-rate composer who ever lived";
yet, at the same time, he considered these quartets to be "a great deal more interesting and rewarding than, say, the quartets of Brahms."69 Of the nine quartets that were performed by the group in 1962, four (Op. 2, 16, 34, and 80) "Received their first public performance in the United States. . . ."70

The symphonies also have suffered a similar neglect until quite recently with the advent of the Artia recordings; the same may be said for numerous other Dvořák works in all media. Thus, only since 1962 have musicians begun to search into the archives of much of what had hitherto lain dormant. Harold Schonberg, a strong protagonist in furthering the resurrection of these long neglected works, wrote: "Those who call [Dvořák] second-rate severely underestimate him, possibly misled by the innocence and transparency of his music."71 Schonberg pointed out that of the nine symphonies, only three are usually heard. "Why," Schonberg asked, "don't conductors look at the Symphony No. 1 in D, or the early E-flat, both lyric, powerful, and brilliantly scored?" Of the Requiem or the Stabat Mater, Schonberg considered them "much superior to Brahms' German Requiem." One of the possible reasons behind this neglect, according to Schonberg, was that musicians are


70From the Program Notes by Dr. William Ober in the recording album of Dvořák: String Quartets, New York: Vox Productions, Inc., 1962, VBX50.

not inclined to learn new pieces, but "are content to play the same pieces over and over again."\textsuperscript{72} An additional comment to this could be that musicians play what they feel the public wishes to hear. As Dr. Nettl noted after commenting upon the myriad number of Dvořák's neglected works which merit performances: "It has frequently been observed that American audiences, once they take a liking to certain pieces, cling to these with tenacity, seldom permitting their substitution by other works of the same composer."\textsuperscript{73} Thus, it might be said that the overpopularity accorded a mere handful of Dvořák's compositions served to obscure the true value of the composer.

The above information has been presented in order to show that, in certain respects, Dvořák's theories about American music and his own American compositions were detrimental to the acceptance of his other compositions—compositions which apparently would repay serious consideration on the part of the present day musician and listener in general.

Yet Dvořák's pronouncements had stirred Americans to reshape their thinking, not only in regard to the exploration of possible source material, but also—and perhaps most important of all—to examine their own resources in the field of musical education. Although it was shown (chapter v) that Dvořák wielded very little power as director of the National Conservatory (the title of "director" was in name only), his

\textsuperscript{72}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{73}Paul Nettl, "What Dvořák Means to the Czechs," \textit{American Music Lover}, VIII, No. 1 (1941), 4.
influence, albeit indirect, was perhaps limitless regarding America's re-evaluation of its own overall music potential.

One of the most important issues to note, in this respect, was that Dvořák had given his full endorsement to the work being accomplished by the National Conservatory. Primary among the Conservatory's purposes was to develop an institution which would fulfill the musical needs of American students, that is, to prove that it was unnecessary for Americans to travel abroad in order to secure a sound education in music. In fact, during Dvořák's tenure, an article contained evidence which showed that a student graduating from this Conservatory could almost be assured of a successful career in music.74 The question was then posed: Why do Americans continue to assume that Europe is the only place for a good education? The answer to this, according to the article, was that Americans were "still in awe of Europe";75 yet, (the article quoted Joseffy), "... we have pedagogic talent enough to furnish a dozen conservatories." Joseffy referred to Dvořák as a "gigantic figure in the eyes of the Europeans ... and one of the great men of the century."

Dvořák was quoted as having expressed the regret that the government had not given financial support to the Conservatory, whose purpose was to free Americans from foreign influence. According to Creelman, Dvořák's opinion was that, in Creelman's words, "America will yet tower up among the musical nations."

75Ibid., p. 136.
Creelman asserted that "the whole influence of the great organization over which Dr. Dvořák presides is being exerted to create an independent [italics supplied] system of musical education in America."\(^76\) These attempts, Creelman added, have been evidenced by such manifestations as the prize competitions (encouraging American composers) and by the excellence of its predominantly American faculty. "'I stay in America,'" Dvořák said, "'because I recognize the National Conservatory as one of the foremost schools of the world, and I am proud to be at the head of it.'"

In other words, Dvořák completely endorsed the Conservatory's policy of encouraging native American talent. The conclusion of the article summarized America's problem, while pointing to the significance of Dvořák's tenure:

The music of the nation is now in the hands of foreigners. Let us educate our own teachers and create a system that will spread sound ideas and reflect credit upon the nation. Why should Americans go abroad to study when they can bring the best teachers here and save the expense of the journey. What we need are American musicians educated in America and surrounded by American influences. . . . The future is in our hands. A great musician has crossed the seas to live with us and help us work out our destiny.\(^77\)

Dvořák, therefore, was strongly associated (in the minds of the public) with the Conservatory which in turn firmly advocated a policy of building up America's educational resources—independent of European influence. The unanimity of accord between Dvořák and the Conservatory is readily

\(^{76}\)Ibid., p. 137.

\(^{77}\)Ibid. In respect to the development of America's musical education resources (conservatories), one might ponder the possible relationship between this late nineteenth century manifestation and the twentieth century renaissance in the field of public school music.
understandable, for it was shown (in chapter iii) that Mrs. Thurber built her school along the same principles as set forth by the European conservatories. Also, it should be recalled that she had sponsored concerts prior to Dvořák's tenure in which only American composers were represented. In other words, Dvořák had arrived at the precise moment in the Conservatory's history when there was a strong emphasis placed on the concept of nationalism. By espousing his own theories on American music; by directing the prize awards; and finally by proving his theories in the form of his American compositions--by all of these, Dvořák had shown that America had a great potential which, when fulfilled, would place this country alongside the great musical nations of Europe.

Another interesting fact in the Creelman article was cited in a quotation by Joseffy, who said that the Conservatory wanted "to educate teachers who will not simply teach Gottschalk's music, but will try to cultivate in their pupils an appreciation of composers like Schubert." Here again, it is implicit that Dvořák had inspired the statement since it was shown (in chapter v) that Schubert was greatly stressed in Dvořák's composition class. Also, it should be noted that Dvořák had just completed an article on Franz Schubert, which Sir George Grove praised as an "interesting critical

---
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Paul Stefan (also a Schubert biographer) agreed with Dvořák's findings that, in effect, Schubert's piano music was Slavic, as were "some of his other works." It is apparent that Dvořák rarely failed to take advantage of an opportunity to educate the public insofar as the potential of folk music was concerned. (One of the few exceptions was his negligence as a conductor in regard to furthering American folk music).

Creelman's article had touched upon America's neglect of the art of music; that is, the government had withheld financial support to the National Conservatory. Dvořák himself was very disturbed about this neglect, as evidenced by an article, "Music in America," which he wrote for Harper's Monthly. This discourse by Dvořák, with the acknowledged cooperation of Emerson, represented his final ideas before leaving American soil in 1895 (actually, the article was published after he had returned to Bohemia). It was written at a time when he had gained enough insight through his own personal experience (the everpresent salary problem which plagued his tenure) to have become very outspoken on the idea of government support of the arts. Since this subject, which
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is still a provocative one today, was comparatively new at that time, the following discussion will treat Dvořák's statements in some detail and will relate solely to the points brought out in his article.

The discourse began with an acknowledgment that three years in America was little time "for a foreigner to give a correct verdict of the affairs of another country." (Page 429.) His information was based on his impressions as gathered from his teaching experience as well as from what others had told him.

The two traits which he found to be most impressive about Americans were unbounded patriotism and enthusiasm. (Page 429.) He explained "patriotism" to the effect that Americans considered anything manufactured in their country to be "the finest or grandest"; "enthusiasm" was related to the way in which Americans "push" to get to the "bottom of things at once." In this respect, as Dvořák explained, he was annoyed at first by his pupils' push to do new things all at once; now, however, he had come to realize that this eagerness was the "best promise for music in America."

Although he perceived the trait of enthusiasm in the Americans, he quickly qualified his remarks, stating that this enthusiasm, unfortunately, was narrow in regard to the public's primary interest in materialistic matters. Acknowledging that such institutions as hospitals, schools, and libraries were well supported by generous gifts, he then

---
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queried: Why had "so little been done for music?" Other countries were pointed out as having supported the arts, whereas America alone failed to give this needed financial encouragement, leaving it instead to "private individuals like Jeannette M. Thurber and H. L. Higginson." (Page 430.) He pointed out that his own success as a composer was due to the grants received during his years of struggle; to this, he added an emphatic statement: Since "Art" does not pay at first, it must be subsidized; otherwise, many talented individuals will be forced to leave the profession. He implied that this was unfortunately prevalent among the needy and talented Americans.

He further pointed out that even a talented student who had completed his education had no assurance of eventual recognition. Dvořák was directing his attention squarely at the plight of American composers. He reasoned that they had no outlet for their works, since orchestras were very few, and opera companies—using the English language—were nonexistent. Moreover, publishers were guilty of accepting only "light and trashy music"; this situation was also prevalent in other countries, Dvořák said, but worse in America. In this respect, he noted that his own compositions on American subjects were rejected by American publishers and thus necessitated their being published abroad. (Pages 430-431.) The argument of there being "no popular demand for good music in America" was disputed by him, claiming that American audiences were as large and as attentive as those found in Europe;
however, opera audiences lagged in this country because of the absence of operas sung in English. (Page 432.)

The remainder of Dvořák's discourse was primarily concerned with his continued exhortations on the value of folk music. He was cognizant that America was a nation of heterogeneous peoples (with a decided Teutonic influence) who absorbed the music of other lands and thus were unable to produce their own national music. Despite this seemingly untenable situation, he continued to maintain that Negro and Indian races provided the material necessary for such national music. He brushed aside the argument that the Negro was not indigenously American, and he minimized the issue regarding the validity of the so-called spirituals written by Stephen Foster. The important thing, regarding Foster's songs, was "that the music itself . . . [was] a true expression of the peoples' real feelings." To obtain this true expression, Dvořák advised searching deeply into the numerous strains of this nation: "Undoubtedly the germs for the best of music lie hidden among all the races that are commingled in this great country." (Page 433.) He validated his theory by pointing to numerous composers who utilized folk sources: Smetana, Liszt, Chopin, Bizet, Berlioz, Weber, Beethoven, Wagner, Rossini, Verdi, and practically the whole Russian school. He cited examples from each of these composers. (Pages 433-34.)

