

PERCEPTION OF DORA PEJAČEVIĆ IN CROATIAN PUBLIC PRINTED MEDIA FROM 1905 TO 1945*

STANISLAV TUKSAR

Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Zrinski trg 11
10 000 ZAGREB

UDK / UDC: 78.072:655.3.066.12(497.5)“1905/1945”
+78.071.1Pejačević, D.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21857/y7v64t47zy>

Izvorni znanstveni rad / Research Paper

Primljeno / Received: 18. 6. 2024.

Prihvaćeno / Accepted: 29. 10. 2024.

Abstract

The perception of the female composer Dora Pejačević in the Croatian public media (newspapers and magazines) in the period from 1905 to 1945 can be traced through about fifty articles. Reports and comments on her character and work were published by a total of 24 newspapers, mostly in Zagreb and Osijek, and in addition to twelve anonymous authors and six signed only with initials, 18 authors were identified for 25 of these articles. The main part of this text consists of citing and analyzing the writings of the six most important authors who wrote about D. Pejačević in the mentioned period: Ern(e)st Schulz, Milutin Nehajev, Viktor Novak, Petar Konjović, Božidar Širola and Lujo Šafranek-Kavić. The writings of these six authors were singled out because of their opinion and evaluation of the life and work of D. Pejačević at a level higher than usual newspaper reports, as

creators of perception and not as mere chroniclers of reception, and because of the reputation they enjoyed among the public in their time as critics, composers and musicologists. These writings show a considerable diversity in the approach and evaluations of both individual works and the entire musical habitus of D. Pejačević.

Keywords: Dora Pejačević; Croatian newspapers and magazines; 1905–1945 period; Ernest Schulz; Milutin Nehajev; Viktor Novak; Petar Konjović; Božidar Širola; Lujo Šafranek-Kavić

Ključne riječi: Dora Pejačević; hrvatske novine i časopisi; razdoblje 1905-1945; Ern(e)st Schulz; Milutin Nehajev; Viktor Novak; Petar Konjović; Božidar Širola; Lujo Šafranek-Kavić

* This work has been fully supported by Croatian Science Foundation under the project IP-2020-02-4277 »Institutionalization of Modern Bourgeois Musical Culture in the 19th Century in Civil Croatia and Military Border« (MusInst19).

Before I move on to the presentation of the content announced by the title, I would like to emphasize a fact already widely known: that Dora Countess Pejačević's life and work took place on multiple levels, so its reflection and her perception in public printed media are equally multi-layered. Namely, thanks to the Countess's specific life trajectories in the physical, intellectual and artistic spheres, the aforementioned reflections and perception have the character of multiple concentric circles: public articles about her appeared – and still appear – in the foreign (mainly Hungarian, Austrian, German), Yugoslavian, wider Croatian, and finally Zagreb press in newspaper, magazine and book forms; furthermore, one circle of these writings refers to those created during her lifetime, another one to those in the next fifty years up to around the mid-1970s, and finally the last one to those that we could call the »era of Koraljka Kos«, i.e. from the beginning of Kos's rightly considered epoch-making work on Dora Pejačević, which encouraged a number of other researchers to pursue further work on the topic. A thorough and comprehensive research, structuring and evaluation of the entire corpus of these writings would probably require a work of the scope of a separate book.¹ Therefore, due to the limited space available here, this presentation should be understood as a spatial and temporal clip, that is, a fragment, which could serve as a kind of »case study« for the mentioned topic as a whole. It should also be noted right away that a solid work of a similar profile created from partially matching sources entitled »The Image of Dora Pejačević in Journalism and Musicology in Croatia« (in English translation) was carried out and published by Zdenka Veber 36 years ago in the Proceedings of a scientific meeting held in Našice in 1985,² and it can actually be understood as a representation of the reception of the character and work of Dora Pejačević at large. In order not to repeat what has already been said in that predominantly factually intoned and already known text, I will try to use the temporally narrowed template, articulated in the title of this communication,³ to offer a different approach to part of that material and its broader interpretation. This approach consists in giving critical emphasis to those personalities and their conceptual premises that articulated and shaped the perception of the character and oeuvre of Dora Pejačević in the Croatian public space, i.e. in the

¹ The scope of the work can be well illustrated by the fact that in the Hungarian online database ARCANUM, in the digitheca under the entry »Dora (Gräfin) Pejacevich«, we find as many as 1474 »hits«, i.e. references! (Accessed 27 September 2023).

² Cf. Zdenka VEBER: *Slika Dore Pejačević u publicistici i muzikologiji u Hrvatskoj*, in: Zdenka Veber (ed.): *Dora Pejačević, 1885 – 1923. Zbornik radova sa Znanstvenog skupa »Dora Pejačević – život, rad i značenje«, održanog u Našicama 7. i 8. rujna 1985. godine*, Našice: SIZ kulture i tehničke kulture općine Našice, 1987, 71-88.

³ We have limited ourselves to the period 1905–1945 for several reasons: the first article in newspapers about Dora Pejačević's musical activities was published in 1905, while the Yugoslav Lexicographical Institute bibliography of articles and discussions about musical events systematically included articles about music only up to 1945, and the last article about her in it appears in that period in 1944; after 1945, there is no such published systematic list, and a fundamentally different socio-political environment appeared compared to the previous one.

medium of words published in newspaper, magazine and book texts. This could also be characterized as all-encompassing observation, cognition and reflection of the phenomenon of Dora Pejačević, which builds on the phenomenology of reception itself.

