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Abstract — Résumé

The 19th century proved to be the starting-point of modern Croatian thought (written in Croatian and German) on the aesthetics of music, music criticism, music historiography, and musicology and/or ethnomusicology. The basic aesthetic issues were nationalism in music, the Romantic theory of music as a language of the emotions, and Hanslick’s idea of music as an autonomous art. Music criticism in the Croatian language was obviously directed towards promoting the national ideology, which was conceived in the period of the National Revival (1835-1850) and advocated by F. Kuhać in the second half of the century. At the turn of the century, Impressionist criticism was inaugurated by A. G. Matoš. The question of the national was also very important in the fields of musicology, ethnomusicology and musical historiography. Folk songs started to be collected in the first half of the century, and attention started to be paid in the field of music historiography to Croatian music history. The key person in the Croatian musicology/ethnomusicology and musical historiography of the 19th century was F. Kuhać (1834-1911), who was, after all, the first in Croatia to introduce the term musicology in the press as early as in 1886. During the last decade of the 19th century V. Novak (1859-1905) wrote the first general survey of music history in Croatia, which was not published until 1994.
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Introduction

The syntagm "words on music" denotes different textual contributions made in the fields of musicology and ethnomusicology, music historiography, aesthetics of music and music criticism. The 19th century proved to be the starting-point of modern Croatian thought in all the mentioned disciplines. Having in mind the
fact that the Croatian language was mainly the language of the lower classes at the beginning of the 19th century, it is no surprise that, for example, the first music criticism was written and published in German. That review on J. Auffenberg’s five-act melodrama Viola with incidental music by K. G. Wisner von Morgenstern was published in the Luna journal in August 1826.1 In the course of the 1830s, Croatian intellectuals, the emerging middle-class, and some members of the aristocracy, inaugurated the Croatian National Revival — or the Illyrian Revival or Movement as it is often called — which was actually ideologically similar to the characteristics of the national movements during the Romantic period in Europe. The period between 1835 and 1850 was marked by setting in motion the process of the constitution of the nation in the modern sense of the word, by the awakening of patriotic awareness, as well as by preparing Croats in northern Croatia and Slavonia to fight against Hungarian domination. However, the result was that Vienna banned the Illyrian name in 1843. In the same year, the nobleman Ivan Kukuljević-Sakcinski spoke for the first time in the Croatian Parliament in the Croatian language instead of in Latin. Moreover, Croatian became the official language in 1847.

Aesthetics of Music

The Illyrian national movement meant not only the political but also the cultural revival of the Croats. It affected all areas of cultural life of Croatia, including that of music. Although rudimentary elements of musical-aesthetic topics are recognizable in the book Fundamentum cantus gregoriani seu choralis [The Basis of Gregorian or Plainchant Singing] written by Mihajlo Šilobod-Bolsić (1724-1787) and published in Zagreb in 1760,2 the Illyrian Movement and, in particular, the writers and poets Ljudevit Gaj (1809-1872), Pavao Štoos (1806-1862), Vatroslav Vernak (1824-1863), Stanko Vraz (1810-1851) and the composers Ferdo Livadić (1799-1878) and Ivan Padovec (1800-1873), proved to be the initiators of modern Croatian musical-aesthetic thought.3 The main ideas promoted by Gaj, Livadić