Dvořák ended his discourse by summarizing the entire musical situation in America, along with giving his views on the future of American music. He said:
Already there are enough public-spirited lovers of music striving for the advancement of this their chosen art to give rise to the hope that the United States of America will soon emulate the older countries in smoothing [by way of federal grants] the thorny path of the artist and musician. When that beginning has been made, when no large city is without its public opera-house and concert-hall, and without its school of music and endowed orchestra, where native musicians can be heard and judged, then those who hitherto have had no opportunity to reveal their talent will come forth and compete with one another, until a real genius [italics supplied] emerges from their number, who will be as thoroughly representative of his country as Wagner [whose operas, Dvořák earlier pointed out, were "all inspired by German subjects," with the exception of Rienzi] and Weber [Der Freischütz] are of Germany, or Chopin of Poland. [Page 434.]

It can be seen that Dvořák was thinking in an idealistic manner; yet his theories were not unreasonable since, as he pointed out, the music of the Old World countries was based principally upon what he was espousing. This whole article was, in effect, a challenge to Americans to revise their entire attitude towards the arts--music in particular--in order to bring about a situation which would permit a "real genius" to arise.

In this respect, it could be argued that the society which Dvořák projected was never fully realized in this country, and therefore his projections, embracing so many areas of American musical life, still remain in the realms of theory.85

85 It is interesting to note, in respect to Dvořák's projected society, that the movement in public school music (starting in the twentieth century) was to open up an unexpected avenue of public encouragement of the arts. For an excellent account of this movement, see the chapter by Allen Britton, "Music Education: An American Specialty," in One Hundred Years of Music, edited by Paul Henry Lang. Furthermore, this movement has antedated by many years the recent developments in the area of federal support of the arts, e. g., the Music Specialist position in the U. S. Office of Education, the "Yale Report" of 1964, and the forthcoming John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Thurber's Conservatory later received neither federal nor private support. According to the 1912-13 catalog, the Conservatory was forced to charge tuition fees "payable in advance." (Judge Bayes' papers.) By 1916, however, the Conservatory was still seeking outside support. The last notice to the effect that the Conservatory was still functioning was a document of the 1928-29 school year. (App. A, 280.) This document as well as others pertaining to the post-Dvořák era of the National Conservatory has been included in the Appendixes in order to provide material for further research on the subject of the Conservatory. Since it has been shown that Dvořák himself exerted very little, if any, influence on the Conservatory's policies during his tenure, there was no justification for presenting the history of the Conservatory past the date of Dvořák's sojourn. 87
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86 From a pamphlet issued by the Conservatory in 1916, titled "Thirty Years of the National Conservatory of Music of America; 1885-1915," written by Henry T. Finck (Judge Bayes' papers).

87 For the reader's information, a few facts should be noted: Mrs. Thurber lived until 1946 (age 95). During the 1930s and 40s she steadfastly pursued a policy of establishing the Conservatory in Washington, D. C. (App. A, 281 --H. R. Bill.) Her work was continued by Judge Bayes, the last surviving officer of the Conservatory, during the 1950s and as recently as 1960. William Crawford, the lawyer who handled Mrs. Thurber's estate, stated in 1963 that although the Conservatory was no longer actively functioning (according to Crawford, it ceased to "function actively" in 1920--App. B, 315), the Conservatory was still in existence --at least on paper. (From a personal interview with William Crawford and Judge Bayes, August 16, 1963.)
The Importance of Dvořák's Ideas for Nationalism in America

Dvořák had stated his views on folk music and had shown through his own American compositions the potential of this source which had hitherto gone unnoticed. During his tenure, as he himself implied, there were no manifestations of a "real genius" emerging as a result of his counsel. Nor, for that matter, has this ideal of Dvořák's been realized up to the present day. One could argue, however, that the primary importance of Dvořák's views was not to be measured according to a qualitative or quantitative estimate of American composers during the past seventy years, but rather by the broader changes that have occurred during this half century.

Most significant was the fact that America began to examine its own native sources with the concomitant of relaxing its dependency on European influences (particularly the German). Although no composers of the first rank were to appear around the turn of the century, there was activity aimed in the direction of Dvořák's challenge.

It was shown (in chapter v) that his pupils (Shelley, Loomis, Fisher, and Rubin Goldmark among others) remained relatively unknown in regard to their success as American composers. All of them, however, did carry on the work of experimenting with American folk lore. Moreover, it was pointed out that Goldmark himself had become a teacher of prominence, having had such students as Gershwin and Copland --both of whom, therefore, were indirectly influenced by
Dvořák. Shelley also had a pupil of importance, Charles Skilton (1868-1941), composer, teacher, and organist who was strongly interested in Indian music, employing this source for several of his works: Kalopin and The Sun Bride (operas), Two Indian Dances (orchestral), and many others.

One of the most important figures, though, had no direct or indirect relationship to Dvořák: Arthur Farwell (1872-1952), American composer, teacher, and author who accepted Dvořák's challenge to investigate indigenous American music. In 1901, he founded the Wa-Wan Press—a publishing house subsequently sold to G. Schirmer in 1912—which "specialized in the publication of American composition built on native Indian and Negro themes." Over thirty composers were represented; among them were Henry Gilbert (1868-1928) who specialized in Negro music, and Harvey Worthington Loomis (1865-1930), a Dvořák pupil who used Indian material for his compositions as well as lectures. Farwell himself wrote numerous compositions (in all media) based on either Negro or Indian music: Symphonic Song on Old Black Joe (orchestral), Navajo War Dance (for chamber orchestra), Four Choruses on Indian Themes, and Plantation Melody (piano and violin). He also held important music posts at such institutions as the New York Music School Settlement, the University of Southern California, and Michigan State College. He was a critic for Musical America (1909-13) and a contributor to Thompson's Cyclopedia ("Nationalism in Music"). Gilbert Chase (critic,
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journalist, and musicologist) credited Farwell with having been the spokesman for the "movement of liberation" (from German influence) begun by Dvořák.89

Other twentieth century composers, having no direct or indirect relationship to Dvořák, wrote with an ear tuned towards native music: William Grant Still (Afro-American Symphony, A Deserted Plantation, and The Black Man Dances), William Dawson (Negro Folk Symphony), Robert Nathaniel Dett (Chariot Jubilee—an oratorio), Edward MacDowell (Second [Indian] Suite), Roy Harris (Johnny Comes Marching Home), Ernest Bloch (America), Ferde Grofé (Grand Canyon Suite), Charles Cadman (Four Indian Songs), Paul Pisk (A Tree on the Plains—an opera), Norman Lockwood (Children of God—an oratorio), Elie Siegmeister (Western Suite), and Don Gillis (An American Symphony). The first three composers in the list are Negroes.

The list does not pretend to cover all the twentieth century composers whose main characteristic has been identified in some way with American music. It merely suggests that a significant number of American composers, utilizing the folk source as a basis for many of their works, did flourish during this century.

Several qualifications should be noted regarding the inclusion of MacDowell. In the article of "American Indian Music," Charles Sanford Skilton (pupil of Shelley), noting the relatively few composers who have utilized Indian melodies,

---

cited MacDowell as the first to experiment in this field; Skilton said: "The pioneer work is the Second Orchestral or 'Indian' Suite of Edward MacDowell, composed in 1890, before Dvořák's Symphony From the New World, employing themes from the thesis [Über die Musik der Nordamerikanischen Wilden] of Dr. Baker." The point should be noted, however, that the Suite may have had its inception in 1890, but it was not published until 1897, which could imply a Dvořák influence; moreover, if MacDowell had finished the Suite around the time that the "New World" was premiered (December 15, 1893), he doubtless would have given immediate notice of this fact. Most important, though, it is erroneous to suggest that MacDowell predated Dvořák's views. John Tasker Howard, discussing the Suite, doubted that MacDowell "ever seriously thought he was writing American music just because he used Indian melodies." In fact, MacDowell himself minimized so-called "nationalism" in music, according to Tasker, who cited one of MacDowell's discourses; Tasker wrote: "MacDowell himself disposed of nationalism in music: '... Nationalism so-called is merely an extraneous thing that has no part in pure art.'" The employment of native melodies intact, in other words, had no place in a serious composition. MacDowell's solution to the question of nationalism was more subtle. "In a [Columbia University] lecture," according to Howard, "he said:
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'What we must arrive at is youthful optimistic vitality and undaunted tenacity of spirit that characterizes the American man.' In some respects this is what Dvořák had advocated, that is, not an exact repetition of native music but rather capturing its spirit. Dvořák failed to realize, however, that Negro and Indian music did not necessarily represent the spirit of the whole of America, but rather reflected two relatively small cultural segments of this large heterogeneous nation. In this respect, therefore, MacDowell's view was perhaps closer to so-called American nationalism than was Dvořák's comparatively narrow viewpoint. In the book, *A Short History of American Music*, Howard discussed the views of both of these composers and concluded that the two were widely divergent; of MacDowell, Howard wrote: "... Spiritually he was never a part of it [nationalism], nor was he in sympathy with Dvořák's views on nationalism." Therefore, although MacDowell was one of the first composers to experiment with Indian music, his contributions towards this field were very limited; in fact, as implied above, he subsequently was a negative force in the development of native American music.

One further implication should be noted in assaying the importance of Dvořák in regard to nationalism. The "New World" Symphony and the many discourses pertaining to its origin were of major significance regarding America's attitude
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towards Negro music. R. Nathaniel Dett (1882-1943), American Negro composer and author (compositions based on Negro folk music), wrote:

There have been three factors outstanding in their influence on the thought of America regarding Negro music development: (1) The world tour, about the year 1880, of the famous Fisk [University] Jubilee Singers. (2) The compositions of Stephen Foster. (3) The Symphony From the New World, by Antonín Dvořák.95

The Fisk group (organized in 1871) was composed of American Negroes who in 1880 gained world critical acclaim for their singing of Negro spirituals. (Clapham suggested that it was possible for Dvořák to have heard them during this tour, thus allowing him to gain "something of the nature of Negro song" prior to his American sojourn.96) The tour did awaken Americans to the realization that an "unexploited art-treasure" (spirituals) was to be found within their own country.97

In regard to Foster's songs, Dett made three observations:

(1) For the first time the Negro as a social element in the life of the American people was artistically depicted, thereby creating a sympathetic, if not altogether respectful interest in the race.

(2) It revealed the Negro in a secular light, which contrasted sharply with the religious aura which the Jubilee Songs, or Spirituals, had thrown around him [the Negro].

(3) It demonstrated that the life of the Negro, as entwined with the development of an Americana, had dramatic possibilities of high commercial appeal.98

---
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The success of Foster's songs, Dett continued, resulted in a preponderance of popular music based upon all segments of Negro life—"from the sublime to the ridiculous." None of these songs, according to Dett, was of a stature equal to that of Foster's accomplishments.

From the above, one could surmise that in certain respects both factors—the Fisk Singers and Foster's songs—contributed to an actual downgrading of America's attitude towards the Negro race; at least these two factors did not permit the ennobling of the race in any way, but rather pointed out the Negroes' subservient existence.