Let's first recall some statistical data. The sources from which the bibliography for the period 1905–1945⁴ was drawn consist of 49 articles (including three texts in separate books) to which several more previously unregistered newspaper announcements should be added, so the number of articles rises to more than 50. Reports, reviews, and evaluations of her character and works were published by a total of 24 newspapers and magazines, among which there are – as far as is known – 21 in Zagreb (*Jutarnji list*, *Sv. Cecilija*, *Morgenblatt*, *Agramer Tagblatt*, *Hrvatsko pravo*, *Suvremenik*, *Obzor*, *Agramer Zeitung*, *Novosti*, *Novine*, *Hrvatska*, *Jugoslavenska njiva*, *Almanah Društva hrvatskih književnica*, *Glas Slovenaca*, *Hrvata i Srba*, *Narodna politika*, *Narodna obrana*, *Suradnja*, *Hrvatski narod*, *Hrvatski list*, *Riječ*, *Hrvatski ženski list*) and three in Osijek (*Die Drau*, *Slawonische Presse*, *Hrvatska obrana*). Along with twelve unsigned inscriptions and six signed only with initials, 18 authors have been identified. They are: Josip Andrić, Janko Barlè, Josip Canić, Vladimir Ciprin, I. Čačinović, Ivana Fišer/Fischer, Kazimir Krenedić, Milan Majer, Pavao Markovac, Dragan Melkus, Jakov Miličić, Milutin Nehajev, A. Novačan, Viktor Novak, Mira Radej, Ernst Schulz, Lujo Šafranek-Kavić and Božidar Širola, and among them there are only two female authors: Ivana Fišer/Fischer and Mira Radej. It is possible to notice that with one sporadic inscription in each of the three years (1913, 1928, 1938), most of the published texts are grouped into five time periods: 1905–1911 (7 inscriptions), 1916–1918 (12), 1920–1926 (16), 1930–1933 (6) and 1943–1944 (5). Authors such as Petar Konjović (*Ličnosti*, 1920) and Božidar Širola (*Pregled povijesti hrvatske muzike*, 1922) included the text about Dora Pejačević in their books, and Antonija Kassowitz-Cvijić introduced her in a separate entry in the collection *Znameniti i zazlužni Hrvati* (1925). It is interesting that later the most prominent historian of Croatian music, Josip Andreis, did not include Dora Pejačević in the first version of his history of music from 1942. Assessing thus that »in the transition to the last, newest age of Croatian music, several musicians stood out, who, although they do not stand firmly on the ground of musical nationalism, are consciously approaching it, trying to escape the influences of European musical currents from the beginning of this century«,⁵ and among such musicians he clas-

⁴ They are: Koraljka KOS: Bibliografija radova o Dori Pejačević, in: ID.: *Dora Pejačević*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Muzikološki zavod Muzičke akademije u Zagrebu, 1982, 210-212; Koraljka KOS: Spezielle Bibliographie, in: ID.: *Dora Pejačević. Leben und Werk*, Zagreb: Musikinformationszentrum, 1987, 146-149; Marija KUNTARIĆ (ed.): *Bibliografija rasprava i članaka. Muzika*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod »Miroslav Krleža«, Book 13, 1984, and Book 14, 1986.

⁵ Josip ANDREIS: *Povijest glazbe s primjerima u notama, reprodukcijama rukopisa i slikama*, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1942, 637-638.

sifies only Blagoje Bersa, Franjo Dugan Sr., Josip Hatze, Ivan Muhvić and Slavomir Grančarić. As expected, Pejačević did not enter even Andreis's list of so-called supporters of musical nationalism, which begins with Antun Dobronić and ends with Ivan Brkanović.⁶ The reasons for this non-inclusion today are difficult to fathom, because it is not possible to guess them even in the ideological reasons of the time, in order to interpret, for example, the non-inclusion of Dragan Plamenac, an author of Jewish origin in the socio-ideological framework of the Independent State of Croatia (NDH).

In order to further concentrate on the main topic of this paper, it is necessary to do two things beforehand: firstly, to briefly present the general features and technical data related to the character and work of Dora Pejačević, which are mentioned by almost all authors; secondly, to distinguish those authors who cited only such topoi from those who offered reasoned opinions and evaluations of a higher order, that is, to separate the creators of perception from the chroniclers of reception.

Practically all authors always state that Dora Pejačević was a countess. The social status of an aristocrat was obviously a kind of »critic's filter or glasses« through which it was probably easier to accept the fact that it was a woman-composer and readers could be additionally tickled with a dose of curiosity and intrigue due to the unusual combination of high birth and professional practice of art. The fact that her father was a Croatian Banus is also frequently emphasized.

Furthermore, the vast majority of authors emphasize her strong talent for music. Sometimes this acts as a counterweight to the fact that she is of aristocratic origin, almost as a kind of justification that due to the strength of her talent she simply had to do music professionally despite the social status she was born with.

Most of the authors have also registered the success of her compositions performed abroad. I see in this a reflex of some so-called innate toadyism that arose from a more or less pronounced provincialism complex, i.e. a value deviation from which Croatian society – especially the media but also a large part of the academic community – has unfortunately not recovered to this day.

