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Foreword

Jolanta T. Pekacz

Franz Liszt's F. Chopin occupies an ambiguous place in the vast literature on Frederick Chopin. On the one hand, it is recognized as a unique work written by a fellow musician of comparable stature, containing valuable observations about Chopin's music and his personality, and historically the first biographical work on Chopin. On the other hand, however, it began attracting criticism even before it was published, and its lambasting has continued until this day. A detailed questionnaire which Liszt sent to Chopin's sister Ludwika Jędrzejewicz on 14 November 1849, just two weeks after Chopin's funeral, turned out to be a bone of contention. Ludwika likely considered the questionnaire insensitive, especially the questions regarding her brother's relationship with George Sand, and handed it over to Chopin's Scottish pupil and friend Jane Stirling, who answered some of its questions, albeit incompletely and cautiously, and evaded others. There is no evidence that Liszt used Stirling's answers. His sources consisted of his personal recollections, other people's memoirs, anecdotes without a clear provenance, and the current opinions, perceptions, and stereotypes about Poland and the Poles. It is widely agreed that a manuscript produced within a short time was the result of literary cooperation between Liszt and his companion at the time, Princess Carolyne Sayn-Wittgenstein, an aristocrat of Polish origin. Uncertain of its quality, Liszt sent the manuscript for assessment, first to his friend, the music writer Joseph d'Ortigue (who apparently offered an overall positive opinion), and then to the prominent literary critic Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve (who advised a complete rewriting but refused to get involved in the project). Liszt was not discouraged by Sainte-Beuve's thinly disguised criticism, nor did he undertake a thorough rewriting as far as scholars can tell. When the biography appeared in Paris, first in installments in La France musicale in 1851 and then in book form in 1852, it was received with mixed feelings. Critics noted its factual errors, verbosity, and bombastic prose. Chopin's family was offended with Liszt's inaccurate statement that young Frederick's education was financed
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by Prince Antoni Radziwill. Jane Stirling was more outraged with what Liszt had left out about Chopin as a musician than impressed with what he had included. Others were disappointed that the first biography of Chopin was not written by one of his Polish friends: Wojciech Grzymała or Julian Fontana. Fontana admitted that Liszt’s work discouraged him from writing his own study on Chopin because Liszt’s international stature made him more credible in the public’s eyes, and the image of Chopin he had created would be very difficult to change. Polish music writer Marceli Antoni Szule noticed insightful passages about Chopin’s music and believed that Liszt’s book might be of some interest to foreign readers but found it useless to Poles. George Sand considered Liszt’s book “a little exuberant in style but filled with good things and very beautiful pages.” Liszt’s biography fared better in the United States, where the first complete translation appeared in 1863 and was warmly received by the musical press.

An expanded edition of Liszt’s biography, published in France in 1879, triggered further criticism, as the additions consisted largely of lengthy ruminations about Polish national traits and pseudo-philosophical musings, attributed to Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein. It was this edition that La Mara (Marie Lipsius) used as the basis of her German translation, which appeared in 1880 as part of Liszt’s Gesammelte Schriften. La Mara further obscured the French original of F. Chopin by arbitrarily paraphrasing, cutting, and transposing some sections of the work. Peter Gast (pseud. for Heinrich Koselleck), Friedrich Nietzsche’s friend and assistant, wrote to Nietzsche on 8 August 1880 that although Liszt’s biography gave him fragmentary ideas about the impression Chopin’s works made on his contemporaries, it was also an example of “how one should not write about such a man [as Chopin]. Unless one wanted to put [the reader] in a rage because Liszt’s way of writing does not uphold the artist’s fame; to achieve this goal, another type of evidence is needed, not distorted historical facts.” Neither Nietzsche nor Gast was enthusiastic about Liszt as a composer, but perhaps it was not Liszt alone who should be blamed for the shortcomings of Chopin’s biography. In more recent times, Adam Karasowski, in his debunking of the legends surrounding Chopin’s life, pointed out numerous factual errors of Liszt’s biography, called it “a torrent of verbosity,” and attributed all its faults to Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein; her “shallow display of erudition” and “the lack of mental discipline.” Only one-tenth of the biography was Liszt’s own, according to Karasowski. In contrast, Polish musicologist Adolf Chybicki, emphasized the value of Liszt’s remarks on Chopin’s music and the ambiguity of factual knowledge and its irrelevance for one’s understanding of a creative process. Thus, the reception of Liszt’s F. Chopin appears to have oscillated between two poles: while Liszt is typically classified for inaccuracies in his account of Chopin’s life, he is also prized for his commentary on Chopin’s music.