1 Cf. ***: Theater in Agram [Theatre in Zagreb], Luna, 1/16 (August 1826), 64.
2 The text written in the form of six dialogues between the teacher and the student (on the origins of music or singing, on the staves, musical notes and clefs, on solmization, on intervals and consonances, on perfect and imperfect modes, and on intonation) had been in use for almost a hundred years. At the beginning of the first dialogue dealing with the origins of music and singing, the pupil asks what music is. The answer is: «Est autem Musica bene canendi scientia: bene autem canere (Boethius testifies) est singulare donum, & gratia Omnipotentis Dei.» [And music is the art of good singing; and to sing well (Boethius testifies) is a gift and the Grace of the Omnipotent God], 2.
3 To the best of our knowledge, musical-aesthetic aspects were discussed for the first time in the writings by five Croatian Renaissance music theorists: Federik Grisogono-Bartolacić (1472-1538), Franjo Petris (1529-1597), Pavao Skalić (1534?-1575), Miho Monaldi (1540-1592) and Nikola Vitov Gucetić (Nicolò Vito de Gozze, 1549-1610). Skalić was the only one born in the northern part of Croatia (in
and Vraz were in accordance with the basic trends of the Illyrian Movement. The two most important things required from the Croatian music of the period were: in the first place, it had to have some connection with the life of the nation and, secondly, it had to have authentic artistic value. Their *credo* was Gaš’s idea: «Let it (Croatian music — L.Z.) derive its strength from the people, or let what is created be created in the spirit of our people, though not as simply or naively as the folk do it, but rather in a refined, artistic manner and according to the rules of art and aesthetics: thus we shall be able to attain what other nations lack, namely, genuine national music.» According to Franjo Kuhač, Padovec, who was also a famous guitar virtuoso, did not share their belief concerning nationalism in music. On the contrary, he believed in internationalism. Finally, Štoos and Vernak were not at all interested in the issues of nationalism in music. Dealing largely in their writings with the Romantic theory of music as a language of the emotions, they enthusiastically advocated it. In the second half of the 19th century, the question of the ability of music to arouse or to express emotions was still a very important focus of the writers’ interest. Štoos and Vernak, who were the first to introduce the subject into the Croatian musical-aesthetic press, were followed by the writer Ernest Kramberger and the musician Ivan Miletić (1862-1927). In the 1890s, Vjenceslav Novak (1859-1905), who was born in Senj on the Adriatic Coast, educated in music at the Prague Conservatory, worked as a music teacher in Zagreb, and was known mainly as a representative of Croatian realism in literature, was still paying attention to that subject.

Dealing directly with problems of a musical-aesthetic nature, Novak was, as far as is known, the first Croatian writer to attempt a definition of music aesthetics, bearing in mind the traditional link of aesthetics with the notion of «beauty». In his preoccupation with the question of «beauty», Novak came to realise that a piece of music depended above all on the beauty of the music. This beauty is expressed in the melody, harmony and rhythm.

However, in his notes on the aesthetics of music, Novak showed himself to be a writer whose aesthetic attitude was a particular result of Positivism and Romanti-
cism, the two philosophical movements of the second half of the 19th century. Namely, although Novak follows Hanslick’s idea of music as an autonomous art, and of a piece of music being primarily an expression of musical beauty, music still represents the most elevated human thought. For Novak, art is the ideal medium for expressing and accepting ideas. In the process of creating and comprehending beauty, the most important factor is »fantasy« but the rational component is very important, too. If we add to these ideas of Novak his opinion that music is superior to the other arts because its impact on a person is more direct, and that therefore it is the least rational, we can see the influence both of Schopenhauer and of Romanticism.

As part of his aesthetic considerations, Novak also discusses taste. According to him taste could be defined as the independence in aesthetic evaluation, and its formation is influenced by one’s innate feeling for »beauty«, by various social factors and by one’s knowledge.

His translations into Croatian of foreign writers’ texts on music should also be mentioned. An essay on the evolution of programme music from the Renaissance to Beethoven, Berlioz, Liszt and Wagner, written by the Czech author František Pich, stands out among Novak’s works of this kind. We could well consider this translation to be the most comprehensive essay on programme music to have been published in Croatian up to that time.

Much credit also goes to Novak for the inauguration of musical-aesthetic education at the music school of the Hrvatski glazbeni zavod [the Croatian Music Institute] in the last decade of the 19th century. The notes for a lecture on the aesthetics of music discovered among the papers left by F. Kuhač, show that he based his lectures completely on the most acceptable, and, as Stanislav Tuksar pointed out, the most influential book in the field of the aesthetics of music of that time: this was Vom Musikalisch Schönen by E. Hanslick.9

The articles written by Novak’s lesser known contemporary, R. V. Moser, show a considerable similarity in the musical-aesthetic attitudes of the two authors. It is also important to mention a series of sketches on musical subjects by an anonymous writer, published in the first Croatian musical journal, Sv. Cecilija, in 1883.10

9 Cf. Stanislav TUKSAR: Eduard Hanslick, Franjo Ksaver Kuhač et Alii and the »National-International« Relationship in the Croatian Fin-de-Siècle Musical Culture, *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* XXIX/2 (December 1998), 155-164. Tuksar even claims that concerning Croatian musical culture of the period under consideration [from 1890s to 1920s] it can be stated, with considerable probability, that the growing influence of Eduard Hanslick’s thought towards the turn of the centuries — in a time when he was already an ‘overcome history’ in Vienna (Brahms died in 1897, and Hanslick in 1905) — brought support to all those — nationally or internationally oriented — who were standing for musical professionalism both in composing and performing, and represented a hard blow to those who (in Hanslick’s own words) tended to ‘replace invention with intentions’», 162.

