

French Music Criticism and Musicology at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: New Journals, New Networks

Michel Duchesneau
Université de Montréal
Email: michel.duchesneau@umontreal.ca

*This article examines the efforts of French musicologists to create a specialized journal at the turn of the twentieth century that would clearly associate music criticism and musicology. Using as case study a set of music journals, from *La Revue d'histoire et de critique musicales* to the *Mercure musical* and the *Revue S.I.M.* that followed, I establish the connections that brought together the nascent musicological milieu, the musical press and the artistic affinities among the principal actors in their attempt to create a new network of music critics guided by musicological exigencies. Jules Combarieu, Romain Rolland, Louis Laloy, Jean Marnold, Émile Vuillermoz and Jules Écorcheville are some of the musicologists engaged in this project between 1900 and 1914. But historical contingencies make this project a relative utopia, and requirements of the young musicology hardly meet that of a music criticism divided between disciplinary tradition and the necessity to support contemporary music. After the war, with the founding of a new *Revue musicale*, René Prunières, prudently, would not hire musicologists to develop a music criticism. Instead, he took up the characteristically Republican project of promoting musical culture, and thus responding to the interests of both the cultivated bourgeoisie and the musical, literary and artistic milieus through diffusion of music knowledge.*

Introduction

This article examines the efforts of French musicologists to create a specialized journal at the turn of the twentieth century that would clearly associate music criticism and musicology. These musicologists strove to develop music criticism that met intellectual standards suitable to history, aesthetics, musical analysis and sociology, the latter discipline making its progressive appearance, though hesitantly in music.¹ Using as case study a set of music journals, from *La Revue*

¹ I have studied in detail the founding of *La Revue musicale* by Combarieu, its musicological objectives and how the founders of the *Mercure musical* and *La Revue musicale S.I.M.* endorsed or shifted from the objectives of Combarieu, in my 'French Musicology and the Musical Press (1900–14): The Case of *La revue musicale*, *Le mercure musical* and *La revue musicale S.I.M.*', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 140/2 (2015): 243–72. However, I have not gone into detail, there, about the relationship between musicology and music critique nor indeed explored the issue of a network of reviewer-musicologists. In the present article, I focus on the second topic about those periodicals, music criticism, in connection with the objectives and methods of the then nascent French musicology and I intend to identify the network of musicologists involved. Cédric Segond-Genovesi has devoted a recent study to the sequential creation of several of the journals I am interested in, from

Table 1 Network of musicologist-critics, 1900–1914

<i>La Revue d'histoire et de critique musicales</i> (<i>La Revue musicale</i>) (1901–1904)	<i>Le Mercure musical</i> (1905–1906)	<i>Mercure musical et Bulletin S.I.M.</i> (1907–1909)	<i>La Revue musicale</i> S.I.M. (1910–1912)	<i>La Revue musicale</i> S.I.M. (1912–1914)
Jules Combarieu				
Louis Laloy	Laloy	Laloy	Laloy	Laloy
Romain Rolland	Rolland	Rolland		
Critic: Louis Schneider	Critic: Jean Marnold		Critics: Gaston Carraud (1910), Émile Vuillermoz	Vuillermoz
		Jules Écorcheville	Écorcheville	Écorcheville
		Lionel de La Laurencie	La Laurencie (2 articles)	
		Henry Prunières	Prunières (1 article)	

d'histoire et de critique musicales (hereafter *Revue musicale*), a journal founded in 1901 by Jules Combarieu, Romain Rolland and Louis Laloy, to the *Mercure musical* and the *Revue S.I.M.* that followed, I will establish the connections that brought together the nascent musicological milieu, the musical press and the artistic affinities among the principal actors in their attempt to create a new network of music critics guided by musicological exigencies. Table 1 lists the journals and the main protagonists to be discussed in this article.

From the final decades of the nineteenth century until 1914, music criticism occupied a considerable space in daily newspapers, journals on general culture and specialized music journals. Given the number of people writing reviews and reports on music, and the vast range of writing styles, music criticism constituted one of the principal written genres on music at that time. French music criticism in the nineteenth century was not necessarily penned by specialists and, as Emmanuel Reibel has affirmed for the central portion of that century, classifying music critics is far from a simple matter: the critics' profession (or their principal activity) did not necessarily account for their particular approach to criticism or the intermingling of literary, musical, journalistic and musicological involvement within the milieu.² And although it is possible to identify the political orientations of certain newspapers and journals, and perhaps even to thus account for a journal's endorsement of certain artistic trends, it is very difficult to establish any firm connections between the diverse orientations, standpoints and principles that

Laloy's *Mercure musical* to Henry Prunières' *Revue musicale*. Though well informed, this study omits Combarieu's *La Revue musicale* and falls short of analyzing music critique and Laloy's and Rolland's ideas. See Cédric Segond-Genovesi, 'Du *Mercure* à *La Revue musicale*: enjeux et étapes d'une filiation (1905–1927)', in Henry Prunières. *Un musicologue engagé dans la vie musicale de l'entre-deux-guerres*, ed. Myriam Chimènes, Florence Gétreau, and Catherine Massip (Paris: Société française de musicologie; Lyon: Symétrie, 2015): 357–87.

² Emmanuel Reibel, *L'écriture de la critique musicale au temps de Berlioz* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 2005): 91.

guided the activity of the critics. However it is possible to conceive links between the content of criticism and political direction for some newspapers and journals. For example, at *La Patrie*, a daily newspaper with strong nationalistic and anti-Semitic views, the music column was written by Achille de Lauzières, Marquis de Thémines, who felt that the evolution of musical style in opera would bring about the collapse of social order;³ as for *La Revue blanche*, it supported Dreyfus and the French intellectual avant-garde. Overall, as we shall see, the networks encouraged music critics to move from one newspaper or specialized journal to another quite apart from the political orientation of the journals or reviewers. The case is different when money issues are involved, for instance when journals are associated with a publisher. *Le Ménestrel*, which belongs to Heugel, must principally defend the works of Heugel's composers. Music criticism was far from uniform in terms of its methods and objectives. Critics had diverse interests, and – perhaps even more important – the press was governed by financial interests: the survival of a journal typically meant reaching the widest readership possible. Grand gestures, flamboyant style, and gossip thus became part and parcel of the language of music criticism, which all too often took on the air of sophisticated literary exercise.

In 1827, François-Joseph Fétis (1784–1871), recently appointed librarian of the Conservatoire de Paris, founded *La Revue musicale*. He gave the journal a musical orientation and an editorial structure that would serve as the model for the next generation of 'Revue musicale'. Considered the first specialized music journal of its kind, *La Revue musicale*'s objectives were to inform and educate readers via pedagogical articles, composer biographies, articles on music history and organology, news of contemporary musical life and reviews of books and scores.⁴ The journal had a very strong editorial bias, as the founder's presence could be detected in every corner. Music from the Renaissance, Baroque and Classical periods (Mozart in particular) was upheld as an ideal, against which Fétis criticized Berlioz's music as well as works by Wagner. Fétis's journal, however, survived only a few years: in 1835, it was bought out by *La Revue et Gazette musicale de Paris* (1834–1880), a journal founded by an editor of German origin Maurice Schlesinger (Moritz Schlesinger) who supported the German romantic movement.⁵ Even though Schlesinger invited Fétis to contribute to the *Revue et Gazette*, his 'intention was to produce a journal whose criticism departed from current modes and which would, specifically, provide an antidote to the professorial aridity of the *Revue musicale*'.⁶ Removing the 'aridity' from this kind of methodical music criticism was therefore a crucial move: it made reading the reviews a more pleasant experience for the journal's audience and, more importantly, it ensured that the works promoted in accordance with the journal's editorial stance were not too harshly criticized. In his book on Fétis, Rémy Campos

³ Christian Goubault, *La critique musicale dans la presse française de 1870 à 1914* (Geneva and Paris: Éditions Slatkine, 1984): 46.

⁴ Katharine Ellis, *Music Criticism in Nineteenth-Century France: La Revue et Gazette musicale de Paris, 1834–1880* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 34. See also Peter Bloom, 'François-Joseph Fétis and the *Revue Musicale* (1827–1835)' (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1972).

⁵ Schlesinger sold his musical stock and the *Revue et Gazette* to the brothers Louis and Gemmy Brandus in 1846, but he kept 25 per cent of the shares, and the journal kept its editorial orientation (Ellis, *Music Criticism in Nineteenth-Century France*, 48).

⁶ Ellis, *Music Criticism in Nineteenth-Century France*, 48.

provides an example of the pattern developed by Schlesinger, which strays at least in part from the intended simplification in critical approach. It has to do with the representation of Meyerbeer's opera *Le Prophète*, on a libretto by Scribe, a musical event of the 1849 season. The score and many adaptations were published by Barandus & Cie, owners of the *Revue et Gazette*. For more than a month, the journal published inserts to publicize the score. It also published the libretto as page-bottom banners and ordered a critical study of the work by Fétis. Campos mentions that Fétis was allowed twice the usual space for the purpose, allowing him to develop 'a more extensive commentary on the score', with numerous musical examples.⁷

By the mid-nineteenth century, the main French music journals were controlled by publishing houses: besides *Revue et Gazette*, there was also *Le Ménestrel* (1833–1940), brought out by the Heugel publishing house, *Le Guide musical* (1855–1914), founded first in Brussels by the publisher Schott and then moved to Paris in 1892, and *La France musicale* (1837–1870), established by the Escudier brothers, who also published and distributed the works of Verdi in France. There were a number of smaller journals that maintained their independence; however, these typically came and went with the musical seasons.⁸ Often devoted to a single musical genre or a particular instrument,⁹ these journals focusing on a specific subject targeted a very specialized, and therefore very small, readership. The music criticism in such journals thus had very limited influence on the general milieu.