While there is no doubt that Liszt’s F. Chopin is not a repository of irrefutable facts, it is not what the reader should be looking for in Liszt’s book. And there is no reason to deny F. Chopin the status of a biography as, for example, Frederick Niecks did in the Preface to his own biography of Chopin, published in 1888. Nor is there any reason to discard the biographical component of F. 
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Chopin as valueless. With the claims to veracity and objectivity of the traditional biography being questioned, Liszt's *F. Chopin* is gaining significance. Inaccurate, verbose, and at times plainly fictitious, *F. Chopin* reflects the manner in which Liszt and Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein (and probably some other observers as well) viewed Chopin in Paris in the 1830s and 1840s. By the same token, numerous digressions in which the author(s) fantasize about the character and customs of the Poles show the extent to which the stereotypes of Eastern Europe and its inhabitants were still current in France in the first half of the nineteenth century. One can only recall Niecks' introduction ("Poland and the Poles") to his otherwise factually rigorous biography of Chopin to realize that many of those stereotypes survived until the late nineteenth century, even among the well educated. And Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein, a member of a cosmopolitan leisure class isolated from ordinary life and rather superficially educated, was in no position to critically assess these stereotypes. As with any other biographical work, Liszt's *F. Chopin* has to be read as a document of its time and its author(s).

Viewed from this perspective, *F. Chopin* reveals its most significant characteristic: its power to influence the subsequent writers on Chopin who repeated stereotypes and images created or reinforced by Liszt. This influence lies precisely in Liszt's ability to amalgamate the real and the idealized, the facts and their perceptions. For in creating a portrait of his friend as a person and as a musician, Liszt merged his own recollections with those of others, and with the current perceptions of Chopin and his music in Paris, and gave them an aura of authenticity through the form of a personal account. In his commentary on Chopin's music, Liszt incorporated the rhetoric of contemporary Parisian music critics who used Chopin's music to promote music idealism against the invasion of commercially produced music. As opposed to the superficiality of piano pieces produced en masse for the less sophisticated, Chopin's music was "aristocratic" and exclusive, and so had to be its author in an age when an artist and his music constituted an inseparable unity. The aura of authenticity surrounding Liszt's *F. Chopin* gave it the status of a primary source. In 1860-1865, the second edition of *Biographie universelle des musiciens* by music critic François-Joseph Fétis (with the collaboration of the Parisian publisher and musician Aristide Farrenc) appeared in Paris with a new entry on Chopin. This new entry contained information, absent in the first edition of *Biographie universelle* (1835-1844), that Prince Antoni Radziwill financed Chopin's musical and general education. Similarly, the second edition contained information, absent in the first edition, about young Chopin's social contacts almost exclusively with the Polish aristocracy in Warsaw (and then in Paris) and spending his holidays in their country residences. Both new pieces of information in the second edition of *Biographie universelle* were taken almost verbatim from Liszt's *F. Chopin*.

The "evolution" of Chopin's biography displayed in the two consecutive editions of *Biographie universelle* is not surprising in the context of the political sympathies of the Parisian monde under the July Monarchy, especially the symbolic importance of displaying sympathy for, and emulating the traditional aristocracy. Liszt captured this spirit, just as Chopin did, and completed in his biog-
ography what Chopin had begun by fashioning himself as a member of the upper class right after his arrival in Paris. By socializing almost exclusively with the aristocracy from early in his life, as Liszt claimed, Chopin became "aristocratic" himself. Isn't it the perception that Chopin wanted to inculcate in his contemporaries? Perhaps, then, Chopin deliberately maintained the myths that appeared in the second edition of Biographie universelle, of Radziwill funding his education and of his socializing primarily with the aristocracy both in Poland and in Paris, as these myths supported the image of himself he maintained in Paris.