10 These are: Glasbeni priemeti naši, t. j. novi [Our Musical Keys, i.e. the New Ones], Sv. Cecilija III/3 (1883); Ugodnosti crkvene glasbe [The Pleasure of Church Music], Sv. Cecilija III/4 and 5 (1883); Što je glasba [What is Music?], Sv. Cecilija III/5 (1883); Što je oduševljenje? [What is Enthusiasm?], Sv. Cecilija III/5 (1883); Pjev [Singing], Sv. Cecilija III/7-8 (1883).
Within the framework of an entirely speculative approach to the issue of the aesthetics of music, the author discusses the possibilities of modern keys, melody and harmony to express feelings in music and even tries to answer one of the most complex aesthetic questions: what is music? His answer that “gglasba je umjetnost izražavati čustva glasovi. Ona je govor duše, jer glasbom duša duši zbori, jest materinski jezik čuvstvujučega čovjeka.” is — after Šilobod-Bolšić — one of the earliest attempts at definition of music in Croatian music literature, which evidently follows the already mentioned Romantic conceptions of music. However, of particular importance is the fact that the author introduced the aesthetic issue of church music. Having focused his interest on the effects of church music and on the pleasure of church music, the author tried to promote the Caecilian principles in Croatia. He was followed by Josip Florschütz (1882-1916), an outstanding philologist from Osijek. Dealing with the relationship between music and religion, he made a terminological and stylistic distinction between church music and religious music. While church music actually means Christian church music and ought to have and retain its own distinct character, strictly separated from any connection or association with secular music, the term religious music denotes all music expressing religious character. According to Florschütz and related to the general idea of music being the expression of feelings, religious music is musical expression of religious feelings.

Besides the mentioned musical-aesthetic subjects, the problem of nationalism in music was still the main subject in the majority of writings on the aesthetics of music in Croatia of the time. Namely, the 1848-49 revolution was immediately followed, in 1850, by a decade of Habsburg absolutism, known as the period of Bach’s absolutism. During that period the ideology of the Illyrian Movement was subdued. However, it was subsequently revived in Franjo Kuhač’s (1834-1911) articles on music that he wrote for a number of journals dealing with music and culture. Born in Osijek, educated in Osijek, Buda and Vienna, where he studied the piano for a certain time with C. Czerny and attended E. Hanslick’s lectures in music history and aesthetics at the University, Kuhač finally moved to Zagreb in 1871. He lived there until his death and, together with the composer Ivan Zajc, marked with his activities the whole relevant period. This is why this period is known in the history of Croatian music as that of Ivan Zajc and Franjo Kuhač. Kuhač is known primarily as the founder of ethnomusicology in Croatia, but because of the extraordinarily wide scope of his activities, he can also be considered the founder of

11 ***, Što je glasba [What is Music?], Sv. Cecilije 5 (1883). “Music is the art of expressing emotions by means of tones. It is the speech of the soul because a soul speaks through music to another soul, it is the mother tongue of a feeling man.”
13 Alexander Bach was the Minister of the Interior in the period between 1850 and 1860. Under his strong hand, the Imperial Court in Vienna introduced a rigid policy of centralization.
Croatian musicology and, in particular, of music historiography. Being in the first place an ideologist with a national approach to music, Kuhač pleads in his writings for the creation of an authentically national form of music expression, one that would provide a recognizable identity for the nation. That is why, according to him, art music should be based on folk music. Besides, the purpose of music would be to serve utilitarian aims of universal importance.

His statement that art itself is a creative and idealised imitation points to Aristotle’s aesthetics as the source of Kuhač’s theses. Confusing the terms idealism and idealisation, the author comes to the development of art. The role of man in music development is limited by his social position. Because truth has to be the basis of each work of art, Kuhač pleads for the total affirmation of realism, and the solution of the problem of the expression of truth in music, that is, nature that is a paragon for every art, which he finds in »native« music. To be beautiful music must be natural and »native«, that is, national. Besides, music, like every art, is not only »prikaz ljepote i teškoće«14 but a reflection of its times as well. Within the limits of the social conditioning of music, Kuhač discusses the relation between politics and art.

