Musicologica Olomucensia 38 – 2026/1
DOI: 10.5507/mo.2026.009

CC BY SA

"Dvořák contra Smetana"? "Smetana contra Dvořák"? What the Composers Themselves Thought and Felt[1]

David Beveridge / davbeve@gmail.com
independent scholar, USA

Abstract

Although the relation between Smetana and Dvořák in the history of Czech music has always received plentiful attention, as have debates over their relative importance and debates about those debates, relatively little has been said about reliable documentation concerning the composers' own attitudes toward each other. The present study, in two parts, assembles all relevant information we have available, in the form of mentions in their correspondence, period press reports, and memories of those who knew them, placing all of this in historical context. The results show that they knew each other very well professionally but were not personal friends, that Smetana had reason to envy Dvořák's successes especially on the international scene during a period when he himself had lost his hearing and been forced to retire from public life, that according to one important source Dvořák felt Smetana had not given him as much support as he deserved in his early years, and in particular that Dvořák may have had cause to resent Smetana for giving him false hopes for production of his first setting of the opera libretto *Král a uhlíř* (King and Collier), which was in the end abandoned. Nevertheless the two composers admired each other's music, and with rare exceptions—trivial and/or poorly documented—did not take positions in opposition to each other. The influence of Smetana on Dvořák, however, has probably been exaggerated in the literature in consequence of the general tendency to overemphasize Dvořák's Czech nationalism.

This first part of the study covers datable testimony from the 1860s and 1870s.

[1] I thank Jarmila Gabrielová, Olga Mojžíšová, and Jarmila Tauerová for comments they made to me when I presented the original form of this study at the Smetana conference in Prague in September 2024 (comments which I have taken into account in this revised and greatly expanded version thereof), and Jiří Kroupa, Olga Mojžíšková, and Milan Pospíšil for other help they have provided to me.

Keywords

Bedřich Smetana; Antonín Dvořák; Boleslav Kalenský; František Pivoda; *Král a uhlíř* (King and Collier); *Šelma sedlák* (The Roguish Farmer)

Part I

(The concluding Part II will follow in the next issue of *Musicologica Olomucensia*.)

During the "battles over Dvořák" that raged in the Czech press around 1910 much was written about the relation of this composer's music to that of Smetana. In our own time, then, much has been written about the motivations of those, headed by Zdeněk Nejedlý, who at that time attacked Dvořák and held up Smetana as the real hero of Czech national music—a hero they felt was unjustly overshadowed by Dvořák's international fame.[2] In our own time musicologists and historians have devoted extensive attention to the harsh pronouncements about Dvořák uttered during that period by Nejedlý and others.[3] Much less, however, has been written about Smetana's and Dvořák's own attitudes toward each other and their personal relations. It was not until 2025 that a really systematic discussion of these matters appeared, as a chapter devoted to Smetana in Ondřej Šupka's book *Antonín Dvořák: Portrait Člověka* (Antonín Dvořák: A Portrait of the Man).[4] In the present study I shall cover the same ground as Šupka and add many additional items of verbal testimony I have gathered, presenting essential information about context along the way, then offer (at the end of Part II) some hitherto unnoticed instances of what may be "musical testimony" in works by Dvořák that, considering the circumstances of their composition, suggest the impression made on him by particular works of Smetana.

---

[2] In Nejedlý's *Zpěvohry Smetanovy* (Prague: J. Otto, 1908), p. 258 he spoke of "Dvořák contra Smetana" as having been a rallying cry of the 1880s: *Dvořák contra Smetana* jest heslo oné doby. But to my knowledge it was Nejedlý himself who had first used the world "contra" in connection with Dvořák, in his book on Fibich from 1901, viewing Smetana and Fibich together as "contra Dvořák." See his *Zdenko Fibich: Zakladatel scénického melodramatu* (Prague: Nákladem vlastním, Tiskem B. Outraty v Jičíně, 1901), p. 173:

> *Fibich jest pravý nástupce Smetanův, kdežto Dvořák jest negací směru obou těchto mistrů.* Proto správně zní tato slavná česká trojice *Smetana–Fibich contra Dvořák*.

Jan Löwenbach, in a protest against attacks on Dvořák, reversed the order in his article titled "Smetana contra Dvořák," *Čas* 25, 1911, no. 337 (6 December 1911), 5–6.