The new English translation of *F. Chopin* by Liszt, following the modern standards of editorial practice and providing annotations comparing the French editions of 1852 and 1879, and La Mara's German edition of 1880, is a valuable project as much as it is long overdue. It places Liszt's book in the context of present-day scholarship and reveals its qualities in a new light. It is an indispensable source for studying the origin of the many stereotypes that keep shaping our knowledge and interpretation of Chopin and his music. And *F. Chopin* is a source of insights about Liszt, Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein, and the cultural and cosmopolitan elites of Europe in the nineteenth century.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

F. Chopin is the first of nine volumes of Lina Ramann’s edition of Liszt’s 1880/83 collection of writings, the Gesammelte Schriften, now in English translation. This set of Collected Writings is an international and collaborative endeavor. Liszt was a cosmopolitan personality in the nineteenth century, and in keeping with his universal approach to music, each volume contains a Foreword written by a scholar or team of scholars of recognition in their respective fields from around the world. Contributors to this series have various specialties ranging from history, biography, performance, musicology, music criticism, administration, and education, and they offer their representative scholarship from Poland, Canada, the United States, France, the Nordic countries, Great Britain, Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Italy. In addition to the Foreword, each volume will include an introduction written by the translator of this series, which will contain new research or a collective discussion of current information from a new perspective. The views of the collaborator and translator may or may not always coincide, but such a diverse interpretation is indicative of Liszt’s own perspectives about music. His ideas invited different and sometimes conflicting interpretations. Finally, every attempt will be made to release a new volume at least once a year, and at times, twice annually. The tentative publication schedule for the entire collection begins during Liszt’s bicentennial year and proceeds as follows:

Volume 1: F. Chopin
Volume 2: Letters of a Traveling Bachelor of Music
Volume 3, Part 1: Dramaturgical Leaves: Essays about Musical Works for the Stage and Queries about the Stage, Its Composers and Performers
Volume 3, Part 2: Richard Wagner
Volume 4: On the Annals of Progress: Concert and Chamber Music
Lina Ramann's edition of the Gesamme/te Schriften was published by Breitkopf & Hartel in Leipzig in its entirety during Liszt's lifetime. Although Liszt agreed to the publication of this large collection, he was not directly involved in the process. Ramann collected the writings, provided some annotation, and under the advisement of Liszt and Princess Carolyne von Sayn-Wittgenstein, she had the original French writings translated into German. La Mara served as translator for the first volume, and the remaining volumes were translated into German by Ramann. It is precisely this process of translation that has led recent scholarship to deny the necessity of having an English translation of an already translated work. Simply put, some scholars have questioned if this current English edition is a translation of Liszt's writings or Ramann's work.

From the beginning, it should be stated that in order to work on any of Liszt's writings, it takes a leap of faith, mostly because his essays have a tainted past. Liszt was accused of plagiarism, namely, that he conspired to have the women in his life write his essays and sign his name to them. He was deemed an anti-Semite because of negative statements about the Jews in *The Gypsies and Their Music in Hungary*. His book about Chopin was attacked because of its biographical inaccuracies and convoluted prose. His writings about Wagner had no merit other than existing as a means of propaganda to help sell the latter's music dramas to an uneducated public. The German essays are also believed to contain intentional omissions, biases, and errors, but other than the critical edition of Liszt's writings in process in Weimar, Germany under the editorship of Dr. Detlef Altenburg, there has not been any attempt to study the German writings comprehensively. Furthermore, in the English world, there has been no effort whatsoever to compare these German writings to the French first editions. These are not easy or pleasant circumstances for any researcher, or translator, for that matter, to deal with.

Modern scholarship has tended to shy away from these writings for the above mentioned reasons. Instead, there has been a trend to skip over the German writings altogether in favor of the French first editions, since there are few autographs in any language to consult. This is problematic in a number of ways. First, there are some of these writings that never appeared in French journals, and by focusing merely on the French first editions, the German writings receive no attention. Also, it was once mentioned to the current author that since there were problems with Ramann's German edition, upon which the present series is based, the only acceptable translation would be the product of Altenburg's critical edition. Certainly, the latter could be done, but the translator will inevitably still have to decide which version to translate—the French or the German—since both languages are present in the Weimar edition, side by side, on each
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At that point, another dimension to the translation process is added. Would the end result be Liszt’s, Ramann’s, or Altenburg’s work? Anyone who has attempted to do any translation of these writings is confronted with these questions. In the past, scholarship has been resolved in presenting only the French writings in English translation, which has resulted in a segmented collection of translated writings in book form during numerous times throughout the last century and a half, or in bits and pieces in various journals. Still, a collective English edition of all these writings has yet to appear. There must be a better way.