While having correctly noticed, on the one hand, the necessity for the scientific research of musical folklore, stating on the other the theory on the similarity of music and speech (anticipation of the 20th century musical semantics and semiotics!), Kuhač wanted to define music as it ought to be by creating laws and normative aesthetics. His belief that it was possible to create a »Croatian musical grammar« that Croatian composers should use so that their compositions would be Croatian in every detail15 shows that Kuhač made no distinction between his national ideas about music and its aesthetic aspects.

Dealing also with the question of nationalism in music, a prominent Croatian writer of the Moderne (fin-de-siècle), the music critic and cello player, Antun Gustav Matoš (1873-1914), who was born in Tovarnik in Slavonia, insisted on the difference between the national in music and patriotism. Being the first Croatian writer to introduce the highest European artistic criteria, that is to say, strict critical and aesthetic evaluation of a work of art, Matoš did not equate aesthetic and national criteria as Kuhač did. He did, however, believe that every authentic art work was essentially national. His essays written in the Impressionist manner were the first to speak clearly and relevantly — from the historic viewpoint — about the sense, meaning and problems of art.

Unlike the impressionist Matoš, a philosopher and writer, Franjo Marković (1845-1914), initiated research into a a piece of music as a work of art from an

14 Franjo KUHAČ: Fortunat Pintarić, in: Ilirski glazbenici, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb 1893), 81: »the reflection of beauty and difficulty«.
15 Cf. Franjo KUHAČ: Osobine narodne glazbe, narodito hrvatske [The Characteristics of Folk Music, Especially Croatian], Tisak dioničke tiskare (Reprinted from books 160, 174 and 176 of the Rad of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts), Zagreb 1909.
objective, scientific and systematic standpoint, and this procedure exerted strong influence on the further development of the aesthetics of music and aesthetics in general in Croatia. Within the framework of his doctrinaire aesthetic system based on the premise that aesthetics is a \textit{philosophical science} about the forms of the beautiful, as presented in the book \textit{Razvoj i sustav občenite estetike} [The Development and System of the General Aesthetics] published in Zagreb in 1903, he also tried to create a philosophical-aesthetic terminology in Croatian.\footnote{16 It should be mentioned here that in the next year the then young composer Antun Dobronić (1878-1955), born in Dalmatia but later working and living mostly in Zagreb, published his first articles dealing with, or, more precisely, barely touching upon musical aesthetic matters. These are: O \textit{narodnom duhu} u našoj umjetničkoj glazbi [On the \textit{National Spirit} in Our Art Music], \textit{Glazbeni i kazališni vjesnik}, I/2 (February 1904), 9-12; \textit{Naša glazbena publika} [Our Musical Public], \textit{Glazbeni i kazališni vjesnik}, I/5 (May 1904), 37-38. But, in 1908 he published two booklets: a collection of essays \textit{Predavanja iz povijesti i estetike muzike} [Lectures on the History and Aesthetics of Music], (Author’s edition, Drniš 1908), \textit{Naše glazbene prilike i neprilike} [Our Musical Chances and Failures]. The analysis of the texts shows, on the one hand, that Dobronić was preoccupied in his \textit{first phase} by the questions of the theory of styles, evaluation, music criticism etc., searching for inspiration from well-known European authorities (E. Hanslick) as well as from Croatian authors (V. Novak, R. V. Moser, A. G. Matoš). On the other hand, already in his early writings he had raised the question around which his interest was later to focus: the issue of the \textit{national} in music. By insisting on the difference between the \textit{national} in music and patriotism, in the same way as Matoš did, Dobronić did not identify the aesthetic and the national criteria, giving priority to the aesthetic, for which Kuhač resented him (Cf. Marija JANĂÅEKL-BULJAN: \textit{Korespondencija Kuhač-Dobronić} [The Kuhač-Dobronić Correspondence], \textit{Arti musices} XI/1 (1980), 41). Even so, he later drew much closer to Kuhač’s ideal. It seems that a decisive role in the further formation of the aesthetic attitude through which Dobronić made himself known in the history of Croatian music as the most ardent and firm ideologue of the \textit{national orientation} between the two World Wars, was played by his studies in Prague (1910-1912).}

Markovic’s activity marks the end of an epoch characterized by the lack of a scientific approach and treatment as well as of aims and methods in the field of the aesthetics of music. Still, the first Croatian book on the aesthetics of music was published only in 1944.\footnote{17 Cf. Josip ANDREIS: \textit{Uvod u glasbenu estetiku} [An Introduction to the Aesthetics of Music], Matica hrvatska, Zagreb 1944.}