However, in addition to these biographical and psychological determinants, categories that concern the stricter musical qualities of her works are also often highlighted. These are categories of taste, compositional knowledge in general, form, harmony and technical requirements for the performance of her works. Thus, her great taste, the seriousness of her compositional knowledge, the strictness of the form, but also a lot of feeling for it, rich harmonies, melodic invention, and great technical requirements for all performers of her works, especially for pianists, stood out. It can therefore be stated that the reception of common issues about Dora Pejačević in the Croatian press during the period of the first 40 years (1905–1945) was generally intoned on a neutral-positive plane, that is, that it

⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 639-644.

fundamentally created a halo-effect in the public characterized by overwhelming sympathy and understanding for the young countess's work.

Things are somewhat different, however, with the perception of Dora Pejačević in reflections and evaluations of a higher order. There is a certain diversity in the approach and evaluations of both her oeuvre as a whole and the composer's general and musical habitus. For this section, we singled out six authors who have published several articles or longer texts on the topic we are dealing with here; these are, in order of publication of their first text: Ernst Schulz, Milutin Nehajev, Viktor Novak, Petar Konjović, Božidar Širola and Lujo Šafranek-Kavić. They are all well-known figures of Croatian (with Konjović also Serbian) musical culture from the end of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century. Here is a more detailed presentation and analysis of their writings.

Ern(e)st Schulz (1866–1943). Schulz was the critic who stressed the structural qualities of D. Pejačević's music. He is today the least known personality among the aforementioned six, although Jelena Vuković characterized him as follows: »From Schulz's criticisms, a good connoisseur of music history, compositional-technical and theoretical procedures and current events in European music production speaks«, and puts him next to Matoš and Nehajev regarding criticism in Zagreb in German.⁷ However, the central editions of the Lexicographical Institute – the *Encyclopedia of Music*⁸ and the *Lexicon of Yugoslav Music*⁹ – did not include him in their alphabet. Schulz worked as a music critic for the Zagreb dailies *Agramer Zeitung* from 1895 to 1908 and *Jutarnji list* from 1915 to 1918, and occasionally in the newspapers *Pobratim* (1898–1899) and *Agramer Tagblatt* (1916). He published a total of 222 texts in them.¹⁰ He wrote about Dora Pejačević on three occasions, in 1916 and twice in 1918, of which two texts are of particular importance. Thus, in the extensive text »The First Symphonic Concert of Croatian Composers«¹¹ from 1916, Schulz writes, along with a general review and presentation of the works of other composers, Širola, Dobronić, Baranović, Stančić and Dugan Sr., about the piano concerto by D. Pejačević. He points how interesting her development as a musician is, from small compositions in chamber music to pieces for orchestra, and points to her highest artistic aspirations with respect for »old forms« as well

⁷ Jelena VUKOVIĆ: Opera u Zagrebu od 1890. do 1920. u orisu glazbene kritike na njemačkom jeziku, *Arti musices*, 31 (2000) 1-2, 27.

⁸ Krešimir KOVAČEVIĆ (ed.): *Muzička enciklopedija*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod »Miroslav Krleža«, Vol. 3, 1977.

⁹ Krešimir KOVAČEVIĆ (ed.): *Leksikon jugoslavenske muzike*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod »Miroslav Krleža«, Vol. 2, 1984.

¹⁰ See the list of his criticisms in: M. KUNTARIĆ (ed.): *Bibliografija rasprava i članaka. Muzika*, vol. 14, 13-18.

¹¹ E. Sch. [Ernst Schulz]: Prvi simfonijski koncert hrvatskih skladatelja, *Jutarnji list*, 5 (12 February 1916) 1398, 2-3.

as a sense for »modern development«.¹² In another text entitled »The compositional evening of Dora Pejacsevich«¹³ from 1918, Schulz repeats some topoi (distinctive harmonization, talent, melodiousness), but also reveals some new qualities of her music: »an extension of the rules of the sonata in its classical form«, perhaps following »Bruckner's example«, increased demands on the listeners, composing »absolute music« and going one's own way, rich contrapuntal and »mature thematic work«, and even traces of »Sturm und Drang« in the string quartet. He additionally warns of the Russian character in the first movement of that quartet, while in the scherzo he finds a similarity with a Slavonian song. Regarding the violin sonata, he asserted that »even though this sonata is called 'Slavic', it seems that the composer felt more 'Croatian'«. ¹⁴

Milutin Nehajev (1880–1931). Writer and music critic, Nehajev found Pejačević's music to be a product of a gifted and zealous musician. According to Sanja Majer-Bobetko, along with A.G. Matoš he was the main representative of the so-called impressionist criticism between the two world wars in Croatia.¹⁵ He was otherwise also a fine amateur violinist¹⁶ who published between 1896 and 1928 (the last text posthumously in 1932) 190 texts in 14 newspapers and magazines,¹⁷ mostly in the dailies *Agramer Tagblatt* (mainly between 1916 and 1919) and *Jutarnji list* (mainly between 1921 and 1926). He wrote about Dora Pejačević only twice: in 1916 and 1918. In a text from 1916, published in the magazine *Savremenik* under the title »After the concert. Symphony concert of young Croatian composers in the Royal National Croatian Theater in Zagreb«,¹⁸ he mentions Dora Pejačević *en passant* in just two sentences, noting that her piano concerto is »of a very strict form«, and that she »has already created several works« in chamber and symphonic music.¹⁹

However, in the text »Kompositionsabend Gräfin Dora Pejacsevich«²⁰ from 1918, Nehajev provides a series of interesting evaluations of her string quartet, piano quintet and violin sonata, performed at the aforementioned composer's evening. In addition to some general points (a gifted musical nature, a soul that lives only its art, mature taste), according to Nehajev, Pejačević has »the reputation

¹² *Ibid.*, 2.