Instead of avoiding this vast collection of writings, why not simply accept the form in which Liszt decided to present his literature to present and future audiences? Liszt may have distanced himself from these writings to a certain degree toward the end of his life, but he did not, as some scholars have claimed, disagree with their publication. Liszt reveals his support for the Collected Writings in a letter to La Mara, which is presented in the introductory section, “Publishing F. Chopin,” where he states he was going to write to Breitkopf & Härtel, the publisher for the 1880/83 Gesammelte Schriften, to tell the company that his collected writings could not begin better than with her translation of F. Chopin (see page 21). Liszt met with Ramann while she was editing the German edition; he made the decision to have all the writings translated into German (see La Mara’s short introduction to F. Chopin on page 44), he wrote to Breitkopf & Härtel to request that the publisher accept the edition, and the entire collection of writings was published in German during his lifetime. It certainly appears that even though he was not directly involved in the process of collecting and translating, he was still in support of the edition’s publication, even if nothing other than passive compliance. He did nothing to stop it.

A firm commitment to these writings needs to be made. One can criticize the writings and the ideas contained therein, criticize the translation, or agree with both. Taking great effort to deny the existence of the collection or avoid it altogether, however, is probably not the best way to go. Even if the edition does not fit comfortably into the research mold that everyone has been trained to accept, it exists. It will remain lurking in the background until it is embraced. Nothing in Liszt research is that clear-cut and dry. As mentioned earlier, it takes a leap of faith to deal with these writings, and not just in Liszt, but in each of us to judge appropriately.

To this end, the entire collection of Liszt’s writings in English translation will now be provided over the next five years. The autograph manuscript of each writing is consulted, if it exists. In the event that the manuscript does not exist, the first and subsequent editions are compared with the German edition. Any differences in all editions are provided in the endnotes. In this way, the current English edition can be read in an easy manner just for pleasure or accessible information, or for more erudite study. Before beginning the translation, however, some “housekeeping” needs to be done.
CHAPTER 1

Liszt as Author

Almost as soon as Liszt's *Bachelor Letters* were published in the *Revue et gazette musicale* and *Le monde* in 1836-8, public suspicion arose over the possibility that Liszt was not the author of these writings. Perhaps bewildered that the king of the keyboard was now emerging as a literary personality, a correspondent with the *Pariser Zeitung* published an article that purported the *Letters* must have had two authors, namely Liszt and his lover and later mother of his three children, Countess Marie d'Agoult. Maurice Schlesinger, editor of the *Gazette*, was quick to the draw, and he responded to the claims by publishing an invitation on 7 October 1838 in the *Gazette* to anyone concerned to come to the office to view the autographs. Schlesinger's response seemed to calm the suspicion, and the question over Liszt's authorship was put to rest—that is, until nearly a century later.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, several scholars involved in Liszt research expressed some doubt about Liszt's authorship. Edwin Evans, translator of Liszt's *Gypsies* book published in 1926 mentions the possibility that Princess Carolyne, Liszt's second mistress, was responsible for the shortcomings in his writings. Peter Raabe, an early twentieth-century Liszt biographer and director of the Liszt Museum in Weimar, also raised doubt over Liszt's authorship, as did Ernest Newman, a British music critic who published widely on the works of Wagner, Richard Strauss, and Bruckner.

The most damaging assertions regarding Liszt's authorship, however, came from Emile Haraszti, one of the foremost Liszt scholars in the early twentieth century. He published interpretations of his findings in a series of articles, which were printed in various journals, such as *La revue musicale* (1936), *Acta Musicologica* (1937 and 1938), *Ungarische Jahrbücher* (1943), and *Revue de musiqueologie* (1942-44), the latter of which was translated into English and published in the *Musical Quarterly* (1947). During his reading of Marie d'Agoult's *Mémoires* published in 1927 under the pseudonym Daniel Stern, he noticed similar passages in the writings of Liszt's former mistress and the *Bachelor Letters* that had appeared in the columns of the *Gazette* a century earlier. In his English study "Franz Liszt—Author Despite Himself: A History of a Mystification," Haraszti provides a long excerpt from Marie d'Agoult's *Mémoires* and the *Bachelor Letter* to Ronchaud, published in the 25 March 1837 edition of the *Gazette*. He placed these passages side-by-side for comparative purposes, and it was quite an impressive display. He asserted that Marie d'Agoult was the author of both writings, and he attempted to support his argument by citing Liszt's lack of formal education in comparison with the Countess's formidable instruction and literary connections to major personalities, as well as her own successful career as a writer after she and Liszt broke ties. Once he presented his argument in favor of Countess Marie as the real author of Liszt's writings before 1848, he made a broad leap in judgment and asserted that Princess Carolyne must have been the author of the articles written after 1848. For purposes of the present discussion, only the writings relegated to Countess Marie will be dealt with here. The latter half of Haraszti's argument, which concerns Princess Caro-
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lyne's involvement, will be reserved for section two of this introduction, "Publishing F. Chopin," and a very detailed analysis in the introduction to Volume 6, *The Gypsies and Their Music in Hungary*, in this English series.