In this respect, therefore, the third of Dett's "factors"—Dvořák's Symphony—equalized the shortcomings of the other two; of the Symphony, Dett wrote:

Quite apart from its musical worth, it has large significance in that it demonstrated for the first time that the idioms [pentatonic scale, syncopation, and so forth] have symphonic value. Thus was exploded a figment in American thought which had assumed, perhaps unconsciously, that because the slaves position was inferior all things created by, and appertaining to him must necessarily be inferior. [Italics supplied.]

This statement by Dett corroborates the sociological implications suggested earlier in the chapter: in effect, that a serious composition employing Negro traits as its basis was incapable of achieving a noble character, since the Negro race was looked upon as being inferior.

Dett himself echoed Dvořák's hope that eventually a real genius would arise and thereby fulfill what had been successfully started in the "New World" Symphony. The
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following statement by Dett bears a striking similarity to what Dvořák had implied:

The Negro composer, rich in his heritage of song, reaches up for the canons of form, by which all music has been advanced; the white composer, schooled in the traditions of artistic development, reaches down for the inspiration which has ever sprung from the soul of those close to the soil. Eventually their hands must meet. It takes no prophet to foretell that from their union shall arise a spirit [italics supplied] which shall sound the note of a new and representative art to the ears of the waiting world.¹⁰⁰

In this respect, Dvořák's projections are still to be fully realized.

**Summary and Conclusions**

The path which Dvořák followed during his three-year sojourn was prophetically implied in a welcoming speech on October 21, 1892, when Colonel Higginson said that Dvořák was to guide America in discovering a "New World of music" --an American music--independent of German and Italian influences. Dvořák succeeded in this challenge, not only by suggesting and then by giving concrete evidence (the "New World" Symphony) that a great potential was to be found in America's native music, but also by his actual presence, which was a tacit endorsement of America's musical education structure. His significance in regard to nationalism went beyond the mere folk music implication, and encompassed the whole of American musical life.

Through his exhortations to America's investigating its own resources, he effected an opening wedge which was

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 1246.
ultimately to release this country from its dependency on Europe. His American compositions, proving that the spirit of folk music could be successfully incorporated into a classic mold, stirred the people into the realization that their (America's) folk music had unlimited possibilities. In this respect, it should also be noted that his Symphony was a factor in changing America's attitude towards Negro music: no longer was this race's music to be thought of solely as representative of a menial people, but instead their music was to be looked upon as a possible basis for noble compositions.

Although there were skeptics (such as MacDowell and Philip Hale) who challenged Dvořák's ideas, there were numerous other American composers and authors who carried on what Dvořák had commenced. The final criterion of judgment, however, should not rest on the number of successful American composers who emulated Dvořák's views; more important was the fact that America for the first time became cognizant of the musical resources within its own borders.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the study was to show the extent to which Dvořák influenced American musical thinking during his sojourn in America--1892-95. Since he held the title of director of the National Conservatory for that entire period, it was assumed that this position enabled him to effect changes regarding the Conservatory's curriculum and its general policy. In arriving at a conclusion, therefore, several major areas were examined: (1) the history of Czech music prior to Dvořák; (2) Dvořák's activities prior to his sojourn; (3) the history of the National Conservatory prior to Dvořák; (4) Dvořák's contracts, which described his duties at the Conservatory; (5) his actual duties at the Conservatory; (6) his American compositions and discourses on American music; (7) American nationalism in the twentieth century. The findings in each of these areas were as follows:

**Czech Music Prior to Dvořák**

Despite having been under foreign rule since 1620, the Czech people (especially the peasants) were able to retain their national identity. Their music had a tradition which dated from the thirteenth century, and later was affected by the Hussite Wars and the Reformation. Many significant Czech composers appeared in the eighteenth century, but it was
Smetana (mid-nineteenth century) who strongly identified with the fight for independence (1848 Revolution) and probed deeply into the potential of native folk music.

**Dvořák Prior to His Sojourn**

Dvořák was born into a Czech community and therefore did not have to search (as did Smetana) for a national identity. His early style of composition (1862-76) revealed an emulation of the Classics (Beethoven and Schubert) and the high Romantics (Liszt and Wagner). Notwithstanding the many disappointments of his early creative efforts (none among the voluminous number of compositions was performed), he persistently continued these experimental efforts until finally coming upon a style that was truly his own, during the second half of the 1870's. These new works (the Slavonic Dances were examined) exhibited traits of Slavic folk music, yet refrained, for the most part, from keeping the folk melodies intact; his works reflected the spirit of the folk music. This style of writing (gaining wide recognition for him) came very naturally since it was rooted in the music he had heard in his childhood. It should be noted that Brahms was his faithful mentor and supporter during this ascent to worldly acclaim. The decade of the 1880's witnessed an increase of his popularity, especially in England, where he made numerous visits. By 1891, he had received two honorary doctorates (Cambridge and Prague) and was appointed professor of composition and orchestration at the Prague Conservatory. It should be noted that this was his sole
teaching experience (aside from private instruction) before his appointment to the National Conservatory in New York.

The National Conservatory Prior to Dvořák

The Conservatory was founded in 1885 by Jeannette M. Thurber, who attempted to model the school along the principles of the Paris Conservatory: government support, free tuition (to the talented and needy), branches in other cities, a singing school in connection with the main establishment, and a curriculum which emphasized solfeggio. Although these initial attempts met with some degree of success (with the exception that governmental financial aid never materialized), the only principle that remained throughout the history of the National Conservatory (1885-1929) was the emphasis given to solfeggio. By 1890, Mrs. Thurber had secured an outstanding faculty, while the students represented over thirty states, reflecting the claim that the Conservatory was truly "National." In 1891, the Conservatory was granted a national charter, which was, perhaps, the first instance that Congress acted on a matter pertaining to the arts. Despite the recognition which the Conservatory had acquired, financial security was not forthcoming, since the students were primarily very young and female (many were also Negro or blind), thereby greatly precluding the possibility of student reimbursement. Mrs. Thurber, who carried the financial burden, was strongly interested in building up America's image of its own musicians; not only did she stress the education of native-born talent, but she also was the first to sponsor a concert devoted solely to American-born composers.
Dvořák and Sibelius were the two candidates considered for the position as director of the Conservatory; owing to a matter of convenience, Dvořák was chosen in 1891. Several alterations were made before Dvořák signed the first contract in 1892; the other agreement was signed on April 28, 1894. In regard to his duties, neither contract mentioned administrative functions, which implied that his title "director" was in name only. His teaching schedule was light: nine hours per week of composition and instrumentation classes in which only talented pupils would be admitted. In regard to conducting, the first contract stipulated a possibility of six concerts devoted entirely to his own works; the second contract omitted this item. Both contracts referred to his rehearsing the orchestra and chorus. His salary was $15,000 annually for the first two years; the last year it was reduced to $10,000. The decrease was probably influenced by the Panic of 1893. It can be seen, therefore, that although the two contracts contained essentially the same information, the first was considerably more favorable to Dvořák, especially regarding salary.

His Actual Duties

Dvořák's American sojourn lasted from September 26, 1892, until April 16, 1895. The three years were spent mostly in New York City, except during the summer of 1894, when he returned to Bohemia for a visit. In regard to his duties as administrator, teacher, and conductor, the following was noted:
Administrator

He was rarely, if ever, consulted on administrative matters. The one possible exception was his interest in the prize competition which had been established by Mrs. Thurber; in this respect, he made a few suggestions which were of negligible importance. Indirectly, he may have been responsible for further encouraging the admittance of Negroes to the Conservatory.

Teacher

His class was small and only talented pupils were admitted. Apparently, he taught as he himself had learned. The students were given composition exercises and were told to emulate the style of Beethoven and Schubert. The tacit implications of his pupils' discourses revealed that the subject of nationalism was omitted from his teaching. Nothing was suggested to indicate that Dvořák was more than an ordinary teacher; none of his pupils emerged as composers of the first rank.

Conductor

Public concerts of the Conservatory Orchestra were rare, owing to a restriction which prohibited professionals from engaging in performances with amateurs (the pupils). Dvořák apparently was unable to develop the pupils' ability to enable them to give concerts on their own. He himself was shown to lack the temperament and mechanics requisite for good conducting. It should also be noted that his conducting engagements with groups not connected with the Conservatory were few. Although these programs did contain
nationalistic compositions of his own, there was an absence of works by any American composers. Therefore, according to the available evidence, Dvořák as a conductor did not make any significant contributions in furthering the development of American music.

One other factor should be noted regarding Dvořák's relationship with the Conservatory in general: his first year was comparatively happy; his last two were filled with financial anxieties. His correspondence with Mrs. Thurber was largely devoted to requests for salary payments and to threats of exposing this untenable situation to the world. This conflict, which reached serious proportions, was attributed to the Panic of 1893, when Mrs. Thurber's finances had taken a sharp drop. In this respect, it was suggested that Dvořák might have chosen to remain in America if economic conditions had not taken that downward turn.

**Nationalism as Revealed in His American Compositions and Discourses**

Dvořák's Symphony *From the New World*, Op. 95, was completed on May 24, 1893; three days before, Dvořák asserted that Negro melodies contain all that would be necessary to inspire "great and noble" American music. That summer, he wrote the Quartet, Op. 96, and the Quintet, Op. 97, during a visit to Spillville, Iowa, a Czech colony where he also came in contact with Indian tribal music. These three compositions (Symphony, Quartet, and Quintet) were, according to Dvořák, based on Negro and Indian folk music. In this
respect, it is important to note that Dvořák himself was responsible for the furor and controversy surrounding the derivation of themes used in these works, since his views were given before the works' premières. He also defined what he considered to be the limits of nationalism in music, namely, any music which "lives in the heart of the people."

Some of the songs of Stephen Foster, therefore, might be considered spirituals, representative of the Negro race. However, the use of such well-known songs as the basis for a larger work was questioned by the writer in regard to their ultimate aesthetic value in a serious composition.

**American Nationalism in the Twentieth Century**

Dvořák's American compositions had proved that the spirit of folk music could be incorporated successfully into a classic mold; this, in turn, stirred Americans to believe that their own folk music had unlimited possibilities. In this respect, it should also be noted that his Symphony, in particular, brought about a changing attitude towards Negro music; that is, for the first time, this race's music was no longer considered solely as an expression of a menial people, but rather was looked upon in ennobling terms. Although Dvořák's opinions met with adverse criticisms during and subsequent to his sojourn, there were numerous other American composers, authors, and critics who, for the first time, were prompted into the realization of America's musical resources, especially regarding the possible folk song treasure within this country's borders. This realization, in
turn, represented a reversal from the normal dependence on European influence.

