PART V

Critical encounters

14 Berlioz and Gluck

JOËL-MARIE FAUQUET

"The Jupiter of our Olympus was Gluck," Berlioz recalled, when speaking of the feelings he had had as an aspiring twenty-year-old composer. To this youthful metaphor of sincere admiration it is instructive to compare the expression of disillusionment set down in the Postface of the *Mémoires* by the now veteran artist approaching the end of his career:

> There is much that I could say about the two Gluck operas, *Orphée* and *Alceste*, which I was invited to direct, one at the Théâtre Lyrique, the other at the Opéra, but I have discussed them at some length in my book *À travers chants*, and although there are things that I could certainly add to that account . . . I prefer not to do so.

This unspoken confession, with its telling ellipsis, leaves us with the impression that there was still unresolved dissonance at the end of Berlioz's long engagement with Gluck. That engagement, always marked by Berlioz's recollections of famous voices such as that of the great dramatic soprano Caroline Branchu, extended from an early, defensive phase – saving the composer from oblivion, on the one hand, and from impertinent arrangers, on the other – to a later, illustrative phase – "reproducing" his works (the word is Berlioz's) and transmitting them to posterity as models of excellence. Berlioz's participation in the revivals of *Orphée* in 1859 and of *Alceste* in 1861 and 1866 marks the culmination of a militant campaign waged by the French composer on behalf of the man whom he recognized, very early on, as both his master and his model.

In order to understand the unique character of the close relationship between Gluck and Berlioz, we must first remember that Berlioz's own creativity was conditioned by certain "poetic shocks," as he called them, which he first experienced as a youth. The works of Gluck and Virgil together were their primary causes, and both had a fundamental impact on the development of the young musician's imagination. Berlioz was not a man of the past, but he was indeed a man of *his own* past, and for him the history of music was above all the history of *his* music: "antiquity" was thus for Berlioz the period in which he discovered its existence – and that was the period of his own adolescence. The music that seems to draw upon the emotional energy of his initial enthusiasms does indeed integrate certain archaic elements into its fabric, for the purpose of

characterization, but it never does so in order explicitly to recapture some distant musical era. For Berlioz, therefore, Gluck was not a composer of the past, he was not the last of those of some bygone era; he was rather, as Berlioz put it in 1859, the first of the romantics.

Gluck became such an absolute point of reference because he was the first, as Berlioz saw it, to have used the orchestra in an expressive manner that was entirely in accord with a particular dramatic subject. In addition, Gluck provided Berlioz with the example of a composer who made fundamental revisions of his own works: it is well known, for example, that *Orfeo* (Vienna, 1762) and *Alceste* (Vienna, 1767) were written first in Italian, and then transformed for the French stage by Gluck himself in, respectively, 1774 and 1776. Given such transformations, we may well wonder what it means to speak of the "unique" or "original" work of art – a question of basic importance to the understanding of the attitude later adopted by Berlioz toward these and other works of Gluck.

Finally, the fact that Berlioz never became a teacher of composition must be taken into consideration, for his actions on behalf of Gluck have a decidedly didactic character. One of the few musicians lastingly to benefit from his guidance was the pianist Théodore Ritter, who transcribed, among other works, the version of *Orphée* that Berlioz prepared for the Théâtre Lyrique in 1859.

As early as 1825, and regularly thereafter, Berlioz's music criticism focused upon the name and the works of Gluck in such a way as protectively to surround them with a kind of palace guard: fearing the possible disappearance of what had so inspired him, and what he wished in his own way to transmit, Berlioz denounced the abandon into which the works of Gluck had fallen, urged that the integrity of his idol's musical texts be respected, and thus invoked a tradition of which he considered himself the primary keeper. With the exception of *Telemaco*, to which he devoted an article in the *Gazette musicale de Paris* of 11 January 1835, Berlioz occupied himself exclusively with the so-called "reform" operas of Gluck, including *Armide*, the rehearsals of which he directed, in 1866, with a view towards a revival that in fact never took place. Indeed, *Armide* is the subject of the very first feuilleton – in *Le Corsaire* of 19 December 1825 – that Berlioz devoted to Gluck. So from the very beginning, Gluck became the focal point of Berlioz's musical polemics.