[3] Rudolf Pečman even made this issue the topic of a whole book: *Útok na Antonína Dvořáka* (Attack on Antonín Dvořák) (Brno: Filozofická fakulta Masarykovy univerzity, 1992).

[4] Prague: Akademie klasické hudby, 2025. See the chapter on Smetana on pp. 375–387.

A Close Relationship Professionally—But Otherwise?

It is clear that Smetana and Dvořák knew each other professionally very well. Starting no later than April 1864 Smetana conducted hundreds of performances (operas and concerts) involving the orchestra of the provisional Czech theatre in Prague during the period when, from the theatre's opening late in 1862 until mid-1871, Dvořák served as a violist in that ensemble (one of only two players on that instrument). At least seven of those performances occurred already before September 1866 when Smetana became the theatre's principal conductor.[5] As a member of the orchestra Dvořák became intimately acquainted with Smetana's first three operas, in each of which he almost certainly played in the premiere as well as many reprises.[6] Then after Dvořák left the orchestra[7] Smetana became thoroughly acquainted with three works by his younger colleague that he

[5] Jarmil Burghauser's *Antonín Dvořák: Thematic Catalogue, Bibliography*, *Survey of Life and Work*, 2nd ed. (Prague: Bärenreiter Editio Supraphon, 1996), p. 505 has Dvořák playing viola in a concert that Smetana conducted already on 7 March 1863, but the many period sources I have found pertaining to that concert give us no reason to think Dvořák played on that occasion and I believe he probably did not.

Definitely involving the Czech theatre orchestra and thus probably Dvořák were the following performances under Smetana's baton before he became chief conductor of the theatre: a concert in April 1864 and three orchestral subscription concerts of the Umělecká beseda (Artists' Society) from December 1864 to May 1865, the premiere of Smetana's opera *Braniboři v Čechách* (The Brandenburgers in Bohemia) in January 1866, a performance of Liszt's oratorio *Saint Elizabeth* three months later in April, then after only another month the premiere of Smetana's *Prodaná nevěsta* (The Bartered Bride).

In a letter of 8 December 1894 to Jindřich Kàan Dvořák recalled having played in a performance of Anton Rubinstein's *Ocean* symphony under Smetana's baton long ago. See *Antonín Dvořák, Correspondence and Documents: A Critical Edition*, ed. Milan Kuna et al., Vol. 3 (Prague: Editio Supraphon, 1989), pp. 324–325, here p. 324. But actually he never played in a performance of that work and Smetana never conducted it.

[6] *Braniboři v Čechách* (The Brandenburgers in Bohemia) was given twenty-one times before Dvořák left the orchestra, *Prodaná nevěsta* (The Bartered Bride) thirty-six times, and *Dalibor* twelve times. See Jan Smaczny [and Marta Ottlová], "Daily Repertoire of the Provisional Theatre Opera in Prague: Chronological List," in *Miscellanea musicologica* 23 (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1994), pp. 9–139; performances of Smetana's operas during the time Dvořák was in the orchestra are shown on pp. 23–51.

[7] We have no sources giving a reason for his departure from the orchestra—a bold move when to our knowledge he had no other steady means of making a living—other than that he wanted to gain more time for composition. One wonders whether his reasons may have been related to the mysterious departure from the theatre (and from Prague) in 1870 of his personal friend Karel Šebor, who at that time was one of the theatre's conductors and had a contract with the theatre for composition of operas as well. Josef Bohuslav Foerster in his memoirs *Poutník (Paměti díl I.)* (Prague: Aventinum, 1929), pp. 142–143 speaks of rivalry at that time between Smetana and Šebor, or at least between the camps that supported them respectively, and says Dvořák explained it to him; but Foerster gives no indication of whether Dvořák favoured one side or the other.

conducted in concerts: in 1872 the overture to Dvořák's first setting of the libretto *Král a uhlíř* (King and Collier) from 1871 (B. 21),[8] then in 1874 the complete *Third Symphony* in E flat from 1873 and the Scherzo from the *Fourth Symphony* in D minor from 1874. As we shall see, he also apparently undertook at least a cursory examination of the scores of Dvořák's first two operas—*Alfred* and his first setting of *King and Collier*—and most likely his third opera as well—the entirely different second setting of *King and Collier* (B. 42). Otherwise, we know that he studied the score of the first set of *Slavonic Dances*.