Once *La France musicale* shut down operations in 1870, followed by *La Revue et Gazette* in 1880, *Le Ménestrel* and *Le Guide musical* were left as the only leading journals still in circulation until 1889, when Arthur Dandelot founded *Le Monde musical*.¹⁰ There were many small journals intended primarily for musical information in various cities throughout France, including *La Musique à Paris* (1894–1900), *L'Écho des concerts* (Marseilles, 1893–1896) and *La Chronique musicale trimestrielle du Sud-Est* (Nice, 1905–1914), but those journals contributed only modestly to the development of music criticism. From a purely quantitative perspective, then, music criticism was predominantly being published in daily newspapers and in numerous journals on general culture¹¹ like *La Revue des deux mondes*¹² and the *Mercure de France*.¹³

⁷ Rémy Campos, *François-Joseph Fétis musicographe* (Geneva: Droz/Haute École de Musique de Genève, 2013): 401–402.

⁸ For example, *Le Progrès musical: journal des familles* (1853–1854), *Le Journal des musiciens* (1855), *La Revue de musique ancienne et moderne* (1856), *La Presse orphéonique* (1870).

⁹ For example, journals on vocal music: *La Chanson* (1878–1880), *La Gazette lyrique* (1880–1881); on piano music: *L'Almanach du pianiste* (1854) and *Le Petit Piano* (1895–1902) or on military music: *L'Instrumental: journal de musique militaire* (1864–1866).

¹⁰ Arthur Dandelot (1864–1943) was the director of an artistic agency and, later, in the mid-1890s, of a concert administration agency in Paris that played an important role in the organization of many special events. Dandelot actively supported the École Normale de Musique in Paris.

¹¹ Christian Goubault has drawn up a very detailed list of these journals and of the music critics who wrote for them. See Goubault, *La critique musicale*, 50–65.

¹² The pianist Camille Bellaigue (1858–1930) became the music critic of *La Revue des deux mondes* in 1885.

¹³ The music critics at the *Mercure de France* included Jean Marnold, Henri Gauthier-Villars, Émile Vuillermoz, and Louis Laloy, as well as the composers Pierre de Bréville and Ernest Chausson.

It took another decade for all the required pieces of a new approach to music criticism to fall into place and for the musical press to gain some momentum. Many new journals were established at that time; among them, one particular series of journals deserves special attention: *La Tribune de Saint-Gervais*, *Bulletin mensuel de la Schola Cantorum* (1895–1929), *Le Courrier musical*¹⁴ (1897), *La Revue musicale* (1901–1912), *Musica* (1902–1914) and the *Mercure musical* (1905), which would become the *Revue musicale S.I.M.* This list, however, excludes certain journals on culture like *Comoedia* that, from 1907, closely followed contemporary literary, theatrical, and musical life. Many musicians and musicologists wrote for these journals. Nor does the list include the journals published outside of Paris, which in some cases played a significant role. Such is the case, for instance, of the *Revue musicale de Lyon* (1903–1912), which merged with the *Revue musicale du Midi* in 1912 in order to create the *Revue française de musique*.¹⁵ With the exception of *Musica*, a monthly illustrated journal destined for a non-specialized public, these journals were inspired in varying degrees by Fétis's project: they sought to instruct and inform the public via musicological articles and music columns that operated independently of any editorial stance that might be advocated by the journal's owner.

Within this dynamic universe of divergent objectives in which almost anyone could take up the pen, some people began to question the importance, pertinence and value of music criticism, and to ask under which conditions it should be exercised. The founding of new music journals around 1900 that encouraged intellectual production in history, aesthetics and sociology of music contributed to renew the debate on the nature of music criticism. Intellectuals, music critics and young musicologists sought to relocate music criticism at the centre of the scholarly activity about early and modern music. The founding of *La Revue musicale* in 1901, by Jules Combarieu, Romain Rolland and Louis Laloy, became the launching point for a concrete attempt at conceptualizing music criticism as an intellectual endeavour that required institutional independence and would draw on knowledge provided by a nascent humanities discipline, French musicology.

Between Music and Literature

When Frédéric Hellouin¹⁶ published his *Essai de critique de la critique musicale*, in 1906, he proposed a typology of music critics. He categorized critics according to their relationship with music, either as composers, musicians or authors ('littérateurs').¹⁷ He selected key figures who were well known for their music criticism at the time to construct his typology (see Table 2).

¹⁴ *Le Courrier musical* amalgamated with the *Revue musicale S.I.M.* in 1909.

¹⁵ The editors at *La Revue musicale du Midi* outlined their objectives as follows: 'Develop the taste for beautiful and authentic music, teach the music history of the Midi as well as that of our local musicians, encourage decentralization in our departments, and contribute to the education of the public insofar as we can'. [The editors], 'Prélude', *La Revue musicale du Midi* 1/1 (1 March 1911): 2.

¹⁶ Frédéric Hellouin (1864–1924) published on eighteenth-century French music. He gave a series of talks at the École de hautes études sociales, some of which were then published in his *Essai de critique de la critique musicale* (Paris: A. Joanin, 1906).

¹⁷ Hellouin, *Essai de critique de la critique musicale*, 143.

Table 2 Frédéric Hellouin's classification of music critics in 1906.

Composers		Musicians		<i>Littérateurs</i>	
<i>Littérateurs</i>	Non- <i>littérateurs</i>	<i>Littérateurs</i>	Non- <i>littérateurs</i>	Non musicians	Intuitive musicians
Alfred Bruneau	Claude Debussy	Camille Bellaigue	Arthur Pougin	Jules Combarieu	Louis de Fourcaud
Camille Saint-Saëns	Gabriel Fauré	Louis Laloy	Albert Soubies	Catulle Mendès	Henry Gauthier-Villars
	Victorin Joncières ¹⁸	Charles Malherbe			Pierre Lalo
	Samuel Rousseau ¹⁹				Jean d'Udine

Although, its excessive positivism was undoubtedly restrictive,²⁰ this typology nevertheless revealed certain perceptions of the milieu of music criticism at the turn of the century; specifically, it articulated the relationship between the critics' qualifications either as musicians or as '*littérateurs*', a term that Hellouin used to mean a person 'who attaches a particular importance to the form of his discourse which bears more on container than on contents'.²¹ And yet three musicologists, according to Hellouin's typology, are classified either as 'musician-*littérateurs*' (Louis Laloy²² and Charles Malherbe²³) or simply as '*littérateur*'

¹⁸ Victorin Joncière (1839–1903) wrote regularly in *La Liberté* from 1870 to 1900 under the assumed name of Jennius. His critical writings occasionally stirred astonishment and even sometimes disapproval from contemporaries, in particular when he compared Berlioz to an 'untrained cook' ('cuisinier inexpérimenté') (*La Liberté*, 10 mars 1873).

¹⁹ Samuel-Alexandre Rousseau (1853–1904) studied the organ with César Franck at the Conservatoire de Paris. He attended the composition class of Paul Bazin and won a Premier Prix de Rome in 1878. He is known for his lyrical works, for instance his opera *La Cloche du Rhin* (1898). He wrote the musical chronicle section of *L'Éclair* from 1893 to his death.

²⁰ Reibel compares Hellouin's work to the taxonomic trees of animal and plant species that were developed in the natural sciences at the end of the nineteenth century, and he criticizes Hellouin's arbitrary choice of using each person's literary approach as an evaluation criterion (Reibel, *L'écriture de la critique musicale*, 92).

²¹ Hellouin, *Essai de critique de la critique musicale*, 142.

²² A former student of the École Normale Supérieure, Louis Laloy (1874–1944) held an Agrégation in the arts and wrote a doctoral dissertation on *Aristoxène de Tarente et la musique de l'Antiquité* in 1904. He studied music at the Schola Cantorum from 1899 to 1905. Very active in the music journalism circles and an ardent defender of Debussy and the new generation of composers around Ravel, he published numerous articles and books on quite diverse subjects: Rameau, Beethoven, opera, Debussy and Chinese music.

²³ Charles Malherbe (1853–1911) studied with Jules Massenet and Adolphe Danhauser. As the archivist (1896) and then the librarian (1899) at the Paris Opéra, he published books, on Wagner and on the history of opéra-comique, as well as compositions (opéras-comiques, chamber music and orchestral music). His activities in musical journalism included writing

(Jules Combarieu²⁴). By focusing on the form of the discourse, an historical or aesthetic approach to music is thus likened to a literary exercise that loads down the music criticism. Despite weaknesses, itemizing music critics by 'classes' gives us a sense of those critics' reputation (relative to one another), and it reveals that French readers had a rather paradoxical relationship to writing during that period. Music criticism should be rigorous and impartial, but not excessively serious. Consider, for example, what Hellouin wrote about Laloy:

In criticism, two characteristics distinguish the academic. First of all, due to the numerous exercises he completed while in school, he uses an abundance of phrases, an abundance that can be laborious for some [writers], and easy for others. Finally, an irresistible impulse that comes straight from his profession pushes him to regard the task he must accomplish much too seriously.²⁵

Hellouin's remark confirms how, from the mid-nineteenth century onward, much of the debate about the role and methods of music criticism centred on the nature of the discourse. The question of whether criticism should be 'serious' would have encouraged Saint-Saëns to return to music criticism in 1879 for the journal *Le Voltaire* after a three-year interruption.²⁶

It is not without some hesitation that I decided to take up the critic's pen once again. If I join the fight, it is because it seems to me – forgive me if it is a delusion – that I must. This is what one of the most clever, honest, and intelligent critics that I know wrote yesterday:

'To speak frankly, music criticism, in the philosophical sense of the word, does not and cannot exist in France. The French public will not tolerate the long tracts on art that are relished by our English and German neighbours; for them [French], music is an ornamental art, fine for passing the time, for awaking sensibility, for providing pleasant subjects for conversation, but positively unworthy of the attention of serious people; it does not seem possible for this art to have this [kind of] logic, rhetoric, and aesthetic, and the critic who ventures into this territory will certainly have fewer than ten readers behind him'.

for *Le Ménestrel* (he also worked as the editor for the journal for some time), but also for a host of other journals, including *Le Guide musical*, *La Revue musicale* and *Le Mercure musical*, to cite only a few.