**Needed Research**

Although the investigation has centered on the movements of American culture in regard to post-high school musical education (the education of the Conservatories), it should be pointed out that the development of American public school music in the twentieth century opened up an unexpected avenue of public encouragement of the arts. Since it was shown that both Dvořák and Mrs. Thurber envisioned an American enthusiasm for the arts, it would be of interest to discover the relationship between the development of musical education in America and the twentieth century renaissance in public school music. Furthermore, although this enthusiasm was irreconcilable with America's preoccupation with materialism, a possibility exists of a relationship between this projected enthusiasm and the current trends in federal support of the arts, as manifested in the Music Specialist position in the United States Office of Education, the "Yale Report" of 1964, and the forthcoming John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D. C.
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The National Conservatory of Music of America.

Agreement by Student.

John O'Calla
of New York State by birth
in consideration of my being admitted as a Student to the Conservatory and receiving free instruction therefrom, hereby agree as follows, viz.: 

1. To observe, under penalty of summary dismissal, all present and future Rules and Regulations of the Conservatory; and to attend, under the same penalty, all lessons, rehearsals, and practices to which I may be assigned, unless prevented from so doing by illness duly certified, or excused by the proper officer.

2. To place my services, if so required, at the disposal of the American Opera Company, Limited, or the National Opera Company, Limited, their several successors and assigns, for a period not exceeding three years from the termination of my studies in the Conservatory; and if either of the said companies elect to employ me, to accept for such services whatever salary may be mutually fixed and agreed upon; and between the Company employing me as aforesaid, and the Conservatory; and to make a contract to the above effect, with either of the said Opera Companies, its successors and assigns, subject to the usual Rules and Regulations then ordinarily imposed by such Company in the case of artists of like professional standing.

3. To pay to the Conservatory, upon the termination of my studies, or upon my connection with the Conservatory being otherwise severed, and for the purpose of enabling it to continue its Educational Work, one quarter of all monies in excess of $1,000 a year—taking each year by itself—which shall accrue to me in remuneration for musical services of any sort during a period of three years from the date of my graduation or other severance, as aforesaid, of my connection with the Conservatory.
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In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal, this, Twenty-ninth day of October, 1887.
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THE NATIONAL CONSERVATORY IS THE ONLY MUSICAL INSTITUTE
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ADMIRABLE FACULTY
With no end in view but the impartation of knowledge and the consequent elevation of the public taste, with no other revenue than that contributed by lovers of music and the very small returns derived from the nominal tuition charged, and with no contribution whatever from talented candidates for admission unable to pay for high class tuition, it is believed that the National Conservatory addresses itself to all patriotic and music loving Americans as a
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An act to incorporate the National Conservatory of Music of America.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Jeannette M. Thurber, William G. Choate, Chauncey M. Depew, Abram S. Hewitt, Frank R. Lawrence, of the State of New York; William Pineckney Whyte, Enoch Pratt, of Maryland; Fitz Hugh Lee, William H. Payne, of Virginia; Olive Risley Seward, John Hay, S. P. Langley, Anthony Pollock, C. R. P. Rodgers, John M. Schofield, of the District of Columbia, and such others as may be associated with them, are hereby constituted a body politic and corporate by the name National Conservatory of Music of America, with perpetual succession, with power to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of law or equity, to make and use a common seal and alter the same at pleasure; to acquire, take by devise, bequest, or otherwise, hold, purchase, and convey such real and personal estate as shall be required for the purposes of its incorporation; to appoint such officers and agents as the business of the corporation shall require, and to make by-laws not inconsistent with any law of the United States for the admission and qualification of members, the management of its property, and the regulation of its affairs. Said corporation is hereby empowered to found, establish, and maintain a national conservatory of music within the District of Columbia for the education of citizens of the United States and such other persons as the trustees may deem proper in all the branches of music. The said corporation shall have the power to grant and confer diplomas and the degree of doctor of music or other honorary degrees.

SEC. 2. The power to alter, amend or repeal this act, is hereby reserved.

Approved, March 3, 1891.

An Act To amend an Act approved March 3, 1891, incorporating the National Conservatory of Music of America.


SEC. 2. That the power to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby reserved.

Approved, March 4, 1921.
A. Anderungen
für den 1. Karlspiegel
für Contracte getroffen.
The National Conservatory
of Music of America
samt Antonin Dvořák
of Prague.

Ad. Paragraph 1

Für St. Antonin Dvořák
nimmt hierzu & nach
in der Form an, jener
wird, der für seine
Abreise eine Summe von
7500 Dollars für die Reise
baut in Prag für die Zeit
lagt mit die die Glieder
feiert. Dafür sollte dann
15000 Dollars x i. d. 7500
Dollars in unmittelbarem
Anteilstrauen in dem Zeit
dem 23/9 1892 bis 23/4
1893 an die Regierung
zurück. Dazu die im
gleiches bis Juli 1893
übergeben.
2. Paragraf II

Fort die Aufführung des von Dr. Antonin Dvořák geschriebenen Streichquartets "From the New World" in folgender Weise ist der Freitag zu freihalten:
Montag: 2 Stunden für Gitarre
der Vorspielung für die Orchestergruppe mit Concerto des Orchestrums
Sekretär mit 1 Stunde für das Büro
Dienstag: 3 Stunden für den
Mitarbeiter zur Erledigung von
Fragen in der Compositoren
Instrumentation
Viertel auf der Freitag der Montag
Kommittage mit "Veranstaltungen"

Dienstag.

Das Notizen, mit anderen Sinfonien
für Musik "popin", sowie den
"Franziska" von der
Aufzeichnung.

Diese Sinfonie ist an den 20
September zu beginnen mit
jedoch 23. Mai für klein
und am 8. Juni in Gang der
Meinung. Die 32. Oktober
inklusive "Franziska" von der
Sinfonie für die Heim
unbefräftigten Spielern
Zweiten, ist am 8. in
immer mit im in der Welt, freilich in auch in Frankreich, ein Erfahrung gibt es fast gar nicht, kann.

**Paragraph III** auszumessen

In der Tat, es freilich, wo es die deutsche Auscure zu fast freilich langsam wird. Man geht für beide Halften zu gar nichts, sonst mit dem Befehl, für keinen für wohl, aufhören in Chicago, dann

ist der Auscure in Chicago

Halt findet man.

Außer dem über mit Hotel, fallen

sich Farm für sich. Und das, dass

wir einen Auscure enttäuschen als in

New York für bisher, so sind

ihn dermaßen lange, dass der

begnügte, trotzdem kein Enttäuschung

für diesen pulver enttäuscht finde.

**Paragraph 4** ist eingelassen

**Paragraph 5** ist zu laden:

das Programm bestand nicht

dieser Auscure ist ganzlich und

deren für meinen Anspruch

et. braucht. für diesen nicht mit

dem von Arrangiert.
Paragraph 11. nicht angegeben

Paragraph 12. nicht angegeben

Paragraph 13. nicht los

Befehl von 5 Monaten Dauer gegeben.
In Volks der Zeit der Zeit
Einen Tag nach der Zeit
Präsidium die K. K.
Verzeichnisse Consulate
auf ein und dasselben.
Aufgaben auf und aufgegeben,
Paragraph 14 bis fünfzehn
mit ihr Amtespfeil, Komplexe
und die Erinnerung des früheren
fort von seinem Körper, das
ey. C. und A. zu fragen.
Paragraph 15
Der Vertrag ist in Form
Paris einzufristigen und
jeder Teil erhält ein Ster.

Paragraph 16
y. C. und A. ausgeführt
für Form St. Antonius
Fort von Paris für
vom Friedrichsfeld I Classen
für mit großen für dasselbe
vom Friedrichsfeld oder
für frei den in der I Classen
für seinen ein weiter die
Hofe und Alltagsgaben Form
St. Antonius Forte iberlassen.
Paragraph I:

Dr. Antonin Dvorak does not accept the paragraph in this form, but wishes to have paid him in the Union Bank of Prague before his voyage, one half of his yearly salary, that is, the sum of $7,500; (and to receive) the other half of the $15,000 in monthly instalments, between September 23, 1892 to April 23, 1893. Moreover, the same shall apply to the school year 1893-1894.

Paragraph II:

Dr. Antonin Dvorak wishes to divide his daily three hours of instruction in the following fashion: Monday: two hours in preparation of the students for performances and concerts of the orchestra; one hour for administration. Tuesday: Three hours for the instruction only of talented students in composition and instrumentation. Wednesday and Friday: the same as Monday. Thursday and Saturday: the same as Tuesday.

The words "in other branches of music", also, "which will be demanded of you" are not acceptable.

The school year shall begin September 23 and continue to May 23, and the period from May 23 to September 22 shall remain to the uninhibited free disposition of Dr. A. D., so that he may always spend this time in activities unhindered by the conditions of this contract.

Paragraph III:

Accepted with the condition that the six concerts within this period will have been given by the 1st of May, and that during the period of the
World Exhibition in Chicago, none of these concerts will be performed in Chicago.

Outside of travel and hotel expenses, should Dr. Antonin Dvorak have to direct a concert elsewhere than in New York, a carriage shall be provided for him, or he shall be reimbursed for the expense of same.

**Paragraph IV:**

Shall be deleted.

**Paragraph V:**

Should be worded as follows: "The program of at least one of these concerts shall consist entirely of the works of Antonin Dvorak, and shall be arranged by him."

**Paragraph VI:**

Shall be deleted. (The rules of the NCMA shall be laid before Dr. Antonin Dvorak and it shall be left to him by which of these he can abide and by which he cannot.)

**Paragraph VII:**

These conditions shall only be in effect during the eight months of the school year and shall not be valid during the period Dr. Antonin Dvorak has reserved for his own free action and shall (therefore) not be in effect from May 23 through September 22 of each school year. (Both school years).

**Paragraph VIII:**

Accepted under the same conditions as Paragraph VII.
Paragraph IX:

Accepted except for the unclear final sentence: "...and that Antonin Dvorak, etc., are mentioned."

Paragraph X:

Shall be altered. Instead of a predetermined appropriate reduction of salary in case of non-fulfillment of duties, more exact conditions shall be established. Dr. Antonin Dvorak reserves to himself the right to give three months' notice of termination of his contract in case the climate should not agree with him. In the event that Dr. A. D. cannot bear the climate, he must prove this via a physician's certificate. The term "sick leave" as employed in Paragraph X shall be raised from four weeks to eight weeks.

Paragraph XI:

Not accepted.

Paragraph XII:

Not accepted.