Beyond this, however, our knowledge of relations between the two composers is frustratingly meagre. We have nothing in diaries they kept or their calendar entries that would cast any light on the situation.[9] And of correspondence between Smetana and Dvořák we have but one scanty item: a telegram Dvořák sent in March 1884 for Smetana's sixtieth birthday saying only:

> Accept the most ardent good wishes for this day. Remain preserved for us for a long time![10]

The lack of any other written messages exchanged between the two composers would itself seem to indicate they had no close personal relationship, especially considering that Smetana spent the last eight years of his life mainly in a rural area far from Prague, so any personal encounters with Dvořák were probably few and far between. In the case of Dvořák we there is also practically nothing indicating his feelings about Smetana or appreciation of his music in his known correspondence with third persons—only that in 1894 he held up Smetana's numerous revisions of *Prodaná nevěsta* (The Bartered Bride) as justification for his own numerous revisions of *Dmitrij* (Dmitry),[11] and in 1898 he remembered that

---

[8] Burghauser (op. cit., note 5) uses the English title *King and Charcoal Burner*, which however (besides being ugly) is somewhat misleading.

[9] For information on Smetana's diaries and calendar entries I thank Olga Mojžíšová.

[10] *Dvořák, Correspondence* (op. cit., note 5), Vol. 4 (Prague: Bärenreiter Editio Supraphon, 1995), in the section "Doplňky" (Addenda), p. 285:
Přijměte nejvřelejší blahopřání k dnešnímu dnu. Buďte nám ještě dlouho zachován! Anton Dvořák

[11] Letter of 10 December 1894 to Alois Göbl. *Dvořák, Correspondence* (op. cit., note 5), Vol. 3 (Prague: Editio Supraphon, 1989), pp. 328–330, here p. 328. In a letter of 29 July 1882 to Marie Červinková-Riegrová, librettist of *Dmitry*, Dvořák spoke of Smetana's "powerful friends," but not of Smetana himself. *Dvořák, Correspondence* (op. cit., note 5), Vol. 1 (Prague: Editio Supraphon, 1987), pp. 309–311, here p. 310: "[M]yslím, že ti mocní přátelé p. Smetany budou na to naléhat, aby opera se k Václavu dávala."

Smetana had conducted his *Third Symphony*.[12] In Smetana's letters to third parties we do find several interesting remarks about Dvořák and his music, which we shall present in due course. Mainly, however, we must rely on recollections of persons who knew them—recollections usually not recorded in writing (as far as we can tell) until much later, even several decades later, and which for this reason among others must be taken with a grain of salt.

In the 1860s

For information about personal contacts between Dvořák and Smetana before 1870 apart from the above-stated performances conducted by the latter with Dvořák in the orchestra we are indebted to one and only one source—Boleslav Kalenský (1867–1913). Kalenský was editor of the first book devoted entirely to Dvořák: a compendium of essays by various authors including a very substantial survey of his life penned by Kalenský himself concentrating on the first three decades, from 1841 through the mid-1870s.[13] Although this compendium was not published until 1912, we learn from its brief preface that the first sections, including Kalenský's biographical essay, were typeset much earlier, years before Dvořák's death in 1904. And from a lengthy foreword to the compendium, written by Kalenský in 1910 but never published, we learn much more: Kalenský began working on his biographical essay in 1901 and completed it in 1902, in consultation with the composer, incorporating some information he says might seem unimportant to the reader only because the composer insisted on it.[14]

From Kalenský's biographical essay on Dvořák we have two brief observations on his personal contacts with Smetana pertaining to the mid-1860s. One is that they encountered each other repeatedly in Prague's "Vienna Café," but that their contact there was very restricted:

> When Dvořák arrived Smetana was usually engrossed in reading all the leading European newspapers […]. Dvořák was just pleased if he could bring more newspapers to the older master.[15]

---

[12] Letter of 8 January 1898 to Eusebius Mandyczewski. *Dvořák, Correspondence* (op. cit., note 5), Vol. 4 (Prague: Bärenreiter Editio Supraphon, 1995), pp. 112–13.