¹³ E. Sch. [Ernst Schulz]: Kompozicijska večer Dore Pejacsevich, *Jutarnji list*, 7 (7 April 1918) 2182, 4.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Cf. Sanja MAJER-BOBETKO: *Glazbena kritika na hrvatskom jeziku između dvaju svjetskih ratova*, Zagreb: Croatian Musicological Society, 1994, 64-65.

¹⁶ ***: Nehajev-Cihlar, Milutin, *Leksikon jugoslavenske muzike*, Vol. 2, 1984, 73.

¹⁷ They are: *Nada, Nova nada, Agramer Tagblatt, Obzor, Balkan, Savremenik, Jutarnji list, Narodno djelo, Domovina, Sv. Cecilija, Der Morgen, Glazbeni vjesnik, Književnik* and *Hrvatska revija*.

¹⁸ Nehajev M.: Poslije koncerta. Simfonijski koncert mladih hrvatskih skladatelja u Kr. Zemaljskom hrvatskom kazalištu u Zagrebu, *Savremenik. Mjesečnik Društva hrvatskih književnika*, 11 (1916) I-II, 28-31.

¹⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, 29 and 31.

²⁰ Nv.: Konzerte. Kompositionsabend Gräfin Dora Pejacsevich, »Feuilleton«, *Agramer Tagblatt*, 33 (6 April 1918) 89, 1-2.

of a zealous composer, aware of the goal in uplifting work«,²¹ she »kept [...] that sympathetic feature of musical self-listening and creation«,²² she »[...] creates obviously from herself and for herself – and this seems to us the greatest praise of her creativity«,²³ her spirit completely devoted to the greatness of her art which »[...] above all kinds of programmatic musicianship longs for the realm of the absolute and finds it«.²⁴ However, one error crept into the published text: it is stated that in the quintet a »Slovenian« (*slovenska*) instead of a »Slavonian« (*slavonska*) theme was treated as a Slavic motif. In addition, Nehajev makes two mild critical remarks: in the third movement of the quartet, »here and there the technical work betrayed the examining reason«,²⁵ and »[...] the leading of the parts or [...] the formation of a sonata setting would surely deserve a more detailed critical treatment«. ²⁶ In accordance with the above, Koraljka Kos considers that Nehajev »hits with amazing intuition on some of the essential features of Dora Pejačević's art«. ²⁷

Viktor Novak (1889–1977). Historian (Latin paleography, diplomacy studies, political thought of the South Slavs) and music writer, Novak stressed D. Pejačević's individuality and generally good musicianship. He first worked in Zagreb, and from 1924 in Belgrade as a professor of Croatian history and auxiliary historical sciences at the University of Belgrade.²⁸ As a music writer and critic, he published between 1913 and 1937 a total of 243 texts in eight Croatian and ten Serbian publications.²⁹ He published only two articles about Dora Pejačević in Croatia: in 1918 and 1920. Here we will analyze only his text from 1918, because the one from 1920, entitled »The success of Countess Dora Pejačević in Dresden« and published in *Jutarnji list*,³⁰ was dedicated only to information about one performance abroad.

²¹ »Ruf der strebsam und zielbewusst sich emporarbeitenden Tondichterin«. *Ibid.*, 1-2.

²² »[...] behält [...] jene sympathische Linie des musikalischen Sich-selbst-hörens und Schaffens bei«. *Ibid.*

²³ »D.P. schöpft offenbar aus sich selbst und für sich selbst – und dies scheint uns das beste Lob ihrer Schöpfung zu sein«. *Ibid.*

²⁴ »[...] welcher über alles programmatische Musizieren nach dem Reich des Absoluten sich sehnt und es auch findet«. *Ibid.*

²⁵ »[...] mag hie und da (der III. Satz des Quartetts) die technische Arbeit die prüfende Vernunft verraten«.

²⁶ »Stimmenführung oder im [...] Satzbau der Sonate würde gewiß eine aufsichtere kritische Behandlung verdienen«. *Ibid.*

²⁷ Koraljka KOS: Ishodišta. Djelo Dore Pejačević u zrcalu kritike i muzikologije, in: ID.: *Dora Pejačević*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Muzikološki zavod Muzičke akademije u Zagrebu, 1982, 2.

²⁸ ***: Novak, Viktor, *Leksikon jugoslavenske muzike*, Vol. 2, 1984, 82.