Paragraph XIII:

Instead of the proposed referee in this paragraph, the arbitration (judgement) of any dispute shall be made by (laid before) the Kaiserlich Koeniglichen Austrian Consulate. Aside from this provision, the paragraph is accepted.

Paragraph XIV:

The total costs of the execution of this contract shall be borne by the National Conservatory of Music of America.
Paragraph XV:

The contract shall be drawn up with two originals, and each party shall receive one original and one copy.*

Paragraph XVI:

The National Conservatory of Music shall be obligated to reimburse to Dr. Antonin Dvorak the cost of the steamship voyage, first class, both ways, for six adults (or three first class cabins), and the choice of the port of departure shall be left to Dr. Antonin Dvorak.

* The translation of the comment on Paragraph XV is an educated guess. Very legal terminology.
The National Conservatory of Music of America

and

Herr Dvořák

Agreement
This Agreement made on the day of 1890

By and Between

The National Conservatory of Music of America (a corporation) of the first part and

Anon. Director of Prague Bohemian Musical Society of the second part

Witnesseth

That the said party of the first part hereby agrees and contracts to pay to the said party of the second part a salary at the rate of fifteen thousand dollars a year for two years from the twenty-third day of September in the thousand eight hundred and ninety fourth year to the twenty-third day of September in the thousand eight hundred and ninety sixth year. The said salary to be for and in consideration of the performance by the said party of the second part of the agreement hereinafter specified and to be paid in manner hereinafter provided namely the sum of seven thousand five hundred dollars being half of the first year's salary to be deposited in the name of the said party of the second part and for him with the Bohemian Union Bank of Prague before his departure to America and the second half of the said first year's salary to be paid to the said party of the second part in eight installments payable monthly in advance the first of such monthly payments to be made on the twenty-third day of September in the thousand eight hundred and ninety fourth and ninety fifth years and to continue from that date until the twenty-third day of September in the thousand eight hundred and ninety sixth year at which time the whole of the said first year's salary will have been paid And as to the second year's salary the same to be paid in a similar manner namely the sum of seven thousand five hundred dollars to be deposited before the twenty-third day of September in the thousand eight hundred and ninety fifth and ninety sixth years in the name of the said party of the second part and for him with any bank which he may appoint and the remainder of the said second year's salary to be paid in eight installments payable monthly in advance the first of such payments to be made
on the twenty third day of September one thousand eight hundred and ninety three and to continue from that date until the entire salary shall have been paid which will be on the twenty third day of April one thousand eight hundred and ninety four.

2. And the said party of the second part in consideration of the said salary agrees and contracts during the said period of two years to become and be the Musical Director of the said party of the first part and as such Director to perform the duties heretoforespecified namely (1) To provide and assist at all the Conservatory examinations which will take place three times a year and each of which may last a week.

(2) To arrange the programmes for four concerts to be given by the pupils of the said party of the first part and to direct the Orchestra and Shows in connection therewith if required by the party of the first part.

(3) To appoint an hour a day three times a week for the purpose of receiving persons in connection with the said party of the first part who may wish to consult with him and during the hours so appointed to remain in his office for this purpose.

(4) To teach composition and instrumentation and to conduct the general rehearsals of the National Conservatory Orchestra and Chorus.

(5) To give his sole attention during each eight months from the twenty third day of September to the twenty third day of May which shall form the scholastic year of the said party of the first part for three hours every day for the performance of the above mentioned duties. The arrangement of such duties and the hours which they shall respectively occupy on each day in every week to be in accordance with the following table.

**Appendix:** Five hours to be given to the preparation of the Students for the performances and
Concerts of the said party of the first part... and one hour for business connection in... presence of the arrangement referred to in... Section 3 of this paragraph.

Tuesday

The whole three hours to be devoting giving instruction in composition and instrumenta... to the most talented pupils only.

Wednesday and Friday

The three hours to be occupied in the... same manner as on Monday.

Thursday and Saturday

The three hours to be occupied in the... same manner as on Tuesday.

3. And it is mutually agreed that in further... mention the said party of the said... part shall conduct such number of Concerts as he may... be required, not exceeding six in each scholastic year as above defined. With regard to these Concerts it is... agreed that the party of the first part shall engage... for them. Any good executive forces so that the chorus... and the orchestra shall be thoroughly prepared and that... the Concert rehearsals held with them shall give satisfaction... to the party of the second part. Such Concerts to be... given in New York or any other City in the United... States with the exception that no Concert shall be... given in Chicago during the time when the "Fields Fair" is taking place in that City. If the said party... of the second part shall be required to conduct a... Concert elsewhere than in New York he shall be... entitled to and be paid his travelling and Hotel... expenses in connection therewith, and also be provided... with a carriage to be reimbursed the expenses incurred... by him in hiring one during such period, as he shall... be resident in any City other than New York in... connection with the said Concert. The programme... at any one of the said Concerts shall consist wholly... of works composed by the said party of the second... part... and shall be arranged by him.

4. It is mutually agreed that the remaining...
four months in each year not forming part of
the said scholastic year, namely from the twenty third
day of May to the twenty second day of September,
shall be at the free and absolute disposal of
the said party of the second part and during
such period the said party of the second part
shall be in no way so bound by the conditions
and stipulations herein contained or otherwise by reason
of this Agreement.
5 And it is hereby mutually agreed that the
said party of the second part shall not during
the said scholastic year teach or render any
services either by way of private tuition or as an
instructor in any Conservatory School or Institution
of Learning other than the Conservatory School
of the party of the first part nor during the same
period accept any engagement to appear in public
whatever. And in case of any proposals or offers
of engagements being addressed to the said party of
the second part during such period as aforesaid
the same shall be at once referred by him to the
said party of the first part.
6 And the party of the second part shall not
during the said scholastic year receive any pupil
of the party of the first part or any person
who have been such pupil has been dismissed
for cause as the private pupil of the said party
of the second part nor shall said party of the
second part give any private instruction or tuition to
any such pupil without the consent in writing of
the party of the first part signed by its President
first had and received.
7 And it is mutually agreed that the
Conservatory of the party of the first part shall
be closed upon all legal holiday and day of
sabbath observed as such and no services are to be rendered
by the party of the second part upon days when
the said Conservatory is thus closed.
And it is mutually agreed by the parties here
that if during the time this agreement covers the party
of the second part shall fail to perform the duties
therein specified then that for every such failure the
salary of the said party shall be validly reduced unless
otherwise determined by the party of the first part.
Provided that no such reduction of salary shall take place
in the case of the said party of the second part becoming
incapacitated from performing the said duties through
illness unless the said party of second part shall be
incapacitated in such illness for a period exceeding eight weeks at any one time. And provided also
that the said party of the second part shall be at
liberty in the event of the climate and weather being
and in producing a Medical Certificate to this effect to
the said party of the first part to give three months
notice in writing of his intention to determine this agreement
and at the expiration of the said period of three months.
Agreement shall be null and void but subject to the
rights and remedies of the said parties in respect of
any breach of the covenants and stipulations here contained
and subject to an adjustment of accounts between the
parties hereon in case of the party of the second part
having been paid his salary for a period beyond the date
of the determination of this agreement. Should the party
of the first part fail to fulfil the obligations specified
in this agreement the party of the second part is entitled
either to insist upon the fulfilment thereof or to declare
this agreement set aside and divided. In the latter case the
party of the second part is entitled to the whole of
that portion of his salary which would have to be
paid to him up till then under this agreement. If
therefore he has already been paid that portion of his
salary he will not have to pay any of it back to the
party of the first part and if he has not yet received it in full he will have the right to demand the full
payment thereof. The party of the second part shall
further have in this case the right to demand contribution
And it is hereby agreed that the costs of
and incidental to this agreement shall be borne and
paid for by the said party of the first part, and
further that the said party of the first part will
refund and pay in any case to said party of
the second part the price of six first-class tickets
by Steamer to New York and back again. Having
left to the discretion of the said party of the said
part to elect from what Port or by what line
he will travel.

This agreement is intended to be executed in the
English and German languages in duplicate in each
language, and each party shall hold one copy in
each language.

It is hereby lastly agreed that this agreement
shall be binding on the said parties herein and be
enforceable either in Austria or the United States
and that in the event of any dispute arising
between the said parties the same shall be
referred to the American Consul resident in New
York from whom there shall be no appeal.

Prague 1872. [Signature]
THE NATIONAL CONSERVATORY
OF MUSIC OF AMERICA.

Incorporated September 21, 1883.

Officers.

President,
Mrs. JEANNETTE M. THURBER.

Vice-President,
Hon. WILLIAM G. CHOATE.

Treasurer,
Hon. HENRY W. CANNON.

Secretary,
Mr. EDMUND C. STANTON.

Director,
Dr. ANTONIN DVORAK.

Trustees.

WILLIAM G. CHOATE,
HENRY W. CANNON,
SAMUEL D. COYKENDALL,
JOHN D. CRIMMINS,
MRS. C. P. HUNTINGTON,
H. L. HORTON,
EUGENE KELLY, JR.,
MISS HANNAH N. LAWRENCE,
JAMES BROWN LORD,
FRANK R. LAWRENCE,
CHAS. INSLEE PARDEE.

T. J. OAKLEY RHINELANDER,
CLARENCE M. ROOF,
MRS. J. S. T. STRANAHAN,
EDMUND C. STANTON,
GUSTAV H. SCHWAB,
FRANK K. STURGIS,
ISAAC STERN,
FRANCIS B. THURBER,
MRS. JEANNETTE M. THURBER,
J. HOOD WRIGHT,
ERASTUS WIMAN.
The Advanced Course includes Violin, Harmony, Chamber Music, Orchestra, and History of Music.

Viola, Violoncello, and Contrabass.

The Preparatory and Advanced Courses are the same as in Violin.

The Preparatory and Advanced Courses of Flute, Oboe, Clarionet, Bassoon, French Horn, Cornet, Trombone, are the same as the foregoing.

Theory of Music.

Harmony, Counterpoint, and Composition.

A special feature of this department is the Advanced Class in Composition, under the direction of DR. ANTONIN DVORAK.

Classes for Teachers.

Classes for Teachers have been established in every department.

The National Conservatory Choral Society.

A Choral Society has been formed for lovers of music of every nationality.

The Orchestral Class combines all the advanced pupils of the Instrumental Classes.
Evening Classes.

Classes for men in singing and solfeggio are in session from 8 to 10 o'clock P.M.

Children's Solfeggio Classes.

Lessons will be given twice a week, at hours which will not interfere with their attendance at school.

V.—Terms.

Dr. Dvorak's Class of Composition for the scholastic year... $300.00
Preparatory Course in all branches for scholastic year... $80.00 to 100.00
Advanced Course for scholastic year... $125 to 200.00

Fees for Special Studies for Scholastic Year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solfeggio and Theory of Music</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Solfeggio</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diction</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Music</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Music</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment Lessons</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual lessons given in classes.