²⁴ After having defended a dissertation at the Sorbonne on *Les rapports de la musique et de la poésie considérées au point de vue de l'expression* (1893), Jules Combarieu (1859–1916) took courses from Spitta in Berlin (1888). Upon his return to France, he taught French at two lycées, Condorcet and Louis-le-Grand, and then became Chief of Staff in the Ministère de l'Instruction publique. In his efforts to support musical education, he produced a number of circulars on the promotion of music in schools and published textbooks on musical education. In 1904, he was appointed lecturer in music history at the Collège de France. He authored books on music history, aesthetics (*La musique, ses lois, son évolution* (Paris: Flammarion, 1907)), and on the relationship between music and society (*La Musique et la magie. Étude sur les origines populaires de l'art musical et son influence et sa fonction dans les sociétés* (Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils éditeurs, 1909)).

²⁵ Hellouin, *Essai de critique de la critique musicale*, 160.

²⁶ Saint-Saëns wrote the musical chronique in *La Renaissance littéraire et artistique* from 1872 to 1874, and in *L'Estafette* for one year in 1876. Marie-Gabrielle Soret, 'Présentation des textes et du contexte' in Camille Saint-Saëns, *Écrits sur la musique et les musiciens*, presented and annotated by Marie-Gabrielle Soret (Paris: Vrin, 2012): 43–5.

Well, I feel that my kind colleague and friend is wrong; I believe that there are more than ten people in France capable of reading criticism that has the courage to venture onto the territory in question.²⁷

In fact, Saint-Saëns seized the opportunity of resuming writing for a journal in which reputed authors and political figures from the Republican milieus publish,²⁸ a circumstance that he considers favourable from his image and the diffusion of his ideas. The reputation of *Le Voltaire* doubtlessly influenced the involvement of Saint-Saëns, who wished to vindicate what he took to be informed and independent criticism.²⁹ For his remark on the capacity of 'serious' musical criticism to attract a large readership, Saint-Saëns relied on the high number of readers of which *Le Voltaire* could boast. Marie-Gabrielle Soret underlines how aware Saint-Saëns was of the need to convey ideas about music to the largest possible audience.³⁰ Over next two decades, Saint-Saëns wrote many critical essays, mostly for the daily press. This presence in journalism added to his reputation as a musician, but also as an aggressive musical thinker with clear-set ideas. Elected to the Académie des beaux-arts in 1881, he became an eminent representative of the French cultural milieu of the time. Also tagged as a 'littérateur' by the journalist Albert Dyrolles in *Le Figaro*,³¹ Saint-Saëns as a writer did not shy away from the issue of the nature of the discourse. Writing about Gluck, Mozart and Meyerbeer as often as about contemporaries such as Gounod and Massenet (his rival) or Wagner, and interested in issues of composition and instrumentation as well as in those of interpretation, Saint-Saëns was an example of a broadly embracing approach to musical knowledge; but his stance, sometimes radical and outmoded, contrasted with the intellectual rigour and independence embraced as ideal by the new generation of writers led by figures like Romain Rolland³² and Louis Laloy. However, because of his position in the Academy, because he had become famous as a musician across Europe and had

²⁷ Camille Saint-Saëns, 'Musique', *Le Voltaire*, 18 July 1879; reprinted in Camille Saint-Saëns, *Écrits sur la musique et les musiciens*, 199. The editor of Saint-Saëns's writings has not been able to identify the author cited by Saint-Saëns (see p. 199, fn 2).

²⁸ Soret, 'Présentation des textes', 43–4.

²⁹ René de Récy published criticism in *La Revue des deux mondes*. He was appreciated by Saint-Saëns, who wrote of him: 'it is the most independent spirit that exists ... to a serious literary talent he joined the rare quality of deep knowing of music, and outstanding analytical skills peculiar to itself'. Camille Saint-Saëns, 'Drame lyrique et drame musical', *L'Artiste*, November 1889, reprinted in Camille Saint-Saëns, *Écrits sur la musique et les musiciens*, 417.

³⁰ Soret, 'Présentation des textes', 40–41.

³¹ Albert Dayrolles, 'Saint-Saëns littérateur. Saint-Saëns chez lui', *Le Figaro*, 4 March 1883.

³² On Saint-Saëns, Rolland's position is ambiguous. Rolland judged the music of Saint-Saëns harshly. For him, the composer was a 'great musician but a mediocre artist'. Letter from Romain Rolland to Sofia Bertolini Guerriri-Gonzaga, 27 October 1901, in Romain Rolland, *Cher Sofia*, Cahiers Romain Rolland (Paris: Albin Michel, 1959): 36. But Rolland acknowledged his skills when it came to music history. In his memoirs, Rolland remembers the jury of the thesis of Jules Écorcheville which included Saint-Saëns. He wrote that the composer showed a 'particular scholarship, lively and comical'. Romain Rolland, *Mémoires et fragments du Journal* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1956): 165. But as time passed, Rolland found Saint-Saëns musical works and writings less interesting and somewhat outdated. See Alain Corbellari, *Les mots sous les notes. Musicologie littéraire et poétique musicale dans l'œuvre de Romain Rolland* (Geneva: Droz, 2010): 193–5.

written abundantly on music, it came as no surprise that Saint-Saëns was appointed Honorary President of the Congrès d'histoire de la musique, which took place in 1900 and brought together historians, composers and music critics.

The commitment to 'serious' art criticism was not the sole prerogative of music in the last decades of the nineteenth century. One can give the example of *La Revue d'art dramatique*, founded in 1886 by Edmond Stoullig, who sought to adopt a more critical approach to the arts. The journal announced the creation of various sections, one for each art (music, theatre, dance, literature, etc.) to be entrusted to specialists. The music column was written by Albert Soubies (1886–1914), in collaboration with the composer and musicologist Charles Malherbe, from 1886 to 1893, and with Robert Brussel³³ from 1897 to 1914.³⁴ In addition, the editorial board engaged in so-called 'impartial' criticism, while in the same breath recognizing the great difficulty of such an undertaking. In the November 1896 issue, following the journal's redesign, the editorial board announced to its readers:

And finally, we will be impartial. Let us be clear, however, about the meaning of this word. We know that impartiality is relative. Absolute impartiality degenerates into the impersonal. We are not promising that to our readers: they will assume that we are just keeping our word and quickly become weary of our neutrality. We would like to publish criticism that goes beyond simply providing information. We cannot promise anything except being understanding and sincere, that is, to accept and to express our impressions that are the most intimate and spontaneous.³⁵

Although the editors' declaration of faith once again brought up the issue of how the critics' authority was often undermined by suspicions of incompetence and bias,³⁶ it nevertheless encouraged the very sceptical Romain Rolland to contribute to the journal, even though he found criticism mediocre, even dangerous, for art:

No criticism. Criticism is dangerous, both for art and for the public. It has no meaning except under the condition that it is put back in its place as humble servant to art; it should open up the path to new kinds of thinking. – And it cannot. To be capable to fight this battle, criticism needs to have the new ideal clearly in sight, and to have faith in this ideal. And this feat can come only from a creative artist who has already internalized the ideal. Truth be told, the only criticism worthy of being read has been, by far, that written by geniuses judging other geniuses, like Wagner, Schiller or Goethe.³⁷

Rolland thus condemns a practice of criticism that does not come from creators. Only they can pretend to judge works from the perspective of their own genius

³³ Robert Brussel (1874–1940) worked as music critic for *Le Figaro* from 1900 to 1935. He was an active contributor to *Musica*, and lent his support to Gabriel Astruc's project of opening the Théâtre des Champs Élysées.

³⁴ Goubault, *La critique musicale*, 60.

³⁵ The editors, 'Au lecteur', *La Revue d'art dramatique*, November 1896, 2–3.

³⁶ Reibel, *L'écriture de la critique musical*, 40.

³⁷ Romain Rolland, 'Réponse à l'enquête sur la critique d'art dramatique française', *La Revue d'art dramatique*, February 1899, 161–2.

and with the independence that goes along with it. Rolland does not hereby define the ideal that must rule over critical practice. Later on, however he evokes originality, and we thus learn that he rejects fashion and conservatism in work as well as criticism:

But if an original work appears, is it not obvious that it will be a threat to this pseudo-elite, the epitome of society's trends and mediocrity, eternally conservative of the past that created it and guarantees its income?³⁸

Rolland certainly alluded to works of the younger generation of musicians, around Ravel, whose career he followed, while bitterly criticizing the conservatism of the public, who hesitated before of these new works as well as those of the past which were being progressively rediscovered. Through the words of Rolland, the set of events and situations that were modifying the French musical stage were surfacing. In addition to the rise of a new generation of artists (Ravel, Schmitt, Roussel, Koechlin) and musicologists (Laloy, La Laurencie, Prunières), there was an important rediscovery of early music of the medieval period and Renaissance, a renewed interest in the composers of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, such as Couperin and Rameau, and a new generation of music critics (Vuillermoz, Landormy) who were defending the music of their time. The expansion of the press contributed to these developments, particularly with new specialized music journals being launched, which provided a platform for a new elite that built on 'all the resources of its culture, its sensibility and its conscience'.³⁹

Professional Mobility

Without delving too deeply into the structural details of the networks of music critics in late nineteenth-century French musical journalism, I will discuss two different career tracks, to illustrate the mechanisms at work in attempts to create a critical network in *La Revue musicale*, the *Mercure musical* and *La Revue S.I.M* – mechanisms that must be understood in the context of musicology and its dissemination through the press. Music critics were typically recruited on the basis of their reputation as writers; literary writers were often given precedence because of the quality of their writing and their connections within the milieu. For example, Judith Gautier (1850–1917), a member of the Académie Goncourt and an ardent defender of Wagner, was recruited by Pierre Lafitte⁴⁰ for his new journal, *L'Excelsior*. The *Mercure de France* entrusted the music column to the young poet Charles-Henri Hirsch (1870–1948) in 1894; in 1904, the column was then delegated to Jean Marnold,⁴¹ who had been primarily educated in literature. However, besides Romain Rolland, who was both a man of letters and a music historian, very few literary specialists wrote in musicological journals as regular contributors. René Chalupt

³⁸ Rolland, 'Réponse à l'enquête sur la critique d'art dramatique française', 162.