[13] Boleslav Kalenský, "Antonín Dvořák, jeho mládí, příhody a vývoj k usamostatnění," in *Antonín Dvořák: Sborník statí o jeho díle a životě* [ed. Boleslav Kalenský] (Prague: Umělecká beseda, 1912), pp. 3–112.

[14] Kalenský's manuscript foreword dated 15 February 1910, in his papers in the Czech Museum of Music, box 7, here pp. 23–25.

[15] Kalenský "Antonín Dvořák, jeho mládí […]" (op. cit., note 13), here p. 49:
Když Dvořák přišel, býval mistr Smetana […] zabaven čtením všech předních evropských listů […]. [Dvořák] byl jen potěšen, když staršímu mistru mohl snésti ještě noviny jiné.

The other, found only in a passage in Kalenský's manuscript of the essay that was not published, is that Dvořák disapproved of Smetana's habit of wearing a *czamara*—a Polish garment worn by many patriotic Czechs during this period as a sign of solidarity with a fellow Slavic nation.[16]

Otherwise, we know that in March 1868 Dvořák was one of eighty-eight members of the Czech theatre's opera company, including thirty-three (the large majority) of the members of its orchestra, who signed an encomium to Smetana on the occasion of his name day.[17] Also pertaining to the late 1860s we have a recollection published in 1910 by the cellist, conductor, and composer Theobald Kretschmann (1850–1919): that Dvořák "worshiped Smetana and Šebor."[18] (This is a curious pairing of composers representing completely different generations—Smetana born in 1824, Karel Šebor in 1843 and thus even a bit younger than Dvořák, though already in the 1860s Šebor achieved great popularity among audiences of the provisional Czech theatre with his first operas. Unlike Smetana, Šebor was Dvořák's personal friend.)

In an article published in 1911 Kalenský provided a summary account, evidently based on what Dvořák had told him in person, of Dvořák's feelings about Smetana during the time the latter was chief conductor of the theatre orchestra and Dvořák played under his baton:

> He came into contact with his conductor Smetana daily, admiring him in respect and love as the creator of Czech national opera. He showed him his own works,

---

In 1927 Josef Suk recalled Dvořák having told him, evidently in 1891, about the time

> […] když jsem ještě ničím nebyl a když jsem se potloukal kolem okna kavárny, jen abych viděl Smetanu v kruhu jeho přátel.

Translation:

> […] when I was still nothing and when I used to hang around the window of the coffee house just so I could see Smetana in the circle of his friends.

See Josef Suk, "Bedřich Smetana a Ant. Dvořák," in *Almanach na památku tisícího provedení Prodané nevěsty*, ed. Zdeněk Nejedlý (Prague, 1927), pp. 92–93, as reprinted in *Živá slova Josefa Suka*, ed. J. M. Květ (Prague: Topičova edice 1946), pp. 36–37.

[16] This passage would come on p. 54 in the published essay, following the sentence "Bystrou pozornost […]." It is on folio 12 in Kalenský's manuscript second draft of the essay, in box 7 of his papers in the Czech Museum of Music.

[17] *Bedřich Smetana: Correspondence II (1863–1874)*, ed. Olga Mojžíšová, Milan Pospíšil, Jana Vojtěšková, and Jiří K. Kroupa (Prague: Národní muzeum and KLP, 2020), pp. 195–199. Cf. the members of the opera company listed in František Martinec and J. Jaroška, *Almanah královského a zemsk. českého divadla v Praze na rok 1869* (listing performances in 1868) (Prague: self-published, 1869), orchestra members on pp. 12–14 and 18.

[18] Theobald Kretschmann (or Krečman), *Tempi passati: Aus der Erinnerungen eines Musikanten* (Vienna, Teschen, and Leipzig: Verlag von Karl Prochaska, 1910), p. 121: "[…] vergötterte Smetana und Šebor […]." I thank David Brodbeck for bringing this book to my attention.

> welcomed his advice, and according to that advice revised the works or destroyed them.[19]

Kalenský then provides a list of works Dvořák showed to Smetana. Only one of them, however, was definitely completed while Dvořák was playing in the orchestra: the *Tragic Overture*, meaning the overture to Dvořák's first opera, *Alfred*, composed in 1870. Concerning the remaining items in the list see p. 40 below at "We must keep."