No private tuition.
VI.—Faculty.

Its membership embraces the foremost artists and instructors of America, and it may be affirmed that no Conservatory abroad can lay claim to so admirably efficient a corps of teachers.

**Director,**

**DR. ANTONIN DVORAK.**

**Singing.**

Signor Romualdo Sapio, Monsieur Victor Capoul,
Mr. Christian Fritsch, Mrs. Beebe Lawton,
Mr. Oscar Saenger, Miss Katharine W. Evans,
Mr. Wilford Watters.

**Singing—Preparatory—**Miss Annie Wilson.

**Opera Class—**Monsieur Victor Capoul.

**Conductor of Opera—**Herr Anton Seidl.

**Repertoire—**Signor Ernesto Belli.

**Operatic Chorus—**To be selected.

**Oratorio Class—**Mrs. Beebe Lawton.

**Piano.**

Mr. Rafael Joseffy.
Miss Adèle Margulies, Mrs. Jessie Pinney Baldwin,
Miss Elinor Comstock, Mr. J. G. Huneker,
Mr. Leopold Winkler.

**Piano—Preparatory.**

Miss Mabel Phipps, Miss Carrie Konigsberg,
Miss Adelaide Okell, Miss Grace Povey,
Mrs. Miltonella Beardsley, Mr. Albert Mildenberg.

**Organ.**

Mr. Samuel P. Warren, Mr. Horatio W. Parker.
HARP.
Mr. John Cheshire.

VIOLIN.
Madame Camilla Urso, Mr. Leopold Lichtenberg
Mr. Jan Koert, Mr. Juan Buitrago.

VIOLA—Mr. Jan Koert.

VIOLONCELLO.
Mr. Victor Herbert, Mr. Emile Knell.

CONTRABASS—Mr. Ludwig Manoly.
FLUTE—Mr. Otto Oesterle.
OBOE—Mr. Arthur Trepte.
CLARIONET—Mr. Richard Kohl.
BASSOON—Mr. Adolf Sohst.
FRENCH HORN—Mr. Carl Pieper
CORNET—Mr. Carl Sohst.
TROMBONE—Mr. Frederick Letsch.

COMPOSITION.
Dr. Antonin Dvorak.

HARMONY AND COUNTERPOINT.
Mr. Bruno Oscar Klein, Mr. F. Q. Dulcken.

SOLFEGGIO.
Mr. Alberto Frencelli, Miss Leila LaFetra,
Mr. Johannes Werschinger.

CHAMBER MUSIC—Mr. Leopold Lichtenberg.
ORCHESTRA—Mr. Frank van der Stucken.
CHORUS—Dr. Dvorak.
ASSISTANT—Mr. Rubin Goldmark.
HISTORY OF MUSIC—Mr. Henry T. Finck.
DICTION—Mr. W. V. Holt.
ITALIAN—Signor Pietro Cianelli.
STAGE DEPORTMENT—Monsieur Mamert Bibeyran.
FENCING—Monsieur Régis Senac.
ACCOMPANIST—Sig. Ernesto Belli.
reserves the right to give three public performances of the works to which prizes shall be awarded; these shall afterwards be the property of the composers and authors.

5. Manuscripts shall be sent for examination, to the above address, between September 1 and October 15, 1892. The award of prizes will be made on or about November 15, 1892.

The Juries:

GRAND OPERA.
Dr. Antonin Dvorak.
Mr. George W. Chadwick, Boston.
Mr. Arthur Nikisch, Boston.
Signor Romualdo Sapio, New York.
Herr Anton Seidl, New York.

OPERA COMIQUE.
Dr. Antonin Dvorak.
Signor Paolo Giorda, New York.
Mr. Bruno Oscar Klein, New York.
Herr Adolf Neuendorff, New York.
Mr. Frank van der Stucken, New York.

LIBRETTO.
Dr. Antonin Dvorak.
Mr. Thomas Bailey Aldrich, Boston.
Mr. Elwyn A. Barron, Chicago.
Mr. C. A. Bratter, New York.
Mr. Henry A. Clapp, Boston.
Mr. Eugene Field, Chicago.
Mr. George P. Goodale, Detroit.
Col. Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Boston.
Mr. M. G. Seckendorff, Washington.
Mr. Edmund C. Stedman, New York.
Mr. Benjamin Edward Woolf, Boston.
Mr. William Winter, New York.

ORATORIO AND CANTATA.

SYMPHONY, SUITE, VIOLIN AND PIANO CONCERTOS.
Dr. Antonin Dvorak.
Mr. Asger Hamerik, Baltimore.
Mr. Rafael Joseffy, New York.
Prof. John K. Paine, Boston.
Mr. Xaver Scharwenka, New York.
THE NATIONAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC OF AMERICA

-with-

ANTONIN DVOŘÁK

AGREEMENT
Dated April 28th, 1894
THIS AGREEMENT, made in New York, the 28th day of April, 1894, by and between THE NATIONAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC OF AMERICA, (a corporation) of the first part, and ANTONIN DVORAK, of Prague, Bohemia, of the second part, WITNESSETH:

THAT the said party of the first part hereby agrees and contracts to pay to the said party of the second part a salary at the rate of Eight Thousand (8,000) dollars for the period of six (6) months from the first day of November, 1894, to the first day of May, 1895; and Ten Thousand (10,000) dollars for the scholastic year of eight (8) months, beginning either from the first of September to the first of May, or from the first of October to the first of June, of 1895 and 1896, of said Conservatory.

THE party of the first part hereby agrees and contracts to pay to the said party of the second part Five Thousand (5,000) dollars, being half of the second year's salary of 1895-1896, four weeks before the opening of the school year, and to be deposited in the name of the said party of the second part and for him with the Bohemian Union Bank of Prague. Said salary to be paid monthly in equal parts, for and in consideration of the performance by the party of the second part of the agreements hereinafter specified.

3. And it is hereby mutually agreed that
1.—And the said party of the second part, in consideration of the said salary, agrees and contracts during the said period to become and be the Musical Director of the said party of the first part, and as such Director to perform the duties hereinafter specified, namely:

2. (I) To preside and assist at all the Conservatory examinations which will take place three times a year, and each of which may last a week.

(II) To arrange the programme for four concerts to be given by the pupils of the said party of the first part, and to direct the orchestra and chorus in connection therewith, if required by the party of the first part.

(III) To appoint an hour and day, three times a week, for the purpose of receiving persons in connection with the said party of the first part who may wish to consult with him, and during the hours so appointed to remain in his office for this purpose.

(IV) To teach composition and instrumentation and to conduct the rehearsals of the National Conservatory Orchestra and Chorus, devoting to orchestra two (2) hours twice a week, for the preparation of the students for the performances in concert of the said party of the first part, and three (3) hours three times a week for instruction in composition and instrumentation to the most talented pupils only.

3.—And it is hereby mutually agreed that the said
party of the second part shall not, during the scholastic year teach or render any service either by way of private tuition or as an instructor in any conservatory, school or institution of learning other than the conservatory or school of the party of the first part; nor during the same period accept any engagement to appear in public whatever. And in case of any proposals or offers of engagements being addressed to the said party of the second part during such period as aforesaid, the same shall be at once referred by him to the party of the first part.

4. — And the party of the second part shall not receive any pupil of the party of the first part or any person who, having been such a pupil, has been dismissed for cause, as the private pupil of said party of the second part; nor shall said party of the second part give any private instruction or tuition to any such pupil without the consent in writing of the party of the first part, signed by its President, first had and received.

5. — And it is mutually agreed that the Conservatory of the party of the first part shall be closed on all legal holidays, and days usually observed as such; and no services are to be rendered by the party of the second part upon days when said Conservatory is thus closed.

6. — And it is hereby further agreed that the party of the first part will pay to the said party of the second part the price of six first-class tickets by steamer to
Europe at the expiration of this contract.

7. It is hereby lastly agreed that this agreement shall be binding on the said parties hereto and be enforceable either in Austria or the United States. And that in the event of any dispute arising between the said parties, the same shall be referred to the Austrian Consul resident in New York, from whom there shall be no appeal.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said parties hereto set their names and seals the day and year first above mentioned.

Witness to Signatures:

New York
April 26th, 1894
FACULTY
1894-95

DIRECTOR—Dr. ANTONIN DVORÁK.

SINGING.
Mr. Oscar Saenger. Mr. Harry Burleigh.

OPERATIC DEPARTMENT—Mr. Anton Seidl.

ORATORIO CLASS—Mrs. Beebe Lawton.

PIANO.
Mr. Rafael Joseffy.
Miss Adele Margulies. Mr. August Fraencke.
Miss Elinor Comstock. Mr. Bruno Gortatowski.

PREPARATORY—PIANO.
Miss Mabel Phipps. Miss Carrie Konigsberg. Miss Adelaide Okell.

ORGAN.
Mr. Samuel P. Warren. Mr. John White.

HARP—Mr. John Cheshire.

VIOLIN.
Madame Camilla Urso. Mr. Leopold Lichtenberg.
Mr. Juan Buitrago. Mr. Joseph Kovarik.

PREPARATORY VIOLIN.
Miss Josephine Emerson. Mr. Henry Klein.

VIOLA—Mr. Kovarik.

VIOLOCELLO.
Mr. Victor Herbert. Mr. Fritz Giese. Mr. Emile Knell.

CONTRABASS—Mr. Ludwig Manoly.


OBOTE—Mr. Arthur Trepte. CLARIONET—Mr. Richard Kohl.

BASSOON—Mr. Adolph Solst. FRENCH HORN—Mr. Carl Pieper.

CORNET—Mr. Carl Solst. TROMBONE—Mr. Frederick Letsch.

COMPOSITION—Dr. Antonin Dvorak.

HARMONY AND COUNTERPOINT.
Mr. John White. Mr. Maurice A. Strathotte.

Mr. Michael Banner. HARMONY. Mr. Edward B. Kinney.
Mr. Wm. A. Fischer. MRS. CLARA KORN.

SOLFEGGIO.
Monsieur Joseph Pizzarello. Miss Leila La Fetra.
Miss Carrie Konigsberg.

CHAMBER MUSIC—Mr. Leopold Lichtenberg.

ORCHESTRA AND CHORUS—Dr. Dvorak.

HISTORY OF MUSIC—Mr. Henry T. Finck.

DICTION—Mr. W. Y. Holt. ITALIAN—Signor Pietro Cianelli.

STAGE DEPARTMENT—To be selected. FENCING—Mr. R. Senac.