³⁹ Goubault, *La critique musicale*, 485.

⁴⁰ Pierre Lafitte was the founder of *Musica*.

⁴¹ Jean Marnold (1859–1935) was the anagram of Jean Morland. A man of letters, he translated Nietzsche's *Die Geburt der Tragödie* (*L'Origine de la tragédie*) with his brother in 1906. He worked as a music critic, first at the *Courrier musical* (1901–1903) and then at the *Mercure de France* (1902–1914).

and André Suarès wrote only sporadically in the *Revue musicale S.I.M.*⁴² Musical training thus became considered a distinct advantage when hiring a music critic, especially for those journals and newspapers popular with upper-middle-class intellectuals. Camille Bellaigue (1858–1930) was recruited in 1883 by Ferdinand Brunetière, the director of *La Revue des deux mondes*, following the publication of the young pianist's 'Étude artistique et littéraire sur Faust' in *Le Correspondant*.⁴³ Pierre Lalo⁴⁴ was similarly hired by Adrien Hébrard, the director of the daily newspaper *Le Temps*, after the publication of his analysis of *Fervaal* in *La Revue de Paris* in 1898.⁴⁵

Hiring a music critic often involved a string of connections, including musical qualification (or not), artistic affinities and personal contacts. *Le Figaro* hired Alfred Bruneau in 1895 to write primarily on theatre matters (he kept this position until 1903);⁴⁶ he replaced Charles Darcours,⁴⁷ who worked as a music critic from 1890 until his death. The appointment of Bruneau is probably not unrelated to Zola's intervention. The writer, with whom the composer collaborated for several years, wrote regularly in *Le Figaro*.⁴⁸ Composer Louis Vuillemin (actually Louis Francis, 1873–1929) was hired to write for *Musica* in 1911 by Xavier Leroux, his teacher and the editor of the journal from 1910 on; Vuillemin was also working as a critic for *Comoedia*. And Louis de Bousès de Fourcaud (1853–1914), a committed Wagnerian, was hired in 1881 by *Le Gaulois* to replace Catulle Mendès, the 'principal creator of the Wagnerian cult in France'.⁴⁹ Fourcaud thus shifted from writing on politics to writing on music, with a brief stopover as the columnist for painting and art history, all within the same journal.

Although most music critics moved between newspapers, journals on culture and musical journals, some had more stable careers. The daily paper *La Liberté* had a preference for composers: Victorin Joncières wrote the music column from 1871 to 1900, and Gaston Carraud (1864–1920), a student of Jules Massenet and winner of the Prix de Rome in 1890, later took over the column and remained at the

⁴² René Chalupt wrote a review of Albert Roussel's *Marchand de sable*, which used a text written by Georges-Jean Aubry (*Revue musicale S.I.M.* 7/3 (March 1911): 97). André Suarès published an article entitled 'L'homme qui improvise' in *Revue musicale S.I.M.* 8/11 (November 1912): 1–12.

⁴³ Camille Bellaigue, 'Étude artistique et littéraire sur Faust', *Le Correspondant*, 25 November 1883, 834–66. Bellaigue (1858–1930) was a pianist (he won the first prize in 1878 at the Conservatoire, where he studied with Marmontel) and a music critic for *La Revue des deux mondes* from 1885 until his death. His musical training provided him with considerable authority and confidence in evaluating the music of his contemporaries.

⁴⁴ A student of the École des chartes et de Polytechnique, Pierre Lalo (1866–1943), the son of the composer Édouard Lalo, led a brilliant career as a music critic, mainly at the newspaper *Le Temps*, where he was responsible for the feuilleton on music from 1898 to 1920. He published more than 500 columns. In the 1920s, he was appointed to the Conseil supérieur du Conservatoire and the Conseil supérieur des émissions de la radio. Regarding Lalo, see Gustave Samazeuilh's foreword to Pierre Lalo's collection, *De Rameau à Ravel. Portraits et souvenirs* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1947): 7–12.

⁴⁵ Goubault, *La critique musicale*, 31.

⁴⁶ Bruneau later worked as a critic for *La Grande Revue* (1903–1907) and for *Le Matin* (1909–1933).

⁴⁷ His real name was Charles Réty (1824–1895), and he was the former director of the Théâtre Lyrique (1860–1862).

⁴⁸ Supported by Director Fernand Rodays who upheld the cause of the Dreyfusards, Zola published his famous article 'J'accuse' in that newspaper in 1898.

⁴⁹ Goubault, *La critique musicale*, 36.

journal for over 20 years. Up to that time, there were very few musicologists in the music criticism milieu, with the notable exception of Jean Chantavoine,⁵⁰ who replaced Paul Dukas at the *Revue hebdomadaire* in 1903 and Judith Gautier at *L'Excelsior* in 1911. Even though Romain Rolland published several concert reviews between 1899 and 1905, mainly in *La Revue de Paris*, his was a modest contribution to the field of general music criticism in France at the turn of the twentieth century.⁵¹

A New Kind of Journal for a New Kind of Critic

An important event for the development of musicology took place during the Paris World's Fair in 1900: the Congrès international d'histoire de la musique (International Conference on Music History). The conference committee initially included Camille Saint-Saëns (Honorary President), Louis-Albert Bourgault Ducoudray (President), Julien Tiersot⁵² (Vice-President) and Romain Rolland (Secretary-General). Tiersot was one of the mainstays of the project. Finding the committee much too small for an international event of such importance, he advised Rolland in October 1899 that the committee should be expanded, and suggested immediately involving the music critic Camille Bellaigue:

he would complement our committee well, as he embodies an important element that is missing, [that is,] high music criticism – alongside a distinguished musician like Saint-Saëns, two composer-historians, both at the Conservatoire, Bourgault and myself, and you, representing the academic music movement.⁵³

The committee ultimately became quite large, as the original members and Bellaigue were soon joined by the musicologists Pierre Aubry,⁵⁴ Jules Combarieu, Charles Malherbe, Henry Expert⁵⁵ and Frédéric Hellouin, as well as the composers

⁵⁰ Jean Chantavoine (1877–1952) studied music history with Max Friedlaender. He published on Beethoven, Liszt, and Mozart, among other topics. He worked as a critic for the *Revue hebdomadaire* (1903–1920) and *L'Excelsior* (1911–1921), and contributed occasionally to the *Mercure musical*.

⁵¹ See, for example, his article on Vincent d'Indy, written to mark the première of *L'Étranger* at the Théâtre de la Monnaie in Brussels on 7 January 1903 (*Revue de Paris* 10/2 (15 January 1903): 401–20).

⁵² Julien Tiersot (1857–1936) studied composition at the Conservatoire with Massenet, the organ with Franck, and history with Bourgault-Ducoudray. He worked as Assistant Librarian of the Conservatoire in 1883, and then became main Librarian in 1909. In addition to his regular columns in *Le Ménestrel*, he also published a number of studies on popular song and participated in activities at the Schola Cantorum devoted to the resurrection of French Renaissance music.

⁵³ Letter from Julien Tiersot to Romain Rolland, 10 October 1899, Romain Rolland Collection, Dossier 'Correspondance à des musiciens', Manuscript's department, Bibliothèque nationale de France (henceforth BnF).

⁵⁴ Musicologist and philologist, Pierre Aubry (1874–1910) held the position of Archivist-Palaeographer at the École des chartes from 1898. He contributed largely to the development of research on French medieval music, particularly on the music of troubadours and trouvères.

⁵⁵ Henry Expert (1863–1952) completed his studies at the École Niedermeyer where he took courses with Franck. Later, he taught at the École des hautes études sociales and became a Librarian at the Conservatoire, replacing Tiersot in 1920. His work focused mainly on French music of the Renaissance.

Charles Bordes, Maurice Emmanuel⁵⁶ and Vincent d'Indy.⁵⁷ Two remarks are in order. The first one relates to Aubry, whose course at the Institut Catholique de Paris in 1898–1899, 'La Musicologie médiévale: histoire et methodes', was an essential preliminary step toward the Congress, as he was the first to use the word 'musicologie' and to define its principles.⁵⁸ The second relates to the strong representation of the Schola Cantorum (Bordes, Emmanuel and d'Indy), an institution in whose methodological orientation the musicological approach had a significant place. It will come as no surprise that in 1908 the school review, *La Tribune de Saint-Gervais*, adopted the subtitle 'Revue musicologique de la Schola'.⁵⁹

The conference committee brought together the future founders of the new *Revue musicale*, a journal that was initially the brainchild of another conference attendee, Paul Landormy. In a conference paper, the young musicologist put forth the idea of creating a 'league for the protection and development of music', accompanied by a bulletin or a journal intended 'to create connections between musicians, to spread new ideas, [and] to develop musical taste'.⁶⁰ Although the league never came to fruition, the journal was soon launched by Jules Combarieu. In a memo circulated in December 1900 to potential subscribers, Combarieu highlighted the journal's twofold objective, clearly encapsulated in the title, *La Revue d'histoire et de critique musicales* (*A Journal of Music History and Criticism*). The journal was to publish articles on 'early French musical works, [according to] the methods employed in history's auxiliary sciences [and to create] a substantial space ... for the analysis of contemporary works'.⁶¹ In the memo, Combarieu named those who had agreed to participate in the project: Aubry, Emmanuel, d'Indy and Rolland. Laloy, who worked as editor-in-chief at the journal from 1901 to 1905, mentioned in his memoirs that Rolland nevertheless felt that the project was premature; Rolland had imagined a journal that was, above all, wholly scholarly, which would certainly have excluded the branch of music criticism that diminished the journal's prestige and placed it at the same level as other musical journals in circulation at the turn of the century, like *Le Ménestrel* and *Le Monde*

⁵⁶ Maurice Emmanuel (1862–1938), composer and musicologist, specialized in ancient Greek music and modal music. He was also interested in the history of musical language and, in 1911, published a book entitled *Histoire de la langue musicale*, 2 volumes (Paris: Librairie Renouard H. Laurens).