In Berlioz's lifelong struggle on behalf of the earlier composer, the year 1834, when he conceived what became *Benvenuto Cellini*, was especially fruitful. On 1 and 8 June, he offered readers of the *Gazette musicale* a biography of Gluck that situates the composer in his own time. These two articles are highly indicative, for they analyze aspects of the operas that would

henceforth serve as the bases of some of Berlioz's "restorative" work on behalf of the composer, including Asteria's monologue from *Telemaco*; the preface to *Alceste* and the modifications of the text and score of the French version of that work (in particular Gluck's own suppression of Alceste's aria "Chi mi parla"); the librettos of *Iphigénie en Tauride* and *Iphigénie en Aulide*; Gluck's self-borrowings, and more. Later that year, Berlioz contributed four further articles to the same journal,[1] which did not seem to him to be too many for an analysis of *Iphigénie en Tauride.* In fact the analysis forms a small and quite remarkable treatise on dramatic composition.

But he directed his primary critical attention to *Alceste.* Berlioz's writings on this work, last performed at the Opéra in 1826, stretch over nearly thirty years, from one article published in 1834 in the *Gazette musicale*[2] to a series of seven published in 1861 in the *Journal des débats*[3] and later reprinted (with some alterations) in *À travers chants.* The latter, to this day one of the most important treatments of *Alceste* and its musical and literary sources, also includes a comparative study of "Gluck's Two *Alcestes*," which Berlioz originally published in 1835 in the *Journal des débats.*[4]

In that same year, the idea of producing *Orphée* (which was almost never seen on stage after the early eighteen-thirties) began to germinate in Berlioz's mind. In an article entitled "On the Gluck Repertory at the Académie royale de Musique,"[5] he considered the varied abilities of the singers engaged by the Opéra to interpret the works of Gluck. He returned to *Orphée* in the *Journal des débats* of 17 March 1839. But it was particularly the revival of 1859 that would lead Berlioz to delve more deeply into this "original" work, which so decisively affected his own musical sensibilities.

As a writer, then, Berlioz never ceased to defend Gluck – and he would do likewise as a conductor. Once again it was primarily *Alceste* that would benefit from his attentions. On 25 November 1838, to the program of the concert he was to give at the Conservatoire, Berlioz added a fragment from the Italian version of *Alceste* that he had reworked in accordance with the wish he had already expressed in his article (mentioned above) of 8 June 1834. In question was the most important alteration that Berlioz hoped to effect in the French version of the work, the reinsertion of the aria "Chi mi parla" (from the second scene of Act II of the Italian score), whose removal he had long deplored. Not only does Berlioz praise the musical qualities of this number, but he also cites its opening words – "Qui mi parla che rispondo! ah che veggo! ah che spavento! ove fuggo! ove m'ascondo! aro . . . gelo . . . manco . . . moro!" – and offers a translation of its most dramatic exclamations: "Qui me parle! [. . .] que vois-je! . . . où

fuir! . . . je brûle . . . je gèle . . . je meurs . . .” The insertion of this number into the third act of the French version, in 1861, would reinforce that act's dramatic character, which Gluck's own contemporaries, starting with Jean-Jacques Rousseau (as Berlioz knew perfectly well), took to be the least persuasive of the three.