ACCOMPANIST—Monsieur Joseph Pizzarello.
lowing is a specimen programme of the Conservatory Concerts, several of which take place every year.

**Harlem, Madison Hall, May 9th.**

**Programme.**

1. **Symphony.** G. Major. . . . **Haydn**
   a.) Adagio cantabile.
   b.) Andante.
   c.) Menuetto.
   d.) Allegro di molto.

CONSERVATORY ORCHESTRA.

**Dr. Antonin Dvorák,** . . . Conductor.

2. **Hungarian Fantaisie.** . . . **Liszt**

MISS BERTHA VISANSKA.

3. **Aria.** "Giaconda." . . . **Ponchielli**

MR. HARRY BURLEIGH.

4. **Concerto** for Three Pianos and String Orchestra . . . . . **Bach**

MISSSES PHIPPS, DYAS, and DALLY.

5. **Overture.** "Preciosa." . . . **Weber**

CONSERVATORY ORCHESTRA.
IN ASSEMBLY,

February 10, 1899.

Introduced by Mr. BEDELL—read once and referred to the committee on public education.

AN ACT

To authorize the National Conservatory of Music of America to contract with its pupils in relation to compensation for their instruction.

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. The National Conservatory of Music of America is hereby authorized to enter into written contracts with its pupils for the payment to said corporation at such times and on such terms, as shall be mutually agreed to, of compensation for musical instruction furnished or to be furnished to such pupils by it.

§ 2. No such written contract shall be void or voidable by reason of such pupil, party thereto, being at the time of its execution, within the age of twenty one years.

§ 3. This act shall take effect immediately.
The National Conservatory of Music of America

53 West 74th Street
New York

INTEGRATED FROM AMERICA UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AND CHARTERED IN 1881 BY A SPECIAL ACT OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, AMENDED BY ACT OF CONGRESS, MARCH 4TH, 1881.

Established for the Thorough Education of Serious Students of Music, and not conducted for profit.

EXAMINATION AND ENROLLMENT September 29th, and October 2nd and 3rd.

The Forty-fourth Scholastic Year opens October 4th, 1928.

ARTISTIC FACULTY Includes:
ADELE MARGULIES, ROMUALDO SAPIO, LEOPOLD LICHTENBERG, AND OTHERS

BRANCHES TAUGHT

SINGING, PIANO, ORGAN, VIOLIN, CELLO, HARP, AND ALL OTHER ORCHESTRAL INSTRUMENTS.

SOLFEGGIO, THEORY, HARMONY, COUNTERPOINT, COMPOSITION, HISTORY OF MUSIC,

CHAMBER MUSIC, ORCHESTRA AND THE ART OF CONDUCTING

TERM S FOR SCHOLASTIC YEAR, OCTOBER TO JUNE:

(Payable in four equal instalments in advance. No fee refunded.)

For advanced Vocal or Instrumental courses, including Solfeggio and Theory of Music or Harmony and History of Music .......................................................... $300.00
Intermediate Course, including Solfeggio and Theory of Music and History of Music ........................................... 200.00
Preparatory Course, including Solfeggio and Theory of Music ..................................................................................... 150.00
Children's Course, including Piano or Violin and Solfeggio and Theory of Music .......................................................................................... 125.00
Theoretical Advanced Course, including Fugue and Composition .................................................................................. 100.00
Evening Courses: Singing, Piano, Violin, Solfeggio and Theory of Music, Harmony ........................................ 150.00
Solfeggio and Theory of Music ................................................................................................................................. 60.00

No other American Conservatory of Music has had a quarter as many musical celebrities on its teaching staff. Nor has any other high school of music done so much for the creative side of the art as The National Conservatory of Music of America. During the three years alone that Antonin Dvorak, one of the greatest composers of his day, was its Director, it provided, besides many others, instruction for four young men who are now among our leading composers—Rubin Goldmark, William Arms Fisher, Harvey Worthington Loomis, Harry Rowe Shelley—as well as the country's two leading colored musicians, Harry T. Burleigh and Will Marion Cooke.

The greatest of all works of reference, the Encyclopaedia Britannica, says:

"The chief public institution for teaching music in the United States is the National Conservatory of Music of America, founded in New York in 1885."

This testimony is corroborated by the most distinguished of French authorities on musical education, Albert Lavignac, who was commissioned by the French Government to write a Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de l'Art. In his famous book on Musical Education he refers to various institutions, adding that "The National Conservatory of Music of America, although dependent upon a private enterprise, comes nearer to the European establishments."


The National Conservatory of Music of America is the only school of music in the United States chartered by Congress. Its charter provides that:

"The said corporation shall have the power to grant and confer diplomas and the degree of doctor of music or other honorary degrees."

For further information address:

Office of the Secretary.

53 West 74th Street, New York City.

N. B.—Pupils from out of town can find good homes at reasonable prices by applying at the Board of Directors of Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. Also at the offices of the Conservatory.
Mr. WADSWORTH introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To designate a building site for The National Conservatory of Music of America, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital is hereby authorized and directed to select and set apart a suitable and appropriate site in the public grounds in the District of Columbia for a building or buildings to be used for the corporate purposes of The National Conservatory of Music of America, founded 1885 by Jeannette M. Thurber, a corporation under the laws of the United States: Provided, That the plans for any building or buildings to be constructed on the said site shall
be approved by the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital and the Fine Arts Commission: Provided further, That no work shall be commenced on said building or buildings until the said National Conservatory of Music of America shall present satisfactory evidence to the said Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital that it has sufficient funds in hand and in prospect reasonably to insure the completion of the proposed building or buildings: And provided further, That the said National Conservatory of Music of America shall not have any power or authority to grant or convey said lands or any portion thereof.

Sec. 2. The power to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby reserved.
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| Letter, [Bayes] to M. Eisenhower, January 11, 1955 | 316 |
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En réponse aux enseignements que vous me faites l'honneur de me demander au sujet du choix de M. Manoury comme Directeur des Classes de Chant du Conservatoire de New York, je m'empresserai de vous dire combien j'approude de la nomination.
Mr. Mansouri est classé parmi nos meilleurs chanteurs, non seulement à cause de sa belle voix et sa formation, mais aussi en raison de ses qualités de style.

Il est ancien élève de notre Conservatoire où il est sorti avec les premiers prix y compris le Prix de Rome.

Il a brillamment débute au grand opéra, auquel il est resté attaché pendant 2 ans. De même, il a tenu avec succès les premiers emplois sur les principales scènes d'Italie. De plus, il a crée au Théâtre de la Monnaie de Bruxelles, l’Héroïade de Montenat.

Cette carrière, déjà bien remplie, lui donne toute autorité pour exercer les fonctions de professeur auxquelles il vient d'être appelé.

Je vous prie, Madame, l'assurance de mes sentiments respectueux et dévoués.

Léo Delibes

Compositeur, membre de l'Institut, professeur de Composition au Conservatoire de Musique.
Dear Mr. Wheeler,

We are sending the Wharf and Warehouse legislation, which is well adapted to the needs of the port. It is well for Congress, with all its able members, to be held by the

The trustees may not be proper or exclusively this body to exercise it.

Wishing you success in this good enterprise.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. Chafee

Mrs. F. H. Newbery

with International Jury.
This Company TRANSMITS and DELIVERS messages only on conditions limiting its liability, which have been ascertained to by the sender of the following message, Errors can be guarded against only by repeating a message back to the sending station for comparison, and the company will not hold itself liable for errors or delays in transmission or delivery of Unrepeated Messages, beyond the amount of tolls paid thereon, nor in any case where the claim is not presented in writing within sixty days after sending the message. This is an UNREPEATED MESSAGE, and is delivered by request of the sender, under the conditions named above.

TEOS. T. ECKERT, General Manager.
NOEVIN GREEN, President.

Received at N. E. Cor. 14th St. & 3d Ave., N. Y.

Dated Washington 13th

To Mrs. Jeanette M. Hurley

126 E. 17 St.

Bill passed senate will your thanks to senator
M. W. Millan & Stewart

Open Daily from 7.30 a. m. until midnight, Sundays included.
I, BERNERS STREET, W:

June 25, 1831

Dear Mrs. Hunter,

In answer to your letter of 29th June, I am just arrived. I am glad to hear you have received my last letter. I am, I think, in better health and more fit for business than I was when I left you. I must continue my study, and I hope you will do the same. I hope you will be happy.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
suspicions they caution me if I fail certain that he intends to accept the position if for no other to suit which he makes all his inquiries. Perhaps you will kindly tell me what to say in answer to his inquiries. Some others I can answer till it myself. and further I can tell him that if
Paris  July 10, 91

Dear Mr. Lincoln,

I feel like beggining

with some phrases with

which D. D. [familial

he's letter, viz.]; "Accept

please my best thanks

for the much trouble you

have taken in my affairs.

Will you kindly write

the party in question, that

I will deposit $7,500

one month before sailing

and I can offer

$15,000 more than

agreed

when we discussed the matter in reg.

to Acet in

You may return thanks 000.
to eight months, about
him from for two years
from the date of his
arrival in New York
until 1873. Many
impressions lead that he is dealing with a
difficult class of people than if he signed it but left
him with certain
regards for the contract.
We have made any
contract before a unit
our professors cannot fail
for they usually think
until they arrive,

Did he will have a new conservatory look
only, the other few years, he may not
for concert work. He is in a set
the matter into shape. There a suggestion
to make to you regarding this training.
Will you kindly instruct your lawyer to prepare
draft contract to be sent to him at once
if you deem wise.

Sincerely yours,
[Signature]
September 3rd

Dear Doctor Drouth,

I telegraphed you yesterday evening that I accept your contract.

We shall begin work as soon as the contract is printed, according to your notes.

and I will forward it to you for your signature. Kindly return the contract to me without delay.

Nothing that you can do will save this, the American, as much as it depends on your part to make it perfect.

Sincerely yours,

(Handwritten signature)
Paris, Sept. 4th.

The St. Donat.

I enclose the copy of the contract, together with your signature in English and French, which Mr. Lichten have kindly signed. Will you kindly sign the copy of the contract and send it to me, before receiving the bill, and you can forward to Mr. Lichten when you go to London. In Doubtless, the contract will be satisfactory. Kindly let me know at what time should you receive any information regarding your Election, Education, his own life in these parts, etc. Messrs. North & Co. will take pleasure. Besides, a copy of your letter to Mr. North, in case you write your agent at your request and enclosures of the letter to me. With compliments to Miss Doroth.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

I called for an explanation to Miss Doroth you say, as well as other remarks you made to me, on the matter.

49 Copper St., Fleet Street.
Messrs. Jones. E. C. A.
New York
November 20th

Dear Sir,

Can you think of any contract with the alterations you desire, as I should like to

Your obedient...