\textit{Music Criticism}

Music criticism in the northern part of Croatia and in Slavonia during the period under consideration was written in Croatian, German, and probably in Hungarian. It should be pointed out that research on music criticism of the time is still being done particularly intensively on music criticism in German, which was regularly represented in the daily German-language press, the most important and influential examples of which were \textit{Agramer Zeitung} (1826-1912) and \textit{Agramer Tagblatt} (1886-1941) in Zagreb, and \textit{Slavonische Presse} (1885-1929) and \textit{Die Drau} (1868-1929) in Osijek. Much of it was anonymous. Still, among the few known authors mention should be made of both Heinrich Hirschl, who prob-
ably came from Vienna and wrote in Zagreb and in Osijek, as well as of one of the first female music critics, Jelica Belović-Bernadzikowska (1870-1946), who was born in Osijek, educated in Vienna and Paris and dealt in the first place with folklore and literature. Her newspaper reviews on music events in Osijek were published between 1913 and 1917 in the daily German-language press in Osijek. After all, as has already been pointed out, the first Croatian piece of music criticism was written and published in German (cf. p. 200). However, in accordance with the basic ideas and tendencies of the Illyrian Movement, the first short news item about music life in Zagreb written in the Croatian language appeared a decade later, that is, in 1835, in Novine Horvatzke and Danica Horvatska. It was only in 1846 that the first genuine music review in Croatian was published in Danica Horvatska. That was an extensive music review of V. Lisinski’s opera Ljubav i zloba [Love and Malice] by Stanko Vraz.18 The art of music criticism written in Croatian may be said to have begun with that review. Comparing it to the one written twenty years earlier by an anonymous author in Luna, Lovro Županović makes the point that “we must recognize the greater reviewing skill and professionalism of the German paper’s critic. Though Vraz, too, tried to describe (and even evaluate) the music, the Luna critic demonstrated a much higher degree of professional skill and knowledge.”19 However, on the other hand, “Vraz’s review offers something else: not just the (understandable) ‘somewhat heightened tone’, but also its author’s awareness of the need to teach the readers the essentials of the music art, to instruct them on how to listen to a musical (in this case, operatic) work. This was in line with his (essentially correct) view that a critical review of a work of art should, among other things, have an educational effect, which should have been the necessary prerequisite of all critical activity at that time.”20 That difference between the reviews published in German-language newspapers and those in the Croatian ones remained valid in the second half of the 19th century, too. Indeed, music criticism in the Croatian language was obviously directed towards promoting the national ideology that was conceived, as has already been pointed out, in the period of the National Revival. It should also be mentioned here that the most relevant music criticism was not published in music journals, although four of them appeared during the period under consideration. But, admittedly, they had a very short life.21 This is probably the reason that the most prominent critics largely published pieces of criticism ei-
ther in the daily press or in the journals covering the field of culture in general. During that period, articles by the first completely professionally trained music critics appeared in the Croatian-language press. They were Franjo Kuhač and Vjenceslav Novak, whose activities actually denoted the beginning of professionalism in the field of music criticism in Croatian (Kuhač also wrote in German). At the same time, prominent Croatian writers followed Stanko Vraz’s tradition of dealing with music criticism. After Dimitrija Demeter’s (1811-1872) contributions, August Šenoa (1838-1881), Ivo Vojnović (1857-1929) and, at the end of the 19th century, Antun Gustav Matoš, were the most outstanding writers to write music criticism in the northern part of Croatia. Their criticism was not purely informative writing. On the contrary, it started out being aimed at evaluation and interpretation, trying to influence the taste of the public. The most original among these writers was A. G. Matoš, who was in closer contact with the rest of Europe than most of his contemporaries from Croatia. Unlike them, he could come into direct contact with people and learn about different movements from first-hand sources. He could compare the different cultural situations and events that he saw and experienced in Europe. And for him, Europe actually meant Paris, which had such a decisive impact on him that it superseded the traditional foreign centres of influence on Croatia, in particular the northern ones: Vienna and Prague. Being actually a founder of the Impressionist tradition in the field of musical criticism, he insisted on the thesis that stated that the critic’s ability, just like the artistic gift, is innate. This kind of criticism was based on the critic’s subjective approach to particular works of art. Impressionist criticism very often devotes more attention to stylistic perfection than to the complexity of critical analysis, and the emphasis is not on what has been said, but on how this has been expressed. In his search for artistic values, and in judging them, Matoš relied exclusively on his own taste, the more so because of his impulsive and excessively sensitive nature. It is a pity that his main and often his only medium for the appreciation and understanding of music was his extraordinary artistic intuition; this quality was not sufficient in forming expert judgements on music. Matoš’s tradition was continued by his contemporary Milutin Cihlar Nehajev (1880-1931), who was born in Senj, educated in Vienna (he held a doctorate in Chemistry), worked as a journalist and writer mostly in Zagreb and who, like Matoš, epitomised the contemporary Croatian intellectual; and partly by a painter, Dragan Melkus (1860-1917), who was born in Bektež near Požega in Slavonia, trained in painting in Vienna and Munich, and dealt with music criticism in Osijek (1909-1917). Finally, we may conclude that Oscar Wilde’s definition in 1890 of »A Critic as an Artist« met the response in Croatian music criticism of the time only in the criticism of Matoš and partly in that of Nehajev. In addition, seen as a literary phenomenon, only their pieces on music criticism could bear comparison to the contemporary literary criticism.
Franjo Kuhač was the first in Croatia to introduce the term musicology in the press, and he did so as early as in 1866. What is more, he stated in his article Muzikologija [Musicology] that he had been the first to use the term in general, in 1882 (thus pre-dating G. Adler’s first use of the term in 1885) in his manuscript Die Eigenthümlichkeiten der magyarischen Volksmusik [The Features of Hungarian Folk Music] reviewed by István Bartalús from Budapest. In any case, he used to be regarded as the founder of Croatian musicology and ethnomusicology. His enormous working energy enabled him to produce a really outstanding opus in all the fields with which he dealt. However, his predecessors must not be forgotten. At the time of the Croatian National Revival Stanko Vraz, Vatroslav Lisinski and Karlo Katineli (Catinelli-Bevilaqua-Obradić/Obradović/, 1807-1864) made efforts to notate folk music. Vraz wrote down about 300 tunes, Lisinski 17 and Katineli 25. The most important among them, recognized by Lovro Županović as the originator of a grand idea that only Kuhač’s persistence would bring to fruition some thirty years later, was Karlo Katineli. His project was to collect and publish a series entitled Južno slavjanske punke pisme (Südslawische Volks-Lieder) [South Slav Folk Songs], but he managed to publish only the first volume, entitled Pisme iz Slavonije [Songs from Slavonia] in Vienna, probably in 1849. Presenting 25 tunes noted down in Požega (Slavonia) in 1847 in a simple piano and harmonic setting, but in what was at that time a very interesting metric structure (the so-called mixed metre), Katineli was a pioneer of Croatian ethnomusicology, which can hardly be said to have existed at that time. He thus not only contributed to the Revivalist effort but also provided the first record of both indigenous and imported folk music in the Požega area.