Berlioz turned again to the “sublime monologue” from the Italian version of *Alceste*, “Chi mi parla,” in one of the series of articles entitled “De l'instrumentation” that formed the basis of his celebrated *Traité d'instrumentation*, using it as a demonstration of the ideal use of muted violins to execute a passage with lightness and rapidity, or to accompany an especially precipitous rhythm.[6]

And on 25 November 1838 Berlioz organized and conducted a concert in which he gave several excerpts from *Alceste* in versions later found in his own rescoring of the work, which was intended for use by Pauline Viardot. The little-known manuscript of this rescoring, clearly prepared before the concert of 10 March 1861 (when Viardot, along with the bass Félix Cazaux, performed at the Conservatoire), gives evidence of the “corrections” Berlioz tended to make as one who claimed properly to understand the tradition in which the score was conceived.[7] Some of these corrections would find their way into the version that Pauline Viardot sang when the work was revived at the Opéra in 1861 – a version that was published by the chef de chant at the Opéra, Vauthrot, in both piano-vocal and piano-solo scores.

The order of the Moldenhauer manuscript is as follows:

> No. 1 (Récitatif d'Alceste) “Grands dieux soutenez mon courage”; No. 2 (Aria d'Alceste) “Qui me parle?”; No. 3 Chœur de dieux infernaux invisibles (a copy that corrects the trombone parts of the printed score – something that would become, in 1857, the subject of a heated dispute between Berlioz and the voice teacher François Delsarte); No. 4 Air (Alceste) “Ah! Divinités implacables”; No. 5 Air (Un dieu infernal) “Caron t'appelle” (which reproduces the effect of the two horns facing one-another, bell-to-bell, that had so struck the fourteen-year-old Berlioz when he read Delaulnaye's article on Gluck in Michaud's *Biographie universelle*); No. 6 Air (Alceste) “Divinités du Styx” / “Ombres, larves” (with the French version superimposed upon the translation of the Italian version).

This alternative sequence was reproduced in the piano-vocal score of *Alceste* that conformed to the revival of 1861. As early as 1834 (in the *Gazette musicale* of 8 June), Berlioz had made a comparison of the aria “Ombre, larve,” of the Italian version, with “Divinités du Styx,” the adaptation in French, finding the former considerably more effective than the latter. It was on this occasion that he made extended reference to the performance of Caroline Branchu:

> Who cannot remember the remarkable interpretation of Mme Branchu, when, as the trombones cried out in response to the phrase "Divinités du Styx," she whirled round towards the side of the orchestra whence came those formidable voices and, with energy renewed and eyes wild with might and horror, she proudly roared the final verse: "Je n'invoquerai point votre pitié cruelle"? Her voice was so scathing and forceful, her expression so magisterial, that the mighty orchestra of the Opéra simply disappeared as though vanquished in wondrous battle. Oh, how grand she was at that time! – as grand as Gluck himself, of whom she was *the* sublime interpreter.

Even more than Beethoven, then, Gluck is the musician who seems most frequently to have occupied Berlioz's attention in his various capacities as a composer, conductor, director, and writer. Not only his criticism, but his private correspondence, too, testifies to his overwhelming admiration for Gluck. As early as 1824, he wrote to his friend Édouard Rocher (on 22 June):

> *Alceste*, *Armide*, now *those* are real operas! And they have an advantage over *Orphée* in the sense that those dogs, the *dilettanti*, don't like them, while *Orphée* has the defect of being approved of by that lot.

From comments such as this we can observe with some precision the development of Berlioz's campaign on behalf of the rehabilitation of Gluck. The campaign was essentially three-pronged, with advances in the areas of the aesthetic, the technical, and the fictional.

First, the aesthetic. It is clear that the "Gluck question" posed itself to Berlioz every time that he, himself, was confronted as a composer with the problem of the creation of dramatic music. For example, it was while the Opéra was considering the acceptance or rejection of the libretto of *Benvenuto Cellini*, in mid-October 1835, that he suggested a revival of *Alceste* to the then director, Edmond Duponchel. And it was while the fate of *Les Troyens* was in the balance, in the fall of 1859, that Berlioz agreed to "restore" *Orphée* for performance at the Théâtre Lyrique. Furthermore, it was surely in order to "save" *Les Troyens* from abandonment that, after noisily refusing to intervene in the Opéra's production of *Alceste*, he finally agreed to supervise the "revision" of that work in June 1861.