²⁹ They are: in Croatia – *Obzor*, *Sv. Cecilija*, *Narodne novine*, *Hrvatska prosvjeta*, *Jutarnji list*, *Savremenik*, *Jugoslavenska njiva* and *Nova Evropa*; in Serbia – *Politika*, *Reč*, *Srpski književni glasnik*, *Bratstvo*, *Reč i slika*, *Vreme*, *Jevrejski glas*, *Muzički glasnik*, *Zvuk* and *Novosti*. See the list of his critiques in: M. KUNTARIĆ (ed.): *Bibliografija rasprava i članaka. Muzika*, Book 13, 561-566.

³⁰ N(ovak) V(iktor): Uspjeh Dore grofice Pejačević u Dresdenu, *Jutarnji list*, 9 (19 March 1920) 2926, 4.

However, in the text »Chamber Music. Composition evening of Countess Dora Pejacsevich«, in the »Listak« column, published in the newspaper *Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba*,³¹ along with some general points (strong and young up-and-coming talent; considerable musical taste; declamatory, pathetic melody; skillful technical operation; strong form; rich polyphony; virtuosic power; »an interesting musical portrait of one of our aristocrats, who entered the life of music with all her soul«), Novak made quite a number of positive judgments about the style and general characteristics of Pejačević's composition: she is a »sympathetic musical individuality«; »works a lot, interestingly and – good!«; »develops a particularly appropriate strength and skillful ability to navigate in modern musical technique and architecture«; »her soul [...] has not strayed far from the romantics«; »strong and original trait, and with this very originality she boldly tries to separate herself from any influence or eclecticism«; »she always has the ability to preserve the conciseness of expression«; and about particular works: »This sonata is a particularly elegant composition, which is permeated with great and deep sensitivity, and the Slavic motifs [...] are excellently and skillfully used, and give the sonata a special value«. However, Novak also adds some mild critical notes to his narrative: »stuff that is crowded in places«; »excessive search for strong, large and energetic effects«; »The second movement [in the quintet] is somewhat tiring with too broad and too long thematic treatment«. Novak's allusion to gender psychology is also interesting: »this female artist is clearly trying [...] to achieve a stronger and more energetic touch of some masculinity«.

Petar Konjović (1883–1970). Serbian composer, conductor, musicologist and music writer, Konjović judged extremely negatively Pejačević's general and musical education, as well as her compositional orientation. He lived and worked in Serbia until 1917, then on several occasions in Croatia (Zagreb, Osijek), and from 1939 permanently in Belgrade.³² He was also engaged in music criticism and journalism, so in the period from 1903 to 1940 he published about fifty texts in 14 newspapers in Croatia and 17 in Serbia. In Croatia, he published mostly in the magazines *Savremenik* and *Hrvatska njiva*, and in Serbia in *Letopis Matice srpske*, *Srpski književni glasnik*, *Politika*, and in *Srbobran* and *Novi Srbobran*.³³ In the book of essays *Ličnosti* (Personalities), published in Zagreb in 1920, in the chapter »From musical Zagreb«, there is also a review, report and commentary under the title »Compositional evening of Countess Dora Pejacsevich«. ³⁴ The complete intonation

³¹ Dr. N.: Komorna glazba. Kompoziciono večer Dore grofinje Pejacsevich, column »Listak«, *Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba*, 1 (6 April 1918) 70, 2-3.

³² ***: Konjović, Petar, *Leksikon jugoslavenske muzike*, Vol. 1, 1984, 446-448.

³³ Cf. the list of Konjović's texts in: M. KUNTARIĆ (ed.): *Bibliografija rasprava i članaka. Muzika*, Book 13, 401-402.

³⁴ Petar KONJOVIĆ: *Ličnosti*, Zagreb: Izdanje knjižare Čelap i Popovac, 1920, 173-177.

of Konjović's text about Dora Pejačević is a blatant example of an approach guided by ideological prejudice. Namely, in addition to the already seen standard positive topoi (pure music; very regular and very defined architecture; sovereign rule over form; her technique has a high level; technical maturity), Konjović is extremely critical of Dora's complete human and musical habitus (= »artistic personality traits«): »[...] through work, culture and – I firmly believe that it is so – thoughts, Countess Pejacevich developed in an environment that is completely foreign and alien to our art and the atmosphere in which our artistry wants and can develop«. A logical question arises: which is »ours« that is completely alien to German art and atmosphere? Furthermore, Konjović sets postulates and prescriptions on which path Dora should follow if she wants to become a »Croatian [or national] artist« and if she wants »[...] to have a share in the creation of a new art«: »Get rid of everything learned, listened to, formal... to get rid of the German view of art and German school... to get rid of the German cultural environment and its influences«. But for that »[...] a great process of renewal, forgetting, coping is needed; [...] man therefore learns that he has something to forget«. These are attitudes that even the Soviet Stalinist socialist realism of the 1930s with its concept of »soul engineering« would not be ashamed of. Advocating some different, new nationalism, Konjović says: »Nationalism is in the blood, in the thinking, and that, first of all, must be expressed in art.« Could it be that Dora was supposed to completely change her spiritual blood with some conceptual meta-transfusion? And after such Konjović's »Blut und Boden« excursion, his psychological-aesthetic prescription comes as a climax: »In our artistic sphere, it must be done by touching the primitive psyche of our people with the personal sensitivities of the artist«. So, in summary: Konjović advocates a complete distancing from the European cultural circle, for some koiné of a new integral Yugoslav nationalism, to which the profile and content of the art of somebody like Dora Pejačević are diametrically opposed.