⁵⁷ 'Comité du Congrès international de musique', *Congrès international d'histoire de la musique tenu à Paris à la Bibliothèque de l'Opéra du 23 au 29 juillet 1900 (VIIIe section du Congrès d'histoire comparée) Documents, mémoires et vœux*, published by Jules Combarieu (Solesmes: Imprimerie Saint-Pierre, 1901), [iii]. It is worth underlining that the proceedings of the congress were published by the monks of Solesmes, who were in charge of the series *Paléographie musicale*, the first volume of which had appeared in 1889. John Haines points out that this is a work 'that marks the beginning of modern French science of early music' ('qui marque le début d'une science française moderne de la musique ancienne'). John Haines, 'Généalogies musicologiques aux origines d'une science de la musique vers 1900', *Acta Musicologica* 73/1 (2001): 24–5.

⁵⁸ Haines, 'Généalogies musicologiques', 21.

⁵⁹ The subtitle appears for the first time on the front of volume 14, issue 1 (January 1908).

⁶⁰ Paul Landormy, 'Des moyens d'organiser, en France, une ligue pour la protection et le développement de l'art musical', *Congrès international d'histoire de la musique*, 249.

⁶¹ Jules Combarieu, Memorandum, 1 December 1900, Romain Rolland Collection, Manuscript's Department, BnF.

musical.⁶² *La Revue musicale's* chief founder, however, wanted the journal to have a direct influence on musical circles, both in matters of historical knowledge and with regard to criticism. He outlined his editorial programme in the first issue, published in January 1901:

Concerning questions of music history, first invoke 'sources'; closely examine original documents, compare them, and make them speak as much as possible; step aside from the monuments that we wish to promote and, rather than using rhetoric under the pretence of making them more beautiful, endeavour instead to describe them and surround them with illuminating facts; observe patiently before judging, ensuring that we see things as they are, and not as it pleases us or as it would benefit us to see them; consider the analysis of early compositions as a source of fine intellectual pleasure, and study everything, the beautiful and the less beautiful, without bias, following the example of the historian who, rather than making himself an object of his work, is obliged to focus at times on heroes, and at other times on monsters or vulgar men; bring this passionate curiosity to the study of the musical past, this love of details, this meticulousness and authenticity that defines the true lover of art (consequently, restore the respect for consecrated masterpieces in the eyes of certain theatre directors and publishers who, in the lowly spirit of commercial exploitation, regularly denature, falsify, and betray the intentions of the great masters); finally, with regard to contemporary art, promote all that which seeks to reinvent not only our aesthetic, but also the outdated musical system that we use;⁶³ be the best friend possible to everything that is new, bold, sincere, human, and French: for us, these should be the rules of music criticism.⁶⁴

According to Reibel, 'in the nineteenth century, the goal of criticism was not to be intelligible, but to prolong and convey the impression [of intelligibility]'.⁶⁵

⁶² Establishing a balance between musicological studies and critical reviews quickly became a point of contention between Rolland and Combarieu. Rolland felt, as did Laloy, that the journal contents and more specifically the criticism could not withstand the slightest musicological error. A letter of Combarieu to Rolland indicates that Rolland had sent him a note wherein he reproached him with errors in the critical notice of the February 1901 issue (pp. 71–75) on Xavier Leroux' opera *Astarté* (Letter from Jules Combarieu to Romain Rolland, 15 March 1901, Romain Rolland Collection, Manuscript's Department, BnF). Even so, Laloy noted that Combarieu made regular blunders: 'Son intempérance de langage lui faisait des ennemis, prêts à relever aigrement les bévues qu'il lui arrivait de commettre'. Louis Laloy, *La musique retrouvée 1902–1927* (Paris, Librairie Plon, 1928): 53.

⁶³ Combarieu certainly refers to tonal language, the boundaries of which were constantly being pushed by the syntactic innovations of the younger generation of composers. At the turn of the century and up to 1914 these innovations gave rise to struggles between avant-garde and conservative musicians. One of the most famous of these struggles was between Ravel and his friends – who created the Société musicale indépendante – on the one hand, and d'Indy and his pupils – who supported a more conservative approach within the Société Nationale de musique – on the other hand. See Michel Duchesneau, *L'avant-garde musicale et ses sociétés à Paris 1870–1939* (Sprimont: Mardaga, 1997). In fact, the journal connected to the milieu of the Schola never really defended the music of the newer generations. This is certainly one of the reasons why Marnold, Laloy and Rolland conceived of the *Mercure musical*, which would be considered a more engaged review. See Marie-Pier Leduc, 'Artisans, génies et vedettes. Le statut des compositeurs dans la presse musicale française au début du XXe siècle' (Master's Thesis, Université de Montréal, 2015), especially chapter 1.

⁶⁴ The editor, 'Notre programme', *La Revue musicale* 1/1 (January 1901): 3.

⁶⁵ See Reibel, *L'écriture de la critique musicale*, 268–72.

This objective, which ruled over music criticism in the newspapers and in widely distributed music journals like *Musica*, was not immediately overturned with the creation of *La Revue musicale*. Critics still characterized music by and large by describing the nature of its effects, rather than trying to understand its internal mechanisms.⁶⁶ However, in the new journal, Combarieu and the other musicologists brought to light a new possibility – that of an informed and well-sourced music criticism. Music criticism was thus reconceived as an outcome of knowledge, dedicated to the analysis and interpretation of musical works, its free expression being guaranteed by the journal's independence. The project was not necessarily new, but the circumstances were certainly favourable to its success: the journal was run independently and therefore was free of the vested interests of institutions and music businesses, and, with the support of a select group of readers, it was also technically free from financial constraints.⁶⁷ Nonetheless, such independence and freedom were relative: Combarieu's *La Revue musicale*, and those journals that followed (*Le Mercure musical* and *La Revue S.I.M.*), soon had to contend with the financial necessity of subscription revenues. Consequently, they had to ensure that the contents could draw the widest readership possible, all the while maintaining the journal's initial 'scholarly' orientation. Despite the material impossibility of avoiding these financial restrictions, *La Revue musicale* (as would *Le Mercure musical* and subsequent journals) still managed to reset music criticism and provide it with new historical and theoretical bases in order to achieve its pedagogical objectives. Music criticism in *La Revue musicale* thus focused on early music and would interpret the works according to historical knowledge about the era in question. In his first column, Combarieu explored the principles that guided Paul Taffanel's decision to systematically introduce a very short instrumental prelude to provide the singers with the right key for all *a cappella* pieces, whether they were composed by Janequin, Bach or Schumann, when he conducted concerts for the Société des concerts du Conservatoire. The critic determined that Taffanel's approach did not conform to historical performance practice. Recalling Théodore Dubois's remarks: 'I can tolerate criticism, but I wish that it would justify itself and base itself on proof',⁶⁸ Combarieu also based his criticism on the understanding of musical practices and works. In this spirit, *La Revue musicale* offered its readers critical studies of recently performed early and modern musical works, accompanied with musical examples⁶⁹ that could be found in the main

⁶⁶ Reibel, *L'écriture de la critique musical*, 272.

⁶⁷ Although we have found no archival traces of the financial means of the revue, it nevertheless to be noted notes that its financial independence was certainly strengthened in June 1901 by a grant from the government ('Souscription du Ministère de l'Instruction publique'). *La Revue musicale* 1/6 (June 1901): 225.

⁶⁸ 'I accept the criticism, but I would like her to give reasons and rely on evidence' ('J'admets la critique, mais je voudrais qu'elle donnât des raisons et s'appuyât sur des preuves'). Jules Combarieu, 'Musique contemporaine. Au Conservatoire', *La Revue musicale* 1/1 (January 1901): 25.

⁶⁹ Julien Tiersot wrote an article with musical examples on the choruses and intermezzi of Jean-Baptiste Moreau (1656–1733) that accompanied Racine's tragedy, *Esther*; Charles Bordes, under the aegis of the Schola Cantorum, edited the work and presented it at the Théâtre de l'Odéon on 18 December 1902 ('Les chœurs d'*Esther* de Moreau', *La Revue musicale* 3/1 (January 1903): 35–40). In the same issue, Louis Laloy wrote a critical piece, also accompanied by music examples, on Debussy's *La Damoiselle Élue* (33–35). In 1904, Laloy wrote another critical piece on d'Indy's *La Symphonie sur un chant montagnard* that included

text of the journal. Concert reviews accompanied by musical examples, however, were still quite rare.