In the eyes of his contemporaries, Berlioz was viewed early on as a composer who was attempting to prolong the Gluckian tradition, so much so that when *Benvenuto Cellini* failed at the Opéra in 1838, Joseph d'Ortigue rallied to the cause of his friend by writing a polemical volume entitled *De l'école musicale italienne et de l'administration de l'Académie royale de Musique, à l'occasion de l'opéra de M. Berlioz.*[8] Here, d'Ortigue likens Berlioz's efforts at operatic reform to Gluck's, notes how both

composers struggled against the invasion of the Italian style, and demonstrates that the "method" which *Benvenuto Cellini* employs is no more or less than the continuation and natural consequence of that of the earlier master. He concludes: "Today, again, we observe a bold composer who is not in the least bit afraid to protest against the very system that Gluck himself attacked head-on."

Second, the technical. Of the musical examples in the *Traité d'instrumentation et d'orchestration modernes* (1843), which comprise one of the most important aspects of the book, the number selected from the works of Gluck is precisely equal to the number selected from the works of Beethoven! Two come from *Orphée*, four from *Alceste*, one from *Iphigénie en Aulide*, eight from *Iphigénie en Tauride*, and two from *Armide*. Additional references to Gluck, without specific musical citations, are furthermore made in the body of the text of the treatise.

Finally, the fictional. In the musical city of Euphonia (in Berlioz's short story of that name),[9] the great musical celebration given in honor of Gluck (whose statue is to be inaugurated) is a performance of *Alceste*, at the end of which the singer Nadira, excluded from singing because of her habit of ornamenting in the Italian manner, finds that the work has revealed to her the true nature of art. She now sees in Gluck a veritable "god of expression." In this discussion of aesthetics, Berlioz imagines the scene as follows:

> Tearing the pearls and gems from her hair, [Nadira] throws them to the ground, tramples them underfoot (as a symbol of recantation), places her hand over her heart, bows her head to Gluck, and in a voice sublime in its accent and quality, begins Alceste's great aria, "Ah! Divinités implacables!"[10]

It is important to note that this scene, in which Nadira is converted to the ideal of Gluckian singing, seems to be based upon an actual incident – namely the concert of 3 February 1839, during the course of which Berlioz first heard the young Pauline Garcia (the future Pauline Viardot) as Euridice, with Gilbert Duprez as Orphée. Indeed, had it not been for the influence of Viardot, Berlioz's desire to hear Gluck in some sort of perfectly ideal form would probably never have come to fruition. For the same reason that prompted Shetland (in *Euphonia*) to refuse to allow Nadira to take the role of Alceste, however, Berlioz qualified Pauline Garcia as a "diva manquée," remarking that at the end of her recitative she made a brief excursion into the lower register of her voice, "whose deeper sonorities she had already allowed us to discover, but at the expense of remaining faithful to the musical text and at the expense of remaining true to the character she had taken upon herself to portray." As for

Duprez: "he would have been perfect had his voice not been extremely fatigued."[11]

Here we find Berlioz confronting the question of performing Gluck in three categories: vocal quality; fidelity to the musical text; truthfulness of dramatic expression.

If we consider the voice as a cultural artifact, we note that the emergence of Pauline Garcia's contralto register, appreciated by Berlioz as early as 1839 (as we see here), and the interest in the repertory of earlier vocal music, particularly Gluck's, that the singer displayed as from that period, would lead Berlioz to come to terms with original Italian version of *Orphée*. Indeed, such an interest in Orpheus' low voice is typical of the romantic era's inclination to favor the contralto register, which, in many nineteenth-century operas, is allotted to evil characters who stand at the dividing-line between the real and the supernatural. (The scenes in the underworld, in both *Orphée* and *Alceste*, are those which, at the time, most attracted both the designers and the critics.) Gilbert Duprez's tenor thus came to be heard as inappropriate to the French version of the opera, which Gluck had specifically prepared for the high tenor voice (*haute-contre*) of Joseph Legros.