In her aforementioned text, Zdenka Veber gave a good assessment of such views, albeit with a mild formulation: »But while Konjović's assessment is very critical, it is also unfair because it is one-sided.«³⁵ However, in this case, the well-known anti-German spirit of a new Franjo Ksaver Kuhač was not resurrected, but there is undoubtedly something announced on the musical horizon that will soon, in the period 1921–1926, appear as a concept of the so-called the »barbarogeny-decivilizer« of the Serbian author Ljubomir Micić, the initiator of Zenitism, the »philosophical-poetic-demagogic doctrine according to which the only salvation for Europe is the unfettered barbaric energy of the Serbian (super)man, which will destroy injustice, hypocrisy and Western traditionalist culture«.³⁶ However, at the

³⁵ Z. VEBER: Slika Dore Pejačević u publicistici i muzikologiji u Hrvatskoj, 75.

³⁶ Nedim SEJDINOVIĆ, Barbarogenije decivilizator, *Danas*, (30 July 2021), <<https://www.danas.rs/kolumna/nedim-sejdinovic/barbarogenije-decivilizator/>> (Accessed 2 October 2023).

end it should be noted that it seems that Konjović, as the only one with Novak, discovered some hidden gender issue in Dora's psychological profile: »[...] in all [her] compositions, the superiority and power of masculinity emerges and clearly wants to emerge«; »masculinity [is] in the basic character of all [her] works«. It seems that in this aspect of the analysis, Konjović was on the right track: both Koraljka Kos (»but she had primarily a male personality«) and the German psychologist Marianne Hassler (»It seems that Dora Pejačević was an androgynous personality, that she united the feminine and masculine personality traits«)³⁷ confirm Konjović's hunch.

Božidar Širola (1889–1955). Music historian, ethnomusicologist and prominent composer of the so-called neo-national trend in Croatian music between the two world wars,³⁸ Širola was the most prominent name among the six music writers mentioned here. We include him here as a unique curiosity, i.e. a person who brought Dora Pejačević into the canon of Croatian musical history during her lifetime. Namely, the then 33-year-old Širola included – as the first and for a long time the only music historian! – Dora Pejačević with a separate entry in chapter 5 »Contemporary music« of his *Pregled povijesti hrvatske muzike* from 1922.³⁹ In it, in addition to listing a dozen of her works, he summarized her life and work in five lines and two sentences. I am quoting those five lines here in their entirety: »DORA COUNTESS PEJAČEVIĆ, a descendant of an old noble Croatian family, appeared in Zagreb as a composer first in the concerts of the Committee for the Promotion of Chamber Music. At first, she devoted herself completely to the study of chamber music, and later she ventured to compose larger works as well«. Širola placed her between Rudolf Matz and Jakov Gotovac, as the third name before the end of the entire book. Too little and too little for the life and work that will be unexpectedly abruptly ended a year later with Dora's death, and a lot in comparison to what we said earlier about her not being included in Andreis's first book on Croatian music history in 1942.

Lujo Šafranek-Kavić (1882–1940). Composer and music critic, graduated from the military academy, studied music in Zagreb and Graz, Šafranek-Kavić latently assigned a marginal importance to Pejačević's music. As a music critic, he published from 1921 to 1940 in 21 publications⁴⁰ an incredible amount of texts of various pro-

³⁷ Marianne HASSLER: Ličnost Dore Pejačević u svjetlu najnovijih psiholoških istraživanja muzikalnosti u doba djetinjstva i adolescencije, in: Zdenka Veber (ed.): *Dora Pejačević, 1885 – 1923. Zbornik radova sa Znanstvenog skupa »Dora Pejačević – život, rad i značenje«, održanog u Našicama 7. i 8. rujna 1985. godine*, Našice: SIZ kulture i tehničke kulture općine Našice, 1987, 37.

³⁸ ***: Širola, Božidar, *Leksikon jugoslavenske muzike*, Vol. 2, 1984, 405-407.

³⁹ Božidar ŠIROLA: *Pregled povijesti hrvatske muzike*, Zagreb: Edition Ripop, 1922, 330.

⁴⁰ They are (in order of publication): *Zagrebački dnevnik*, *Dom i svijet*, *Kritika*, *Nova Evropa*, *Sv. Cecilija*, *Obzor*, *Srpski književni glasnik*, *Naša muzika*, *Hrvatska pozornica*, *Jutarnji list*, *Savremenik*, *Muzika*, *Morgenblatt*, *Zagreb*, *Komedija*, *Zagorski list*, *Hrvatski list*, *Termini*, *Večer*, *Muzičar* and *Zagrebački list*.

files – a total of 1,340 of them!⁴¹ He was a permanent critic of *Obzor* (1923–1933), *Jutarnji list* (1926–1927; 1932–1938) and *Zagrebački list* (1939–1940) and a permanent chronicler in the journal *Sv. Cecilija* (1923–1936). He was included in our list of music writers for one and only reason: because in all of his 1,340 writings, he dedicated only 11 lines to Dora Pejačević in a single review published in 1930!⁴² It was dominated by a panegyric to the performer, and not to the composer (although he conventionally compliments her). We quote that paragraph in its entirety: »The second item on the programme was dedicated to the local author, Countess Dora Pejačević, who died prematurely. In her *Phantasie concertante* for piano and orchestra, written interestingly and soundly with a lot of knowledge and mastery of the apparatus, our respected artist Mrs. Antonija Geiger-Eichhorn stood out as always with extraordinary virtuoso sovereignty, who gave her interpretation zeal and brilliant shine.«⁴³ This case certainly falls into the category of, in fact, a latent »negative perception«: the most prolific critic of the period between the two world wars in Croatia devotes (in original) only 18 words to Dora Pejačević and one of her works! Isn't this a clear sign of her complete negligence and marginalization?