A New Network for the New Critics

The initiative of Combarieu and his colleagues inaugurated a new network of music critics that comprised music specialists and musicologists. During the first couple of years (1901–1902), it was difficult to persuade new contributors to participate in the project; nevertheless, Romain Rolland actively sought to recruit new writers. Traces of his efforts have remained: in a letter of February 1902 he solicited Paul Dukas's collaboration at *La Revue musicale* by suggesting that composers were particularly well-placed to write good music criticism:

We are fairly well equipped to deal with music of the past but less so for contemporary music All it takes to write passable criticism for music of the past is some intelligence and work: everything is already in order and has been explained; the preceding generations have worked to shape our judgment and taste. But for criticism of the present, it takes a lot more; one needs to be, in one shape or form, a creator. However, artist-creators much prefer to create than to analyze, except in very few cases where the two strengths are combined....⁷⁰

Dukas had already acquired a solid reputation as a music critic by that time; his contemporaries greatly admired his work, which Goubault designated as 'erudite criticism'.⁷¹

Unfortunately for Rolland and his colleagues, Dukas was already writing the music columns in the *Revue hebdomadaire* (1892–1901) and the *Chronique des arts et de la curiosité* (1894–1905), and so could not contribute to the new journal. In another letter from May 1902, Rolland asked Tiersot if he would publish a talk he had recently given in the *Revue musicale*.⁷² Although Tiersot had previously published material in the journal,⁷³ his work as a columnist at *Le Ménestrel* curtailed his activity as a critic for the *Revue musicale*. His contributions were sporadic, and tended to be essentially musicological. In the end, Rolland regularly had to write the concert reviews himself.⁷⁴ This work ceased to please him, however, when he was prevented from expressing his opinions freely.

In a letter of 1907 to a friend, Esther Marchand, Rolland explained that in the past Combarieu had refused to publish extracts from a collection of musical works from the seventeenth century that he had put together for his dissertation because

seven musical examples: 'Les Concerts. Concerts Chevillard – 28 février', *La Revue musicale* 4/6 (March 1904): 166–8.

⁷⁰ Letter from Romain Rolland to Paul Dukas, 15 February 1902, sales catalogue of autograph letters from Rolland, summary and commentary by Bernard Duchatelet, Association Romain Rolland, 2012, 39.

⁷¹ Goubault, *La critique musicale*, 97 and *passim*.

⁷² Letter from Romain Rolland to Julien Tiersot, 8 May 1902, Romain Rolland Collection, Manuscripts Department, BnF.

⁷³ Tiersot's first article published in the journal focused on popular music: 'Une danse populaire des Alpes françaises: le Bacchu-Ber', *Revue musicale* 1/11 (November 1901), 385–90.

⁷⁴ The section reserved for concert reviews changed titles several times: *Musique contemporaine* (Contemporary music), *Les concerts* (Concerts), *Les théâtres et les concerts* (Theatres and concerts). Romain Rolland regularly wrote reviews until the end of 1904.

he had judged it to be 'uninteresting'.⁷⁵ The problem of freedom of expression that he encountered at *La Revue musicale* tainted in the same way its participation to *La Revue de Paris*.⁷⁶ Rolland could not wholeheartedly commit himself to Combarieu's journal. The two men did not get along very well;⁷⁷ Rolland was critical of his colleague's judgment and the stranglehold he maintained over the journal's contents, which restricted the writers' freedom of expression.⁷⁸ This disagreement soon pushed Rolland to switch allegiances and support the creation of a new journal.

As for Combarieu, while he kept certain articles and reviews for himself, he did share part of the editorial responsibility with Laloy.⁷⁹ Laloy, in turn, became a rather prolific writer. He published a number of articles and pieces of music criticism in the early years of the *Revue* that garnered much admiration, such as his critical analyses of works of 'modern music', the first of which examined d'Indy's *L'Étranger*, Debussy's *L'Après-midi d'un faune* and Chausson's *Serres chaudes*.⁸⁰ By and large, between 1901 and 1904, the principal authors of the new criticism in the *Revue d'histoire et de critique musicales* were Combarieu, Rolland and Laloy. The network of music critics was admittedly quite small. Although the journal published a few writings by well-known critics like Louis Schneider (1902) and Gauthier-Villars (1903), the editorial board, which was dominated by Combarieu, seems to have struggled to generate enthusiasm for this new approach to criticism within the journal. And yet, as Rolland recalled, following the conference in 1900 and with the establishment of music history courses at the Schola Cantorum and a lecture series at the *École des hautes études sociales*,⁸¹

the development of music criticism was actually quite swift. University professors, former students of the *École normale supérieure* and the *École des chartes*, like

⁷⁵ Letter from Romain Rolland to Esther Marchand, 12 June 1907, *Correspondance. Romain Rolland, Esther Marchand, Charles Koechlin*, ed. Germain Louis Viala, Marc Lericque-Koechlin (Mérignac, France: published by the author, 2006): 42.

⁷⁶ In a letter to Sofia Bertolini Guerrieri-Gonzaga about his review of Saint-Saëns's *Barbares* Rolland wrote: 'I sent my article to *La Revue de Paris*. Ganderax came to tell me that I was free to write what I wanted, as long as I did not touch the musician (who is a friend of the *Revue*), or the librettist (Sardou – who is his personal friend), or the stage director ..., etc. I was on the verge of dropping the whole thing, but I said nothing, and I managed to sneak in a good dose of truth, which Sardou will not like very much. Please always take care to remember, when you read something of mine in *La Revue de Paris*, that I cannot freely express myself (especially when it comes to judging my contemporaries)'. Letter from Romain Rolland to Sofia Bertolini Guerrieri-Gonzaga, 27 October 1901, in Romain Rolland, *Chère Sofia*, letters selected and edited by Marie Romain Rolland, Cahiers Romain Rolland n° 10 (Paris: Albin Michel, 1959): 36. Romain Rolland's article, 'Saint-Saëns et les Barbares', appeared in *La Revue de Paris* 8/6 (November 1901): 210–25.

⁷⁷ The hostility between the two gained strength after Combarieu was appointed in 1904 to a chair at the Collège de France, which Rolland also coveted. See Duchesneau, 'French Musicology and the Musical Press'.

⁷⁸ About this Corbellari writes that Rolland left *La Revue musicale* 's'étant à de multiples reprises disputé avec Combarieu, qui ne semblait pas avoir partagé l'intransigeance abrupte et hautaine de Rolland'. Corbellari, *Les mots sous les notes*, 30.

⁷⁹ In his memoirs, Laloy stated that Combarieu recruited him as editor-in-chief for the journal following a highly acclaimed talk he gave on the 'Genre enharmonique des Grecs' at the conference on music history in 1900 (Laloy, *La musique retrouvée*, 55–56).

⁸⁰ Louis Laloy, 'Musique moderne I', *La Revue musicale* 2/11 (November 1902): 452–8.

⁸¹ See Duchesneau, 'French Musicology and the Musical Press'.

Henri Lichtenberg, Louis Laloy and Pierre Aubry, sought to use precise methods of historical criticism in their analysis of works of the past as well as of the present. Choirmasters or organists with rare erudition like André Pirro and Gastoué, composers like Vincent d'Indy, Debussy, and a few others, produced exceptional analyses of their art, [a quality] that can be attributed to the intimate understanding of their artistic practice There is a public and a host of distinguished writers to sustain ... five or six good music journals of a scholarly nature, some of which could rival the best in Germany.⁸²

The journal that 'could rival' German journals was not Combarieu's *La Revue musicale*. Instead, it was the *Mercure musical* that fitted the bill. The new journal was, in fact, established in response to Combarieu's lack of vision and commitment, and as a counterpart to the *Revue musicale* which remained, in Laloy's words, too 'moderate'.⁸³ Laloy clearly indicated that Rolland and Jean Marnold (who was working at that time as a music critic for the *Mercure de France*) convinced him to leave Combarieu's journal in May 1905 in order for them to launch the new journal together. Prior to this, Marnold and Rolland, with Laloy's support, had tried to convince Combarieu to reorganize his journal in order to take advantage of the infrastructure that was already in place. Combarieu's journal, it should be recalled, had received a grant from the Ministère de l'instruction publique et des Beaux Arts. Furthermore, it was printed by the Benedictines of Solesmes Abbey, which, according to Laloy's recollections, was one of the sole printshops owning music fonts.⁸⁴ In July 1904, Rolland wrote:

I completely agree with you about the Journal, and I feel that it is best to wait for Laloy to disassociate himself from Combarieu, if he can, or to transform the *Revue musicale* according to our wishes. That way, we could benefit in part from the material organization and from the editor's experience. It goes without saying that, whatever happens, I am at your service.⁸⁵

In August, Marnold confirmed his intention to infiltrate Combarieu's journal in a letter to Rolland:

For our project of the *Revue musicale*, once Laloy returns, I shall see if it is possible to penetrate bit by bit, and in doing so show Combarieu how the journal would benefit from the change. He might ask his associate to *abduct* you (!!!) from the *Revue d'art dramatique* (there are cats that eat with relish only that which they have stolen).⁸⁶

The overhaul of Combarieu's journal never happened, and so Laloy quitted his position as editor-in-chief. With the creation of the new journal, Marnold, Rolland and Laloy sought to foster intelligent and independent music criticism. Judging from Rolland's correspondence, he respected Marnold's style and

⁸² Romain Rolland, *Musiciens d'aujourd'hui* (Paris: Hachette, 1908): 260.

⁸³ Laloy, *La musique retrouvée*, 138. For information on the *Mercure musical*, see Segond-Genovesi, 'Du *Mercure* à *La Revue musicale*'.

⁸⁴ Laloy, *La musique retrouvée*, 56.

⁸⁵ Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Marnold, 31 July 1904, Romain Rolland Collection, Manuscripts Department, BnF.