Here we see the terms of the problem that Berlioz would solve twenty years later by adapting the role of Orphée to the contralto voice of a woman who would become for him something of a romantic entanglement as well as a close friend, Pauline Viardot. But it should be noted that even earlier, in 1855, Berlioz agreed to indicate to Rosine Stoltz (no romantic entanglement there) the transpositions that she would have to make in order to assume the title role in *Orphée* at the Opéra.

While in his public criticism Berlioz's opinions on the performance of Gluck are firm and clear, they appear to become rather more ambiguous as from 1859. Indeed, his letters to Pauline Viardot at the time reveal a contradictory attitude: reluctant to intervene, for *Orphée*, and refusing (at first) to intervene, for *Alceste*, Berlioz eventually recognized the necessity of doing so. It was then that he opted for the subtle solution of "reproducing" *Orphée*, first, by melding together the Italian version, originally written for the castrato Gaetano Guadagni, and the French version, originally written for the *haute-contre* Legros, and then by smoothing out the synthesis. "That of a maker of mosaics" is the way Berlioz qualified his task here, after having given up on the project he had first envisioned of entirely revising the order of the numbers of the original *Orphée*.[12] The only element that remained of that project, apart from the reordering of a few numbers, was the division of the work into four acts rather than three. It is moreover significant that Berlioz's "purism" further gave way to the

cadenza that Pauline Viardot, Camille Saint-Saëns, and Berlioz himself wrote for the concluding aria of Act I, "Amour, viens rendre à mon âme."[13] Like others at the time, Berlioz erroneously attributed this aria to Ferdinando Giuseppe Bertoni – an error that gave him a perfect alibi, as it were, for music written by someone other than Gluck could obviously be modified without reservation!

Still, the desire to return *Orphée* to its original purity led Berlioz piously and attentively to make a number of small adjustments in the vocal part of the title role. Cuts, by shortening the work, strengthened the synthesis of the two versions. To fit the tonalities of the Italian version, Berlioz had to transpose (usually down by fourth or fifth) the numbers from the French version that he had decided to retain. He further modified some of the recitatives and made a number of changes in the text. For the original final chorus, "L'amour triomphe," he substituted a chorus from *Echo et Narcisse*, "Le dieu de Paphos et de Gnide," which had been popular during the First Empire. Finally, he removed from the score several sections that seemed particularly dated, such as the *airs de ballet* and the *chaconne* – for Gluck, to Berlioz's way of thinking, was a musician of the present who deserved to be liberated from the bonds of a now superseded past. The scores and parts used for the 1859 revival furthermore reveal that, contrary to what he proclaimed, Berlioz made several changes to the orchestration, most notably in No. 3, Orphée's *romance* and recitative "Objet de mon amour": here, besides adding two clarinets to the ensemble, he placed a violin, oboe, and cello on the stage in order to effect a dialogue with the orchestra and thus reinforce the echo effect upon which the structure of the piece is based.

The reappearance at the Théâtre Lyrique of *Orphée*, literally *re*-produced by Berlioz, on 18 November 1859, was a cultural event of considerable consequence. Its success was largely due to the extraordinary dramatic authority of Pauline Viardot, who fascinated painters and sculptors as much if not more than she did musicians. Eugène Delacroix, for example, himself little attracted to Gluck, designed the costume for Viardot's Orpheus.