And to conclude:

1) Despite the relatively small number of about fifty articles about Dora Pejačević, published during the first 40 years since she first appeared in public, it was possible to broadly reconstruct the reception and perception of her character and oeuvre.

2) It is possible to state that in the period 1905–1945, despite the basically positive-neutral reception, perception – that is, observation, cognition and reflection on her appearance – shows a certain quality of musical-theoretical analysis regarding her most important works, but the critical-aesthetic evaluations cover a wide range of different attitudes conditioned by the musical and general ideological starting points of the evaluators themselves, sometimes in mutually contradictory statements.

3) The immanent and explicit objections about the lack of a national component in most of her compositions are reminiscent in the Croatian context of similar objections placed earlier on parts of the oeuvre and compositional orientation of Vatroslav Lisinski and Ivan Zajc, and on a global scale to those directed against Pyotr I. Tchaikovsky in the context of Russian musical culture in the second half of the 19th century.

4) It was necessary for half a century to pass following her death so that in a completely changed intellectual and musical-historical environment and within

⁴¹ According to M. KUNTARIĆ (ed.): *Bibliografija rasprava i članaka. Muzika* (Book 14, 54-83) 1, 319 units, but Sanja Majer-Bobetko added 21 more unsigned from *Sv. Cecilija* (op. cit., 144-148).

⁴² Lujo ŠAFRANEK-KAVIĆ: Koncert Zagrebačke filharmonije, *Obzor*, 71 (17 March 1930) 63, 2-3.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 3.

the atmosphere of affirmation of the idea of the right to pluralism in creativity, thanks in large part to the efforts of the prominent musicologist Koraljka Kos, Dora Pejačević and her work finally began to be valorized according to the immanent values of her music, devoid of ideological influences of any provenance. After all, this is evidenced by a real little »doromania« that has been spreading both in Croatia and the world in recent years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- ***: Konjović, Petar, *Leksikon jugoslavenske muzike*, Vol. 1, 1984, 446-448.
- ***: Nehajev-Cihlar, Milutin, *Leksikon jugoslavenske muzike*, Vol. 2, 1984, 73.
- ***: Novak, Viktor, *Leksikon jugoslavenske muzike*, Vol. 2, 1984, 82.
- ***: Širola, Božidar, *Leksikon jugoslavenske muzike*, Vol. 2, 1984, 405-407.
- ANDREIS, Josip: *Povijest glazbe s primjerima u notama, reprodukcijama rukopisa i slikama*, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1942.
- Dr. N. [Viktor Novak]: Komorna glazba. Kompoziciono veče Dore grofinje Pejacsevich, column »Listak«, *Glas Slovenaca, Hrvata i Srba*, 1 (6 April 1918) 70, 2-3.
- E. Sch. [Ernst Schulz]: Kompozicijona veče Dore Pejacsevich, *Jutarnji list*, 7 (7 April 1918) 2182, 4.
- E. Sch. [Ernst Schulz]: Prvi simfonijski koncerat hrvatskih skladatelja, *Jutarnji list*, 5 (12 February 1916) 1398, 2-3.
- HASSLER, Marianne: Ličnost Dore Pejačević u svjetlu najnovijih psiholoških istraživanja muzikalnosti u doba djetinjstva i adolescencije, in: Zdenka Veber (ed.): *Dora Pejačević, 1885 – 1923. Zbornik radova sa Znanstvenog skupa »Dora Pejačević – život, rad i značenje«, održanog u Našicama 7. i 8. rujna 1985. godine*, Našice: SIZ kulture i tehničke kulture općine Našice, 1987, 33-41.
- KONJOVIĆ, Petar: *Ličnosti*, Zagreb: Izdanje knjižare Čelap i Popovac, 1920.
- KOS, Koraljka: *Dora Pejačević*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Muzikološki zavod Muzičke akademije u Zagrebu, 1982.
- KOS, Koraljka: *Dora Pejačević. Leben und Werk*, Zagreb: Musikinformationszentrum, 1987.
- KOVAČEVIĆ, Krešimir (ed.): *Leksikon jugoslavenske muzike*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod »Miroslav Krleža«, Vol. 2, 1984.
- KOVAČEVIĆ, Krešimir (ed.): *Muzička enciklopedija*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod »Miroslav Krleža«, Vol. 3, 1977.
- KUNTARIĆ, Marija (ed.): *Bibliografija rasprava i članaka. Muzika*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod »Miroslav Krleža«, Book 13, 1984.
- KUNTARIĆ, Marija (ed.): *Bibliografija rasprava i članaka. Muzika*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod »Miroslav Krleža«, Book 14, 1986.
- MAJER-BOBETKO, Sanja: *Glazbena kritika na hrvatskom jeziku između dvaju svjetskih ratova*, Zagreb: Hrvatsko muzikološko društvo, 1994.
- Nehajev M.[Milutin]: Poslije koncerta. Simfonijski koncert mladih hrvatskih skladatelja u Kr. Zemaljskom hrvatskom kazalištu u Zagrebu, *Savremenik. Mjesečnik Društva hrvatskih književnika*, 11 (1916) I-II, 28-31.