⁸⁶ Letter from Jean Marnold to Romain Rolland, 19 August 1904, Romain Rolland Collection, Manuscripts Department, BnF.

way of thinking – at least that is what he seems to have meant.⁸⁷ He wrote to Marnold:

I read your columns with keen interest. They are free, lively, and prolific. Is there anything new regarding the journal project? I am, more than ever, in favour of it. The last few issues of the *Revue musicale* are the best proof of the utility and, moreover, the necessity of a new journal. Even the free spirits are no longer free when they write for Combarieu's journal.⁸⁸

The project came to fruition in the Spring of 1905 and the first issue of the new journal, the *Mercure musical*, appeared on 15 May 1905.⁸⁹ Of the initial trio, however, only Laloy and Marnold remained on the editorial board of the *Mercure musical*, after Rolland withdrew from the journal. Musicological and critical activity had become less of a priority, for Rolland who was then intensely involved in the writing of his celebrated novel *Jean-Christophe*. It is indeed because he wanted to be free to criticize in his novel, even indirectly, the musical milieu that he progressively withdraws from the latter.⁹⁰ Between 1905 and 1906, Laloy and Marnold published many provocative articles,⁹¹ and reviews were often written with the kind of freedom of expression for which Rolland had called.⁹² The journal became involved in several controversies in defence of modern music – particularly in support of Debussy – and in attacks against the conservatism of certain works for the operatic stage.⁹³

Rolland still wrote some articles for *La Revue d'art dramatique* in 1905, a journal he particularly liked, but he was increasingly less motivated to write criticism. Even so, Marnold asked Rolland if he would take over the opera reviews. The writer hesitated:

I will do my best to help you with the new journal. As for the theatre [column], I would ask for a delay in giving you my answer until the start of the term in October. It's partly an issue of my health, as I am constantly prevented from going out in the

⁸⁷ In 1909, Rolland again told Marnold how much he admired his 'scholarship and his loyalty'. He added: 'Your reviews are true. So are mine, I believe. I am convinced that it is necessary that we exist, both of us – not only for ourselves – (I feel very strongly about this, for my part) – but also for our cherished music, which needs men like you and me who complement and balance each other'. Letter from Romain Rolland to Marnold, 10 November 1909, Romain Rolland Collection, Manuscript's Department, BnF.

⁸⁸ Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Marnold, 22 January 1905, Romain Rolland Collection, Manuscript's Department, BnF.

⁸⁹ See Segond-Genovesi, 'Du *Mercure* à *La Revue musicale*'.

⁹⁰ See Corbellari, *Les mots sous les notes*, 35.

⁹¹ See Goubault, *La critique musicale*, 116.

⁹² In a letter to a certain M. Isaac, who asked for his help in publishing an article written by Esther Marchand on Bach and Beethoven, Rolland wrote, 'I would be very happy to help Mme Marchand; however, I have completely separated myself from the *Revue musicale* where only Combarieu remains from the former management. All I can do is put Mme Marchand in contact with the new music journal recently founded by Louis Laloy: *Le Mercure musical*. It is a widely-read, but quite progressive journal, and a little combative'. Letter from Romain Rolland to M. Isaac, 7 January 1906, *Correspondance Romain Rolland, Esther Marchand, Charles Koechlin*, 27.

⁹³ See Rosemary Yeoland and Agnès Hafez-Ergaut, 'Camille Mauclair: critique et compétences', *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 37/2 (December 2006): 213–24.

evening in Winter. But to tell you the truth, it's a question of taste. You praise my honesty. Understand that I am sickened by the endless, ridiculous, and childish farce that is musical theatre. You will tell me it is all the more crucial to take up the battle. I dread that it will be a waste of time and that this farce is pretty much inherent to the genre. You are asking me to clean the Augean stables. They should rather be burned.⁹⁴

In the end, the art critic Raymond Bouyer⁹⁵ took over the theatre column. His music criticism did not resort to the historical or analytical methods promoted by the musicologists, nor did it have a polemical style like that of Marnold and Laloy. The latter two critics took care of the main bulk of the bi-weekly column ('Chronique de la quinzaine') until 1907 when the journal, for financial reasons, merged with the *Bulletin de la Société internationale de musique* (French section), a journal recently launched by the musicologist Jules Écorcheville,⁹⁶ who had participated in 1904 in the creation of a French section of the Société internationale de musique and had afterwards held the office of treasurer in it.⁹⁷ Écorcheville's name first appeared on the list of the main collaborators in the June 1905 issue. In fact, he collaborated but scantily to the journal, under the name Jean Leroux.⁹⁸ However, his works on French string music of the seventeenth century were much cited in the journal through his friend Laloy, who reported on his thesis defence and publications. In the 15 July 1906 issue, *Le Mercure musical* even published an article by Lionel de la Laurencie devoted to Écorcheville's two theses: *Vingt Suites d'orchestre du XVII^e siècle (1640–1670)* and *De Lulli à Rameau (1690–1730). L'esthétique musicale*.⁹⁹ The newly amalgamated journal was managed by Laloy and Écorcheville, and had a dependable readership that comprised the members of the S.I.M. Marnold's combative spirit probably did not fit well with Écorcheville, who chose to shift the journal away from aesthetic polemics about modern music and, instead, promote historical studies. The musicologist sought to make the journal more scholarly in character,¹⁰⁰ while still providing substantial space for musical news

⁹⁴ Letter from Romain Rolland to Jean Marnold, 29 April 1905, Romain Rolland Collection, Manuscripts Department, BnF.

⁹⁵ Raymond Bouyer (1862–1935), writer, art and music critic, later worked as sub-editor for *La Revue d'art* and music critic for *La Revue bleue* in 1909. He published a series of articles on music criticism entitled 'Critiques musicaux de jadis ou de naguère', in *Le Ménestrel*, published between 21 August 1909 and 2 April 1910.

⁹⁶ Jules Écorcheville (1872–1915) was a student of César Franck between 1887 and 1890. After studying literature, he spent a year with Hugo Riemann in Leipzig (1904–1905) and defended two doctoral theses at the Sorbonne in 1906. A specialist of French music of the seventeenth century, he undertook the *Catalogue du fonds de musique ancienne de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (8 vol. 1910–1914). In 1912, he became president of the S.I.M. On the founding of the *Bulletin de la S.I.M.*, see Segond-Genovesi, 'Du *Mercure* à *La Revue musicale*'.

⁹⁷ The president was Lionel Dauriac and the secretary Jacques-Gabriel Prod'homme.

⁹⁸ He published a satirical text about popular opera, entitled 'Dialogues d'été', in the October 1905 issue (pp. 377–82), and a review of concerts at the École des hautes études sociales in the issue of April 1906.

⁹⁹ Lionel de la Laurencie, 'Musique du XVII^e et du XVIII^e siècle. Jules Écorcheville: *Vingt Suites d'orchestre du XVII^e siècle (1640–1670)* In-4^o raisin de iv-145 pages. *De Lulli à Rameau (1690–1730). L'esthétique musicale* In-4^o couronne de ix-172 pages. Paris, Marcel Fortin, éditeur 6, Chaussée d'Antin, 1906', *Le Mercure musical* 2/14 (15 July 1906): 75–7.

¹⁰⁰ In an effort to make up for the backlog in French musicology in cataloguing archival collections, Écorcheville published several bibliographic inventories in the journal (Jules

and events (in the column 'Le mois'). The music chronicle was an important part of the journal, as its readership included many of music enthusiasts from the upper classes who supported the S.I.M.¹⁰¹ and enjoyed reading news about musical life, particularly when controversies erupted. Laloy fully supported the journal and wrote extensively for it,¹⁰² but there were also several new contributors, including Rolland's student, Henry Prunières,¹⁰³ and Lionel de La Laurencie, a musicologist who was already building a reputation for his work on seventeenth-century French music. These two men were to play an important role in the milieu, Prunières with the revival of *La Revue musicale* after World War One and La Laurencie in the creation of the Société française de musicologie in 1917. But in the early years of their careers, from 1907 to 1908, these young musicologists mainly published articles on music history that related to their doctoral dissertations,¹⁰⁴ and wrote music criticism with a kind of free spirit instilled in them by Rolland, which nevertheless also betrayed debutants' hesitation, a kind of bookishness mixed with judicious commentary.¹⁰⁵

The *Bulletin français de la S.I.M.* ran into financial difficulties in 1909 when the publisher went bankrupt. Laloy gave Écorcheville the necessary funds to publish the last few issues of the year and then left the journal definitively, having decided to be no longer 'involved in managing journals, [and instead] be content writing for them'.¹⁰⁶ Écorcheville thus turned to Émile

Écorcheville, 'Les textes de musique ancienne et leurs rééditions modernes', *Mercure musical et Bulletin français de la S.I.M.* 3/6 (15 June 1907): 627).

¹⁰¹ Segond-Genovesi, 'Du *Mercure* à *La Revue musicale*'.

¹⁰² Laloy stated: 'Our society [*Le Mercure musical*] comprised six sponsors who each put forward five hundred francs. I took responsibility of the remaining deficit. I was very happy when I was able to join forces with Jules Écorcheville at the end of the following year and amalgamate the *Mercure* in question with the journal *S.I.M.*, the French news medium for the Société internationale de musique'. Laloy, *La musique retrouvée*, 138.

¹⁰³ Prunières wrote his first critical pieces under the pseudonym Henry de Busne or Debusne. He began using his real name in 1908.

¹⁰⁴ Prunières (1886–1942) was working on his dissertation on *L'Opéra italien en France avant Lully*, which was published in 1913 (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1913). Lionel de La Laurencie (1861–1933) published several studies on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French music between 1904 and 1914, including a book on Rameau (Paris: H. Laurens, 1908).

¹⁰⁵ La Laurencie wrote a critical review of the Lejeune concert in March 1908. He ended the article in these terms: 'And this Ditters, since completely forgotten in France where he first made a name for himself in 1768 with a cosmopolitan symphony, a true proscenium arch "in the taste of the 5 nations", appeared like a playful, whimsical musician, with a fondness for the witty phrases and sprightliness of fiddle tunes. One finds in his music those qualities that incited all of Vienna to attend his opéra-comiques around 1786: the theme of the presto finale in his quartet, with those four bouncy, repeated notes, with that persistent rhythm, that lightness and airiness that foreshadows Mendelssohn's scherzi. ... There was also an amusing accordion effect; just as the first violin, slightly shrill and acidic, plays a popular motive over the pedal sustained by the three other instruments, and, in the opening allegro, the entry of the second theme played by the cello and the viola, which lends an endearing sense of mystery to their timbre and [the use of] a distant key from the tonic. In the meantime, M. Doucet also played, with very good style, a cello sonata by Handel, and was accompanied remarkably well at the piano by Mlle Bartzi, whose secure rhythm and precocious authority were most impressive'. Lionel de La Laurencie, 'Concert Lejeune', *Mercure musical et bulletin français de la S.I.M.* 3/2 (15 March 1908): 324.