Berlioz's version of Gluck's *Orphée* was long and continues to be sung as the "original" version of the opera. But even Berlioz's version has undergone several transformations. In 1859, Léon Escudier published what he called the "only version entirely in conformity with the performance." This was a reduction for voice and piano made by Théodore Ritter, with a preface by Berlioz – now quite rare – that appeared only with the first printing of that score.[14] Here the composer offers a justification for his fusion of the French and Italian versions of the opera while otherwise wholly minimizing his contributions in comparison to those of the

director of the Théâtre Lyrique, Léon Carvalho, and of the leading lady, Pauline Viardot. Apart from the replacement of the work's finale, he indicates as his principal modification the restitution to Act I of a recitative from the Italian version that Gluck removed from the French: Orfeo's "Che disse?" For reasons unknown, this preface disappeared from the second printing of the score, which was made shortly after the first few performances. The "version Berlioz" thus became "unrecognized" or "unacknowledged" by its author. Nevertheless, building upon the success of the Paris performances, Viardot went on to sing *Orphée* in England and in Germany, and no one was unaware of the fact that Berlioz was the mastermind of this absolutely stunning revival.

In 1866 Berlioz was asked by the German publisher Gustav Heinze to revise the work that he had done for the Théâtre Lyrique by reinstating those numbers which had been suppressed. When Berlioz refused, Heinze gave the task to Alfred Dörffel, who did indeed take up Berlioz's revision and add the bits set aside in 1859. It is *this* version, published by Peters and still in wide circulation, that passes for the authentic source of the original French version. However, the rehabilitation in recent times of the original Italian version of 1762, along with performers' and conductors' total abandonment of the original French version of 1774, has had the salutary effect of once again drawing attention to the "true" Berlioz version of 1859, which in its own turn may be seen to have the status of an "original."[15]

The tremendous success of *Orphée* in 1859 led the directors of the Opéra to undertake *Alceste*, with Pauline Viardot in the title role. Even more than with *Orphée*, Berlioz was preoccupied with *Alceste* from the moment of that "poetic shock" he felt on first encountering the work through some twenty-five years of writings, which illustrate for us the various factors that led him to bring the opera to life. In this case, however, the transposition of the title role is not justified in the way that it is in *Orphée* because the tessituras of the Italian and French versions of *Alceste* are the same. Despite his public refusal to modify the work, Berlioz agreed privately, if reluctantly, to make a few changes, among them the insertion of the aria "Chi mi parla."

Perhaps one can best explain Berlioz's apparently ambiguous attitude as follows: although he disapproved, as a purist, of making transpositions that altered the tonal plan of the score, he nonetheless allowed himself to make small modifications, additions, and corrections (of the sort he had been calling for since 1834) in the effort to perfect a work that he already considered exemplary.

In addition to motivations of an "exterior" sort, as we might wish to

call them, Berlioz was also impelled to act for reasons of a private and even sentimental sort. In the case of *Orphée*, he no doubt wished to atone for the "sin" committed by Offenbach with his *Orphée aux enfers* of 1858. And in the case of *Alceste*, by altering the vocal text (most frequently by transposing it down a minor third), he may well have wished to rediscover, in Pauline Viardot's rendition, the force of one of those "original" voices he so much prized, in this instance, that of Caroline Branchu. It is also possible that, with *Alceste*, he wished to retaliate, on behalf of the Opéra, after the recent, scandalous failure there of *Tannhäuser* – some of whose set designs were reused for the underworld scene of *Alceste* – by setting Gluck in opposition to Wagner! Be this as it may, the success of the revival of *Alceste* at the Opéra, though considerable, was not as great as that occasioned by the revival of *Orphée* at the Théâtre Lyrique.