Sincerely,

[Signature]
also, have you the
manuscript of about a
paper ready with the
autograph. You will pull
shiep me.
All as above, in for
publication and publish
like you to write revere
the two photographs and
the two manuscripts.

To the President Communion
J. Brown of Cheyney, N. J.

Easily mail all before
February 10th.
Instead his pleasure
we use at the President
Communition, of course.
If you write to me, you can not deliver the
writings.
Do with money which
may come in the first
will be very soon.
Don't worry, you
need not.
To the National Conservatory of Music of America, New York.

Anhante "Symphonic in D minor."


V. Drew 1892

Antonin Dvorak
Dear Mr. Thurber,

This is the gentleman Mr. Krovitch of whom we have spoken this afternoon. He appears to your power.

10/10/92, A. Dvorak
Dear Mr. Thurlow,

Please accept many thanks for your kindness and generosity. You have made the Bohemian people in Chicago very happy.

About 100,000 Bohs. will be present to make it a big day. I and my family will leave for Chicago 8th August, and hope to spend some days there. Then I go back to Briemwiller for the Fourth letter will be enclosed. Draft of lease to thank you and remain always yours

Antoun Dvorak
Dec. 13th, 1890

Dear Mr. Choote,

Believe me, I appreciate your kind words and the kind heart that dictated them. We both know how to appreciate noble causes, those who live for others rather than themselves, and one of my griefs has been that I have just been trembling on the brink of bankruptcy for months and cannot keep Mrs. Choote in her great struggle, and cannot tell why. I hope she may be restored to health, which after all is a greater blessing than precious faith, only yours

H. G. Th. 20
March 12, 1874

Mr. O opportune,

I have been doing

The fact is that

The fact is that I

He said some

The fact is that I

This explains the delay

I am sure there will be

I am sure there will be

I can give you a

A note payable on

A note payable on

I will be able to give you some

I will be able to give you some

Please let me know

Please let me know
April 21st, 1876.

Sir, in answer to your despatches, and a prior despatch from you at 9th Sep. 1876, I am to inform you that the King's special order of the 14th Jan. 1876, in terms of the 5th Feb. 1876, for the purpose of the existing contract as directed by the Naval Committee of COMMISSION, will be at your disposal.
Dear Mr. Thunder,

After the experience we made this year, I think it would be good and fair to give a writer some
for computing and leave it and it all.

The prices for Sympathy

1: for assistance $400 ± 2
2: for work (Pens or Chisels) 250 ± 2
3: For work (Pens or Chisels) 300 ±

I think this will serve the purpose and will be all right.

Very sincerely yours,

The following month, would be 18 December. And

[Signature]
Dear E. Driscoll,

Well I'm not truly of opinion clearly the opera Daphne; I have just been thinking and writing me what to do about the music. I have to give some notice regarding it to the press.

The letter (of last) was found and found in my possession.

Yours faithfully,
W. F. Webster
March 6th, 1924

[Handwritten date: March 6th, 1924]
1895
March 15.

My dear Anna,

I have just received your letter and am delighted to hear from you. I hope you are well and that all is going on as well as usual. Your letter always gives me much comfort and pleasure. I am glad you are going to the school and that you will make the most of it. Your progress is as usual, your studies and all your work.

I am looking forward to seeing you soon and hoping we will all be able to meet again soon.

With love and affection,

[Signature]

1895
Miss Marguerite from Vysoke (17th of June) our queen.

She came from Prague in the beginning of July to see us, and we have been told that she, with regard to her advanced age (70) she is quite unable to take the charge of our children (as she did two years ago) and we cannot leave our children to foreign people which we don't know and who is cannot be relied upon. And especially the two boys need mostly the protection and shelter of us.

Another reason for doing so is that my wife is quite unable to live more separated without children.

As we heard last year very much troubles and sorrow and Mrs. Fesoval was overwhelmed unhappily and touching, very sad as I have told you many times.

If you further know, our daughter Anne suffers very much from rheumatism so that it would be very dangerous to undertake such a fatiguing journey. Our baby boy is very sick after a serious illness (diabetes and kidney disesae) and in such condition she is not able to leave our house. The lady has to go to school and the eldest daughter Ophilia seating educated in everything whilst is necessary for such a young girl like she cannot leave Prague at all!
New York,

November 2, 1876

Mr. St. Martin,

The time how you
have been during the last
three years, hope you are
looking better and that
the situation you
are in now, are.

Dairies have
been

Tom St. Martin.

Wishing you better
health, with this,

The Childer
in your house.

J. W. D.
Mr. Smith to Mr. Hunter.

Dear Sir,

As you know, I take the greatest interest in the development of American society and, more especially, in the intellectual and moral progress of our country.

I was greatly interested in the work I had begun on the development of the American institutions. Your annual progress report, which I have received, shows considerable improvement since my last visit.

I must express my regret that I was not able to continue the work I had started. You will find attached my plans for the future.

In reply to your request that I should

remain in the United States,

I beg to state that I

can make arrangements to stay

for 1772. In the meantime, you

can rest assured that I shall do

my best to contribute to the

national economy.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
THE ONLY DIRECT ROUTE TO GERMANY.


ESTABLISHED, 1866.

FIVE DIRECT CABLE ROUTES BETWEEN

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND EUROPE.

CABLEGRAM RECEIVED AT No. 8 BROAD STREET, NEW YORK, AUG 25, 1907

PLACE FROM

Budweis

TO

Thurber

49 West 25 Street, N.Y.

Yes can use my name as director of National Conservatory

Antonin Dvorak
Madame, Antoine Dvořák, veuve du compositeur M. le docteur Antoine Dvořák, remercie vivement de toutes les témoignages de sympathie et de condoléance qui lui ont été exprimés à l'occasion de la mort de son mari.

Prague, Mai 1904.
Mrs. Jeannette M. Thurber,
37 Forest Street,
Hartford, Conn.

Dear Mrs. Thurber:

I have received your letter of January thirtieth, together with the newspaper clippings which you were good enough to enclose. Please be assured that I have read them all with deep interest. For some time past I have made it a point to inquire among my associates in the Congress whether or not the project which you had in mind could receive congressional approval and be started on its way. I am sorry, however, to report to you that the outlook is not encouraging. The Congress is overwhelmed these days with problems of national and international importance and this situation bids fair to continue for a long time to come. Frankly, I think it would be wiser that I should not attempt to push through legislation for the establishment of the Conservatory. Such an attempt, I am sure, would fail, and through such failure the prospect of success some time in the future would be diminished. I am sure you will understand that I appreciate your fine public spirit, and that I regret very deeply the difficulties which lie in the path of its fulfillment.

With best wishes, believe me,

Very sincerely yours,
July 24, 1946

Re: Estate of Jeannette M. Thurber

Mrs. J. Layng Mills
Westbourne Apartments, Alger Court
Bronxville, New York

Dear Mrs. Mills:

I have examined the minute books and have sorted and studied the papers concerning the National Conservatory of Music of America, all of which you left with me.

The National Conservatory of Music of America was a non-stock membership corporation which had an active existence under your mother's direction between 1885 and about 1920. It has not been functioning for more than a quarter of a century. It has no Board of Trustees or officers.

In my opinion the estate of Jeannette M. Thurber, deceased has no stock or property right in the National Conservatory of Music of America which is capable of gift, transfer or sale by the executors.

I understand that the volumes of Handel and the boxes of musical scores and the old safe at Gilbert Storage & Warehouse were your mother's separate property and, of course, if they can be sold, the proceeds should be received as estate assets.

For your information I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Francis B. Thurber.

Very truly yours,

WHC: AJ
January 11, 1955

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, President
The Pennsylvania State University
State College, Pa.

Dear Dr. Eisenhower:

You may recall that on my visit to State College on October 15 last, I spoke to you about the National Conservatory of Music of America. It was my purpose to write you on my return to New York, but the pressure of other matters intervened.

I enclose herewith a pamphlet issued in 1916 by the Conservatory, then having its office at 126-128 West Seventy-ninth Street, New York City. In it you will find the story of the foundation of the Conservatory, together with two Acts of Congress, the one approved by President Harrison on March 3, 1891, and the other by President Wilson on March 4, 1921. The second bill conferred upon the Conservatory the power to "establish and maintain branches outside the District of Columbia." Your attention is particularly directed to page 13, the paragraphs entitled Origin of the National Conservatory, and to the two Congressional bills, to be found opposite page 34.

It seems reasonably clear that the position in world affairs now held by the United States warrants one in entertaining the belief that, sooner or later, it will become the music center of the world. It is my opinion that the Conservatory can be re-activated provided a site were made available in Washington and funds necessary for the housing and maintenance of the Conservatory. An entirely new board of trustees might be named, representing the various parts of the country, which board might well include the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives, ex-officio.

Should you wish other or additional information, kindly let me know.

With renewed personal regards and best wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours,
Mr. William R. Bayes
Choate, Mitchell & Bayes
Forty-One Broad Street
New York 4, New York

Dear Mr. Bayes:

This will acknowledge, on Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower's behalf, receipt of your recent letter relating to the reactivation of a National Conservatory of Music of America. Dr. Eisenhower appreciates your thoughtfulness in sending him the material relating to the Conservatory's history.

Sincerely yours,

Larry Dennis
Administrative Assistant
to the President

LD:STC
June 22, 1960

Hon. Charles Garside
1148 Fifth Avenue
New York 28, New York

Dear Charles:

I have your letter of the 31st inst., which you mailed to Bill Crawford, and enclose herewith a copy of a Congressional Act approved March 3, 1891, authorizing the founding, establishment and maintenance of a National Conservatory of Music of America within the District of Columbia, for the education of citizens of the United States and for such other persons as the Trustees may deem proper in all the branches of music.

I also enclose a copy of an Act of Congress approved March 4, 1921, authorizing the National Conservatory of Music of America to establish and maintain branches outside the District of Columbia.

I am a surviving member of the Board of Trustees and, as I understand it, would be in a position to appoint associate members to the Board, which might include the persons who may at this time become interested in carrying out the purposes of the Conservatory, not alone because of its name but because of the power conferred by these two Congressional enactments.

Should there be any interest on the part of the Ditson Fund Committee of Columbia University, kindly let me know.

Prior to the incorporation by Congress, the National Conservatory of Music of America was incorporated under that name in the City of New York, by a Certificate of Incorporation filed and recorded September 19, 1885. Following this, the late Andrew Carnegie became President, with associate Trustees which included August Belmont, W. K. Vanderbilt, Henry G. Marquand, William G. Choate, and others whose names I can supply.

Very sincerely yours,

William R. Bayes
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