¹⁰⁶ Laloy, *La musique retrouvée*, 138.

Vuillermoz,¹⁰⁷ who had an established reputation as a music critic and an extensive network in modern music circles, to fill the position of editor-in-chief. The editorial board for the journal, henceforth called *S.I.M. Revue musicale*,¹⁰⁸ soon expanded with the addition of René Lyr as the editor for Belgium in 1910 and Émile Heintz-Arnault for Germany in 1912.¹⁰⁹

In order to ensure the journal's survival, Écorcheville needed to provide it with fresh momentum and guarantee a larger readership. While the musicology articles still maintained an important presence, they were accompanied by increasingly larger sections devoted to gossip items, memoirs, music news and happenings (concerts, books, music-halls and cabarets), curiosities and investigations. Obviously, the review could not afford to publish only pure musicological content that would have only aroused the interest of a handful of musicologists. With its prosperity thus secured, the journal absorbed two other music journals, Combarieu's *La Revue musicale* in 1912 and *Le Courrier musical* in 1913.

With regard to music criticism, the coverage of the theatres and concerts changed course: in 1910 Écorcheville handed the critical platform over to the established critic and former composer, Gaston Carraud, who penned 'Le mois à Paris' and the 'Théâtres et concerts' column in the journal's supplement, *L'actualité musicale*.¹¹⁰ In 1911, Vuillermoz took over, and wrote the main bulk of the theatre reviews. Prunières wrote a review of the performance of Molière's and Lully's *Bourgeois gentilhomme* at the Odéon in December 1911,¹¹¹ and La Laurencie penned another two reviews in 1912: however, these were the last articles written by the members of the network of musicologist-critics in the journal. Beginning in 1912, Écorcheville and Vuillermoz seemed to adopt the premise initially promoted by Rolland: that is, to invest composers with the necessary authority to write music criticism.¹¹² Between 1912 and 1914, Debussy, Ravel,

¹⁰⁷ After first studying literature and law, Émile Vuillermoz (1878–1960) began attending classes, specifically those given by Fauré, at the Conservatoire. Although he also composed, he was best known for his music and film criticism. Vuillermoz held close ties with the new generation of composers around Ravel, and participated actively in the creation of the Société musicale indépendante in 1910.

¹⁰⁸ This new title would be in use from 1910 to the end of 1911. In 1912, the elements of the title were reversed to give *Revue musicale S.I.M.*

¹⁰⁹ Émile Heintz-Arnault's collaboration as 'rédacteur pour l'Allemagne' to *La Revue S.I.M.* did not last for long. His name is listed among the collaborators from November 1912 to May 1913. He wrote only two chronicles. The first was published before his being listed among the collaborators, in the section 'Le mois' of the issue of 15 June 1912 ('Lettre de Berlin', 71–2). The second was published in the issue of 15 April 1913. It was a review of six concerts of French music organized in Berlin under the aegis of *La Revue musicale S.I.M.* ('S.I.M. à Berlin', 61–3). That Heintz-Arnault had been asked to collaborate to the journal in Spring 1912, seems to correspond in time with Écorcheville's move toward German musicological milieu. He was elected president of the S.I.M. on 1 October 1912, after a two-month international election.

¹¹⁰ The journal published this supplement sporadically: the first time between December 1909 and November 1910, and again between December 1913 and May 1914 (with a new title, *Supplément de la quinzaine*).

¹¹¹ Henry Prunières, 'Lully à l'Odéon', *S.I.M. Revue musicale* 7/12 (15 December 1911): 70–72.

¹¹² There were articles occasionally written by amateurs, such as Félix Guérillot, a lawyer and an active member of the Société internationale de musique, and Albert Trotrot-Dériot, a sales representative who, beginning in 1910, took up the management of *La Petite Maîtrise*, a journal of religious music published by the Schola Cantorum.

d'Indy (aided by either Auguste Sérieyx or Pierre de Bréville), Alfredo Casella and Reynaldo Hahn wrote the concert reviews; Vuillermoz, however, continued to write the theatre criticism. Readers reacted enthusiastically as composers took over this critical platform, and the journal moved decisively into its most successful period ever.¹¹³

Conclusion

When Laloy recalled the founding of Combarieu's *La Revue musicale* several years later, he reminded his readers that, at that time, Rolland felt the project was premature.¹¹⁴ Was it French musicology that was not yet ready in Rolland's mind? Or was it the French reading public, who lacked the education required to contend with an approach to writing about music that differed from what they were used to reading in newspapers or the music journals already in existence? Ten years later, Rolland would insist that there now existed 'a public and a host of distinguished writers to sustain ... five or six good music journals'.¹¹⁵ In reality, however, Laloy and Marnold, and later Écorcheville and Vuillermoz, found themselves in the position of continually adapting the content of the *Mercur musical* and the *Revue S.I.M.* to accommodate at once the journals' relatively fragile financial situation and a readership that was not yet ready to follow scholarly criticism, as the musicologists and founders of *La Revue musicale* had originally hoped for back in 1901. Rolland, Laloy and Écorcheville had attempted to build a real network of musicologists working as music critics.

Laloy seems to have been the pillar of the new criticism; however, his commitment to Debussy, and the controversies he stirred up (particularly in his articles against Camille Mauclair),¹¹⁶ contributed to his being associated with the gang of fighters of the *Mercur musical*, an option that Écorcheville would not favour for *La Revue musicale S.I.M.* When Laloy withdrew voluntarily from the management of the journal in 1909, once the publisher went bankrupt, he was relegated to a secondary role from 1910 on. Rolland's former students,

¹¹³ Vuillermoz recalls this golden period for the journal: 'The fame of this art home [*La Revue musicale S.I.M.*] exceeded professional spheres: He had to be organized, to meet the interest demonstrated by the innocently enough Tout-Paris and boulevards, demonstrations of fraternal sympathy. Dinners and parties where the Revue bring together, in a palace in fashion, the notables of the brightest Parisian circles and the most famous personalities of the world of letters, theatre and arts, allowed to Ecorcheville to realize the exceptional place held by the SIM in the artistic life and in intellectual luxury of the capital'. Émile Vuillermoz, '*La Revue S.I.M.*', in *Le Tombeau de Jules Écorcheville suivi de lettres inédites*, ed. Louis Laloy, Lionel de La Laurencie, and Emile Vuillermoz (Paris: Dorbon, 1916): 34.

¹¹⁴ Laloy, *La musique retrouvée*, 56.

¹¹⁵ Rolland, *Musiciens d'aujourd'hui*, 260.

¹¹⁶ In 1905, Laloy published an article 'Le drame musical moderne. II, les véristes Zola-Bruneau', *Mercur musical*, 1/1 (1 June 1905): 169–76, in which he criticized 'the bitter work of Alfred Bruneau and insipid drama of Gustave Charpentier' (p. 169). Soon after, Mauclair published an article entitled 'Le snobisme musical', in which he challenged the 'critique documentée' and compared musicological writing to a 'science [that would be] a sarcophagus covered with hieroglyphics' (*Le Courrier musical*, 8/12 (15 June 1905): 368. The communication between the two critics was acrimonious. Laloy spoke of the universal incompetence of Mauclair. Jean Marnold entered the battlefield and the quarrel degenerated to the point of provoking Arthur Mangeot's intervention in the *Monde musical*. See Yeoland and Hafez-Ergaut, 'Camille Mauclair: critique et compétences'.

Écorcheville and Prunières, worked as music critics at a time when the conditions were the closest to his ideal of independent journalism. Although Écorcheville, in his position as editor-in-chief, still penned some of the journal's review columns, the other musicologists stopped writing criticism and composers instead took over the task. The network of musicologist-critics thus broke down and, paradoxically, the journal resumed a tradition of composer-criticism inherited from the nineteenth century, which had been dominated by the figures of Berlioz or Schumann. The years 1912–1914 stood out, however, as the golden age of this independent *Revue* so coveted by Rolland, Tiersot and Laloy. Écorcheville managed the journal with palpable tact, balancing the journal's interests with those of the partner institutions, the S.I.M. and the Société française des amis de la musique, and the journal boasted an extraordinarily large readership,¹¹⁷ despite a highly competitive market. The network that brought to life this music criticism, regarded as 'serious, thoughtful, patiently speculative and calmly curious, intelligent and never afraid to reveal its scholarship, and courteously combative',¹¹⁸ came to an end with the outbreak of war in 1914, as the *Revue S.I.M.* ceased its operations. It was revived, however, after the war with the founding *La Revue musicale* by Prunières. But Prunières, prudently, would not hire musicologists to develop a music criticism at once rigorous and combative, as Laloy or Marnold had done. Instead, he took up the characteristically Republican project of promoting musical culture, more in the style of Écorcheville, and thus responding to the interests of both the cultivated bourgeoisie and the musical, literary and artistic milieus through diffusion of music knowledge. He strove for a music criticism that would 'deploy the best effort to dissipate the ignorance of the public and their absurd prejudices, and to make them appreciate both the art of the past that they do not mistrust and the art of the present that they abhor *a priori*'.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷ Vuillermoz confirms that on the eve of the World War One, *La Revue musicale S.I.M.* was experiencing an increase in its readership: 'The number of readers grew abroad as well as in France, projects were piled up, grandiose yet feasible'. Vuillermoz, '*La Revue S.I.M.*', 34.

¹¹⁸ Raymond Bouyer, 'Critiques musicaux de jadis ou de naguère. Essai sur la critique musicale en guise de préface', *Le Ménestrel* 75/34 (21 August 1909): 266.

¹¹⁹ An excerpt from an interview with Henry Prunières produced by Frédéric Lefèvre for *Nouvelles Littéraires*, and cited in *La Revue musicale* 10/98 (November 1929): 91.