Five years later, in 1866, Berlioz was invited by Émile Perrin (director of the Opéra since 1862) to supervise another revival of *Alceste*, which opened on 12 October, with Marie Battu in the title role. This provided the composer with an opportunity to reestablish the original tessitura of the role and to restore the many cuts that had been made in the score in 1861. But contrary to what one might think, apart from a few of the 1861 transpositions, Berlioz continued to believe wholeheartedly in some of the earlier changes, including the arrangement of the aria "Divinités du Styx" in Act I and the arrangement of the aria "Qui me parla" in Act III. In addition, he suppressed Hercules' aria "C'est en vain que l'enfer" (from Act III), which he and others wrongly attributed to Gossec. Still, on completing his restoration, Berlioz had the satisfaction of feeling that his task had been well done. Even his old enemy François-Joseph Fétis sent his compliments, writing that Berlioz had "profoundly understood the thinking of *Alceste*'s great composer," to which Berlioz courteously replied that he was pleased to be able to defend their mutual gods.[16] Berlioz had manifested a similar zeal in this regard, two years earlier, when, in 1864, by fitting new words to the vocal line, he assisted his friend Humbert Ferrand to transform the *Marche religieuse* from *Alceste* into a strictly Catholic *Chant pour la communion*, which was published by Brandus in 1865.

Berlioz's work on behalf of Gluck is obviously not the first example, nor is it the last, of one composer "reinventing" another. Ought we in this case, however, take such reinvention as evidence that Berlioz, the quintessential romantic, wished now to adopt a more classical artistic posture? In his efforts to produce the works of Gluck in an ideal fashion, Berlioz was actually under the influence of the grand idea that was in fact the credo of Second Empire society – that *progress* was possible in the arts as it was in

all human endeavor. Such an idea resulted from two convictions: first, that modern copies, given their technical excellence, were superior to their ancient models; and second, that *all forms of expression* tended constantly to evolve towards perfection. So it is erroneous to think that Berlioz's attention to the past is an unmistakable signal of a retreat into conservatism. On the contrary, to his contemporaries, Berlioz's concern with "antiquity" was an aspect of a mentality in which the use of the past was but one element of a modern vocabulary designed to engender expression of a kind that was advanced and up to date.

From this point of view, Berlioz's innovative personality is no less present in *Les Troyens* than it is in the *Symphonie fantastique* and *Roméo et Juliette*. And the emotions painted by Gluck are no less contemporary than those painted by Virgil. Even if one sees in *Les Troyens* the apotheosis of Gluckian tragedy, then, one must not take that work as some kind of retraction of an earlier, more obviously romantic aesthetic. As early as 1839, comparing Gluck to Virgil, Berlioz wrote that "if it were not anachronistic to say so, one might suggest that Gluck attempted to depict the ever-suffering ghost of the Queen of Carthage, of that Dido whom Virgil has us discover *indignata sub umbras* and who, in the face of the Trojan warrior who was the cause of all her anguish, fled to the edges of the dark fields in order to hide her wound and her grief."[17] In this way Berlioz demonstrated his conviction that perceiving a work in purely aesthetic terms could give access to what time had rent obscure, and could place that work in a kind of eternal present. It remains to be seen whether, in his capacity as an "arranger" of Gluck, Berlioz believed he had attained the same perfection that he strived for in his own compositions, or whether, on the contrary, he was doubtful of having done so, and thus preferred, on closing his *Mémoires*, to say nothing more.

Berlioz's editorial efforts on behalf of Gluck would in any event ensure that modern musicologists would engage with the work of the earlier master. "In Europe," Berlioz wrote in *Les Grotesques de la musique* (1859),

> no one has dared to undertake a new, carefully prepared, annotated edition, properly translated into German and Italian, of Gluck's six grand operas. And no one has made a serious attempt to find subscribers for such an edition. No one has even contemplated risking twenty thousand francs [...] to fight against the ever more numerous tendencies that threaten to destroy such chefs-d'œuvre. Thus, despite the great resources that are available to art and to industry, these masterpieces, thanks to everyone's monstrous indifference to the well-being of the art of music, will perish.

These touching lines had the salutary effect of inspiring Fanny Pelletan, a wealthy and well-trained musician, to undertake a first complete edition

of Gluck's operas. Pelletan, aided by her teacher, Berlioz's friend Berthold Damcke, brought out the two *Iphigénies*, *Alceste*, and *Armide* between 1873 and 1876 (the year of her death). What was Gluck's salvation was Berlioz's salvation as well.

Translated by Peter Bloom