Franjo Kuhač was more successful in publishing the folksongs he collected and recorded, but he himself did not succeed in publishing them all. A total of 1600 songs in four volumes had been published between 1878 and 1881 in his Južno-slavjanske narodne popievke [South Slav Folk Tunes] series. The fifth book containing 400 tunes was prepared by Božidar Širola (1889-1956) and Vladoje Dukat (1861-1944) and published in 1941. The sixth volume was prepared for publishing by

---

22 Cf. Franjo KUHAČ: Muzikologija [Musicology], Vienac, XVIII/35 (August 1886), 555-556. The manuscript itself is a comparative study of Croatian, Hungarian, German and Italian folk music.

23 The first, quite modest efforts to compile records of folk music in Croatia were made in its southern part by Petar Hektorovic (1487-1572) in 1556 and by Julije Bajamonti (1744-1800).

24 Lovro ŽUPANOVIĆ, Centuries of Croatian Music 2, 114.

25 That information was taken from the note written by Kuhač on the copy of the book found in his library.

26 Lovro ŽUPANOVIĆ: Centuries of Croatian Music 2, 114.
Vinko Žganec (1890-1976) and has remained in manuscript form. More than half of the recorded material originates in Croatia (mainly from Slavonia). Croatian folk tunes from outside Croatia are also included [106 from Gradišće /Burgenland, 5 from the Pécs (Pecuh in Croatian) region in Hungary and 4 from Moravia] as well as folk tunes from Slovenia, Voyvodina (mainly from its region Srijem), Serbia, Bulgaria, Bosnia, Montenegro, Herzegovina and Macedonia.