Haraszti's rhetoric is convincing, especially due to his authoritative tone. He provides a date for everything, and while such a detailed account is usually a good idea, the information presented needs to be correct and organized. Haraszti flips back and forth between dates, and this makes his discussion confusing to follow. By rearranging his argument chronologically, however, his rhetoric begins to dissolve. Presented below is Haraszti's discussion organized by date from the earliest instance in his report to the latest:

- **24 July 1835**: Joseph d'Ortigue's biography of Liszt appears in the *Gazette musicale*.
- **1835**: *De la situation des artistes et de leur condition dans la société* appears in the *Gazette musicale*.
- **End of 1836**: *Gazette* prints "A Letter to George Sand."
- **November 1836**: *Le monde* founded.
- **End of 1836**: Liszt and Marie return to Paris from Switzerland and Italy.
- **1836-38**: Liszt publishes *Lettres d'un bachelier en musique* in the *Gazette*, as a response to George Sand's *Lettres d'un voyageur*.
- **February 1837**: Liszt writes to d'Agoult who is staying with George Sand in Nohant. He writes to her that he had just revised the "Letter in order to give it on Sunday to the *Monde* and *Gazette*. I expect it will have great success. I am grateful to you for keeping half the secret, at least with George."
- **November 1836**: Liszt writes to d'Agoult that he is taking care of "our letter, which will appear tomorrow." Haraszti says this was the *Lettre d'un voyageur* to George Sand.
- **14 February 1837**: Liszt writes to Marie that he needs "four seances which I am supposed to write after the enormous success of the *Lettre*, on which everyone is complimenting me." This letter concerns a chamber recital performed by Liszt, Batta, and Urban.
- **15 April 1838**: Letter to Heine appeared in the *Gazette* with Liszt's signature. This letter was an open response to Heine, who had treated him roughly and reproached him for his so-called "unsteady character."
- **26 April 1838**: Marie d'Agoult writes to Ronchard: "Franz has been in Vienna for three weeks. I sent a bulky package to the *Gazette*, there is a letter to Heine that he should read."
• End of April 1838: Liszt writes to his mother and asks if Schlesinger had printed his response to Heine's letter.
• 2 October 1838: Pariser Zeitung declares d'Agoult as the real author of the letters.
• 17 October 1838: Gazette denies that d'Agoult was the real author and states that the manuscript could be offered as proof.
• 3 April 1839: A correspondent from Milan's Journal des débats announces that before Liszt left Italy, he published in German with an Italian translation a volume of prose and one of poems about his childhood memories.
• Second week of April 1839: While in Venice, Marie responds to Ferdinand Hiller in Paris to inquire "ironically," as stated by Haraszti, who this correspondent of the Débats might be.
• 28 April 1839: Liszt, in Pisa, writes to Jules-Jean about a proposed article that later appeared in L'artiste.
• 2 October 1839: Liszt writes to Marie, in a correspondent from Milan's Journal des débats, announcing that before Liszt left Italy, he published in German with an Italian translation a volume of prose and one of poems about his childhood memories.
• Second week of April 1839: While in Venice, Marie responds to Ferdinand Hiller in Paris to inquire "ironically," as stated by Haraszti, who this correspondent of the Débats might be.
• 28 April 1839: Liszt, in Pisa, writes to Jules-Jean about a proposed article that later appeared in L'artiste.
• October 1839: Liszt writes to Marie to ask her to request of d'Ortigue to rewrite his biography. This biography was not written.
• 19 November 1839: Liszt writes to Marie and asks her to request of d'Ortigue to rewrite his biography. This biography was not written.
• 17 December 1839: While in Vienna, Liszt writes to Marie: "Do not publish anything in the future on my behalf, either in the Gazette or elsewhere."
• 24 December 1839: Liszt, now in Budapest, writes to Marie: "I believe it would be better to wait until I am in Paris to have the Bachelier printed."
• 14 May 1839: Marie writes to Liszt, who is now in London, that she had sent two more articles to Jules-Jean, but they were never printed.
• 22 January 1841: Marie writes to Liszt, now in Great Britain: "I read our feuilleton in the Monde (1837), and I found it superb. I believe it would be very good for you to do a few pieces. I am ready," Liszt did not respond.
• From 1841 forward, Marie writes as Daniel Stern.
• 11 April 1842: Liszt writes from Dorpat about a plan to have his secretary Belloni sign a biography which the Countess was going to put into shape: "I shall not hurry you for this biography, but you have no idea how much I am annoyed with all those intolerable biographical notices that keep cropping up in the German papers. You will render me an important service by putting things straight. If you can at all manage, try to get this done before the fall. ... This will not prevent the insertion of some more personal chapters ... and Belloni's signature will facilitate quotations for the Viennese, Italian, or English papers, etc., because I want everything in it." Nothing came of this project.
• 1840-46: Liszt only returns to France on rare occasions between these years, and after 1846 he did not return at all until 1853 for a two-week visit.
• 1845 Liszt meets Princess Carolyne.