- N[ovak] V[iktor]: Uspjeh Dore grofice Pejačević u Dresdenu, *Jutarnji list*, 9 (19. 3. 1920) 2926, 4. Nv. [Nehajev, Milutin]: Konzerte. Kompositionsabend Gräfin Dora Pejacsevich, »Feuilleton«, *Agramer Tagblatt*, 33 (6 April 1918) 89, 1-2.
- SEJDINOVIĆ, Nedim: Barbarogenije decivilizator, *Danas*, (30 July 2021), <<https://www.danas.rs/kolumna/nedim-sejdinovic/barbarogenije-decivilizator/>> (Accessed 2 October 2023).
- ŠAFRANEK-KAVIĆ, Lujo: Koncert Zagrebačke filharmonije, *Obzor*, 71 (17 March 1930) 63, 2-3.
- ŠIROLA, Božidar: *Pregled povijesti hrvatske muzike*, Zagreb: Edition Rirop, 1922.
- VEBER, Zdenka: Slika Dore Pejačević u publicistici i muzikologiji u Hrvatskoj, in: Zdenka Veber (ed.): *Dora Pejačević, 1885 – 1923. Zbornik radova sa Znanstvenog skupa »Dora Pejačević – život, rad i značenje«, održanog u Našicama 7. i 8. rujna 1985. godine*, Našice: SIZ kulture i tehničke kulture općine Našice, 1987, 71-88.
- VUKOVIĆ, Jelena: Opera u Zagrebu od 1890. do 1920. u orisu glazbene kritike na njemačkom jeziku, *Arti musices*, 31 (2000) 1-2, 3-95.

Sažetak

PERCEPCIJA DORE PEJAČEVIĆ U HRVATSKIM JAVNIM TISKANIM GLASILIMA OD 1905. DO 1945. GODINE

Percepciju skladateljice Dore Pejačević u hrvatskim javnim glasilima (novine, časopisi) u razdoblju od 1905. do 1945. možemo pratiti kroz pedesetak napisa. Izvještaje i osvrtne na njezin lik i djelo objavila su ukupno 24 glasila, pretežno u Zagrebu i Osijeku (*Jutarnji list*, *Die Drau*, *Sv. Cecilija*, *Morgenblatt*, *Agramer Tagblatt*, *Hrvatsko pravo*, *Savremeni*, *Obzor*, *Agramer Zeitung*, *Novosti*, *Hrvatska obrana*, *Novine*, *Hrvatska*, *Jugoslavenska njiva*, *Almanah Društva hrvatskih književnica*, *Glas Slovenaca*, *Hrvata i Srba*, *Narodna politika*, *Narodna obrana*, *Slawonische Presse*, *Suradnja*, *Hrvatski narod*, *Hrvatski list*, *Riječ*, *Hrvatski ženski list*), a uz dvanaest anonimnih autora i šestero potpisanih samo inicijalima identificirano je 18 autora za 25 tih napisa. To su: J. Andrić, J. Barle, J. Canić, V. Ciprin, I. Čačinović, I. Fišer, K. Krenedić, M. Majer, P. Markovac, D. Melkus, J. Miličić, M. Nehajev, A. Novačan, V. Novak, M. Radej, E. Schulz, L. Šafranek-Kavić i B. Širola (među njima su samo dvije autorice: Ivana Fišer i Mira Radej). Moguće je zamijetiti da je, uz po jedan sporadični napis u pojedinim godinama, većina objavljenih tekstova grupirana u pet vremenskih skupina: 1905-1911. (5 napisa), 1916-1918. (12), 1920-1926. (16), 1930-1933. (6) i 1943-1944. (5). Glavnina ovog teksta sastoji se od navođenja i analize napisa šestorice najvažnijih glazbenih kritičara koji su u navedenom razdoblju pisali o D. Pejačević: Ernesta Schulza, Milutina Nehajeva, Viktora Novaka, Petra Konjovića, Božidara Širole i Luje Šafranek-Kavića. Četvorica među njima objavila su svoje tekstove u novinama, dok su skladateljicu u svojim knjigama spomenuli Petar Konjović (*Ličnosti*, 1920) i Božidar Širola (*Pregled povijesti hrvatske muzike*, 1922). Neovisno o tome, Antonija Kassowitz-Cvijić uvrstila ju je u zbornik *Znameniti i zaslužni Hrvati* (1925).

Napisi ove šestorice izdvojeni su zbog mišljenja i vrednovanja života i djela D. Pejačević na razini višoj od uobičajenih novinskih izvješća, kao kreatora percepcije, a ne tek pukih kroničara recepcije, te zbog reputacije koju su u svoje vrijeme uživali u javnosti kao kritičari, skladatelji i muzikolozi. Ti napisi odaju stanovitu raznolikost u pristupu i ocjenama kako pojedinih djela tako i cjeline glazbenog habitusa D. Pejačević.