Among Kuhač’s followers in collecting folk songs — bearing in mind the region under consideration — mention should be made of Martin Borenić (1850-1939) and Mihovil Naković (1840-1900). Born in the Austrian region of Gradišće (Burgenland), where they lived and worked, they published the first church song-book of Gradišće in Győr in 1901. Kerštjansko-katoličanski crkveni jacker [Christian-Catholic Church Song-Book] consists of 268 harmonised tunes (besides 73 Croatian songs, there are Hungarian, German and Latin tunes in the song-book as well as 37 composed by the authors themselves).

While Kuhač had predecessors in collecting, notating and arranging folk tunes, he was the first to speak and write scientific studies on the subject. And, in my opinion, that makes him the founder of Croatian ethnomusicology. Besides occasional commentary in Južno-slovjenske narodne popijeveke, he wrote numerous studies about the nature of Croatian and Slavonic folk music. What is more, Kuhač wrote a detailed study about the methodology of the contemporary techniques of folk-tune recording. His interest in folk music also led him towards collecting both musical instruments and writing about them. Among his ethnomusicological studies, an outstanding position is occupied by a peculiar synthesis Osobine narodne glazbe, narocito hrvatske [The Characteristics of Folk Music, Especially Croatian] mentioned above on p. 6, which, as L. Županović rightly claims, «marks the crowning achievement of his many years of systematic study».

Summing up Kuhač’s conceptions and interests — having in mind both the quality and the volume of his writings — it is shown that, in spite of certain oversights and contradictions caused largely by his uncontrollable temper, by a ten-

27 Kuhač’s four volumes became valuable sources of folk tunes and served for a whole generation of composers to realize his ideas about nationalism in music in the sense that has already been described (cf. p. 204). That was the so-called (neo)national orientation in Croatian music, being particularly strong and dominating over other styles (Late Romanticism, Impressionism, Neo-Classicism, Expressionism, contributions to socially engaged music) in the period between the two world wars.

28 The term jack denotes folk song of Croats from Gradišće (Burgenland) and from West Hungary.

29 Cf. Franjo KUHAČ: Deve rasprave: Zadaća melografa i Vrijednost pučkih popijevaka [The Task of the Folk Music Collector and the Value of Folk Tunes], Komisionalna naklada knjižare Dionike tiskare (Reprinted from Vienac, 1892) Zagreb1892.


31 Lovro ŽUPANOVIC: Centuries of Croatian Music 2, 191.
dency towards polemics and even by an insufficient knowledge of the matter being dealt with, he still showed himself to be the most prominent 19th century Croatian writer and researcher (not only in Northern Croatia and Slavonia) in the field of (ethno)musicology, which is, after all, according to his own words and understood in the broadest sense, “in essence a completely independent science which comprehends everything that has anything to do with music.”

Music Historiography

When speaking about the Croatian music historiography of the 19th century, the name of Franjo Kuhač once again cannot be ignored. Apart from some articles of journalistic provenience and some of the entries about Croatian music figures in Slovnik umjetnikah jugoslavenskih [Dictionary of South Slav Artists] written by Ivan Kukuljević-Sakcinski (1858-1860, unfinished), Kuhač’s efforts actually marked the beginning of systematic scientific research in Croatia in the field of the history of music, the results of which were presented in numerous articles, essays and comprehensive studies starting with Über die nationale Musik und ihre Bedeutung in der Weltmusik [On National Music and its Significance in World Music], which was published in 1869 while he was still living in Osijek (he moved to Zagreb in 1871). He was interested in both Croatian and general music history. The history of Croatian music was, of course, in the forefront. While Kuhač’s ethnomusicological research made possible his studies on the Croatian folk tunes in both certain Haydn and Beethoven orchestral compositions as well as in the Austrian national anthem by Haydn, his research of early Croatian Romanticism resulted in a series of portraits of the relevant musicians and the monograph study of the life and work of Vatroslav Lisinski — the most prominent among them. His life engagement was...
to collect data on Croatian musicians and on all those who had contributed to music life in Croatia in the past, because he planned to publish Biografski i muzikografski slovnik [Biographical and Musicographical Dictionary]. However, that idea was not realized and, together with Knjizopis u Slavena [Slav Musical Notation, 1890] and Die musikalische Orthographie [Musical Orthography, 1895], the rich material he collected is still in manuscript form. However, it must be said that Kuhač’s conviction that music historiography, just like music itself, ought to endorse and promote national identity sometimes interfered with his scholarly objectivity in the interpretation of certain historical facts, and even led him to arbitrary and scholarly unsupported conclusions. But, on the other hand, he won lasting merit in the development of all the mentioned fields in Croatian culture in general, and, what is more, Kuhač in fact enabled qualified writing and discussion about music, in particular of musico-pedagogical provenance, in the Croatian language. Namely, his translation of J. Chr. Lobe’s Katechismus der Musik [Catechism of Music] was the first attempt at the creation of Croatian standard musical terminology, about 48 per cent of which is still being used in practice.