First of all, it is important to note that Liszt never denied requesting help in writing his articles, and Haraszti's list above shows this quite clearly. In the 11 February 1837 entry to the Countess, Liszt refers to the George Sand letter as
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"our" letter, and he solicits the aid of Belloni, Marie d'Agoult, and d'Ortigue to remake his biography. Nowhere in the above list of events does he hide his collaboration or take the sole credit for his writings. He had a heavy workload and traveled continually during his early years as a virtuoso, so it would have been nearly impossible to take on the additional writing responsibilities without help. This is all to say that there was no attempt by Liszt to hide anything from his readers, but the same cannot be said about Haraszti.

Close examination of some of Haraszti's dates reveals that the information is presented in a deceptive way. After stating that the *Gazette musicale* offered to show Liszt's manuscript to anyone concerned over his authorship of the Letter published in his journal, he mentions [erroneously] that no autograph in Liszt's hand dating from the Paris period has ever surfaced. Then he purports:

> From Pisa he proposed on April 28, 1839, to Jules Janin an article on the fine arts, which eventually appeared in *L'artiste*. A year later, on May 14, 1840, the Countess wrote to him at London that she had sent two more articles to Janin; however, they were not printed. On April 3, 1839, an alleged Milan correspondent of the *Journal des Débats* announced that Liszt, before leaving that city, had published there (in German, with an Italian translation) a volume of prose and one of memoirs, memories of his childhood and youth. Having read this fanciful information while in Venice, the Countess wrote to Hiller, then in Paris, to inquire ironically who this correspondent of the *Débats* might be.\(^9\)

The way this passage is written makes it appear as if the Countess was insinuating that she was the author of the writings in the *Débats*, especially with Haraszti's inclusion of the word "ironically." Additionally his rhetoric is organized in a manner that suggests Janin denied the articles because he thought Liszt was trying to deceive his readership by claiming to be the author of articles actually written by the Countess. However, when the 14 May 1840 entry is viewed within its chronological context, it becomes evident from the 17 and 24 December 1839 entries that Liszt is attempting to take control of the publication of his writings. He tells Marie "not to publish anything in the future on his behalf," and asks her "to wait until I am in Paris to have the *Bachelor Letters* printed." When Janin received the articles from Marie in May 1840, it is quite possible, therefore, that Liszt had already informed the *L'artiste* editor to not publish anything without his authorization. Thereafter, Marie d'Agoult begins her own writing career as Daniel Stern, and there is no further writing collaboration between the two of them.

There is another similar situation where Haraszti attempts to confuse the reader with his rhetoric. The passage reads:

> A file of manuscript papers which is in the keeping of the Ollivier family bears the indication "Articles *Gazette musicale*," and in a letter to Ronchaud of April 26, 1838, Mme. d'Agoult, who was bored being alone in Venice, seems to confirm the collaboration: "Franz has been in Vienna for three weeks. I have sent a rather bulky parcel to the *Gazette*. Is it there a letter to Heine, which I should very much like him to read?" Dated April 15, that is a week after Liszt had left Venice, the letter to Heine appeared in the *Gazette* over Liszt's signature. As
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