Kuhač was joined a little later by the historian Vjekoslav Klaić (1849-1928) and by Vjenceslav Novak. Coming from Garčin in Slavonia, Klaić, dealing with music in an amateur manner as a composer, conductor, and organizer of music life in Zagreb, focused his scholarly interest in the field of music historiography mainly on the period of the Croatian National Movement. Some of his biographic studies still function as relevant and respectable sources. Perhaps the most intriguing study on that period was the one about rousing songs, in particular about Još Horvatska ni propala [Croatia hasn’t fallen yet]. Raising doubts about Livadić’s authorship (which was Kuhač’s correct attribution), Klaić stirred up controversy among intellectuals of the time and even some later reminiscences of the topic. On the other hand, an outcome of his broad interest and historical knowledge was
his essay on Georgius Crisanius (Juraj Krizanic) and his treatise *Asserta musicaea*. Published in 1892, that was the first large-scale essay about this 17th-century Croatian music theorist.\(^4\) Finally, both Kuhaèi and Klaiëi promoted the idea of introducing music theory and history into the curriculum of the Zagreb University.

The idea of teaching history of music was not implemented at the University at that time, but, similarly to the aesthetics of music, at the music school of Hrvatski glazbeni zavod [the Croatian Music Institute]. The first lecturer was Vjenceslav Novak. As he was not a researcher himself but primarily a pedagogue, his music-historiographical works intended for teaching were based mainly on secondary sources. The most important among them is his general survey of music history, which was written during the last decade of the 19th century but not published until 1994.\(^5\) In any case, that was the first synthesis of music history written in Croatian. Following the models represented in the books by recognized authorities (A. W. Ambros, Robert P. J. Musiol, E. Naumann and, especially, B. Kothe) with interpolated chapters on South Slav histories of music, in particular the Croatian one, Novak’s *Povijest glazbe* [History of Music] presented the basic ideas of 19th century music historiography and it served teachers in manuscript form, even during the period between the two world wars. Lacking any utilitarian value at the present moment, it does however represent a historical testimony to the state of music historiography in Northern Croatia at the turn of the 19th into the 20th century.

B. Kothe’s book *Abriss der allgemeinen Musikgeschichte für Lehrerseminare und Dilettanten* served also as a sample to Stjepan Hadroviæ (1863-1934; the Canon of Vrhbosna, regens chori of the Sarajevo Cathedral, music teacher and composer) to write his booklet *Kratka povijest glazbe* [A Short History of Music]. Like Novak, he added to his work the history of Croatian music based, as it is indicated in the subtitle, on Kuhaèi’s writings. Unlike Novak, Hadroviæ managed to publish it in Zagreb in 1911, and it remained the only printed general history of music by a Croatian author until 1942, when the book by Josip Andreis and the first volume of a textbook on the history of music by Hubert Pettan were published.\(^6\)
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Sažetak

RIJEČI O GLAZBI U SJEVERNOJ HRVATSKOJ I SLAVONIJI TIJEKOM 19. STOLJEĆA I DO PRVOG SVJETSKOG RATA

Estetika glazbe, glazbena kritika i historiografija, kao i muzikologija i/ili etnomuzikologija u sувremenom smislu riječ počele su se u Hrvatskoj razvijati tijekom 19. stoljeća. Osnovne teme kojima se onodobna hrvatska estetika glazbe bavila bilo je pitanje nacionalnog u glazbi, zatim romantička emotivistička teorija glazbe kao jezika osjećaja, te Hanslickova ideja glazbe kao autonomne umjetnosti. Na tom području posebno se ističu svojim radnjama Vj. Novak, F. Kuhač i F. Marković.