Kalenský returned to the topic of Dvořák's service under Smetana in an article published in 1913, saying that

> during the time of his own creative ferment, longings, and dreams he looked upon the creator of *Braniboři v Čechách* (The Brandenburgers in Bohemia) and *The Bartered Bride* with trust as his compositional model, as upon an artist beloved of God.[20]

(Kalenský also reported, though, how bitterly disappointed Dvořák was that Smetana did not give him greater help than he did in getting his works performed; see again below on p. 40 at "We must keep.")

Dvořák's First Operas

We have no source providing clear evidence that Smetana ever become acquainted with or even knew of the existence of any work Dvořák composed before *Alfred*—which work, however, Dvořák evidently submitted to him in its entirety, not just the overture as mentioned by Kalenský. This we know only from recollections published in 1927 by Smetana's pupil Josef Jiránek, who had lived with Smetana from 1865 to 1872. Jiránek wrote that Dvořák, while still a member of the theatre orchestra, brought to Smetana his opera "Jindřich IV" (meaning most likely the medieval King Henry IV of England) composed to a German text. This must have been *Alfred*—about a different medieval English king (Alfred the Great) and indeed to a German text. Jiránek was unable to report on

---

[19] Boleslav Kalenský, "Dvořákiana I: Prof. dr. Zd. Nejedlý a Dvořák," *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), 34, No. 5 (25 November 1911), pp. 39–40, here p. 39, col. [2]:
Stýkal se se svým kapelníkem Smetanou denně, obdivoval ho v úctě a lásce jako tvůrce národní zpěvohry české, ukazoval mu své výtvory, vítal jeho rady, opravoval dle nich svá díla nebo je ničil.

[20] Boleslav Kalenský, "'Hudební klub' o Dvořákovi," *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), 35, No. 12–14 (4 January 1913), pp. 81–85, here p. 83, col. [2]:
[…] pohlížel v době svého tvůrčího kvasu, tužeb a snů na tvůrce „Braniborů" a „Prodané nevěsty" s důvěrou jako na svůj skladatelský vzor, jako na umělce bohy milovaného.

Smetana's opinion,[21] but *Alfred* was never performed, nor to our knowledge were any plans made for a performance, until long after Dvořák's death. By contrast in 1872, after Dvořák left the theatre orchestra, Smetana accepted for performance his *second* opera, composed in 1871—the first of his two settings of the libretto *King and Collier*. But, as we shall see, he did so under duress and in the end the performance was aborted.

Smetana under Attack

For context we need to observe that already in 1870 the voice teacher and music critic František Pivoda had launched a series of attacks on Smetana, especially on his leadership of the Czech opera ensemble, claiming among other things that in planning the repertoire he gave preference to his own works over those by other Czech composers.[22] Early in 1872 Pivoda renewed his assault with an article in which, among other complaints, he insinuated that *The Bartered Bride* was being performed too frequently.[23] It was just around this time, apparently, that Smetana accepted *King and Collier* for performance, although the earliest documentation of its acceptance I have found does not appear until many months later.[24] Pivoda launched another volley in his assault on Smetana in

[21] Josef Jiránek, "Vzpomínky na Dvořáka," *Za hudebním vzděláním* 2, no. 8 (1 April 1927), pp. 131–134, here p. 132.

[22] "Divadlo, literatura a umění," *Pokrok* [2], no. 52 (22 February 1870), pp. [2–3] and "Hovorna," *Pokrok* [2], no. 61 (3 March. 1870), p. [3], cols. [2–3].

[23] "Některé myšlenky o české opeře, jejím utvoření, rozkvětu, zachování a působení," *Osvěta* 2, No. 2 ([February] 1872), pp. 135–140, here p. 136. This issue of *Osvěta* is not dated, but under "Literatura a umění" in *Národní listy* [12], No. 25 (26 January 1872), p. [3], cols. [2–3] we find its contents announced, including the article by Pivoda, as being in the February issue of *Osvěta*, evidently already in print.

[24] The first evidence I have found that Dvořák had *submitted* the opera to the theatre is under "Z českého divadla" in *Světozor* 5, No. 52 (29 December 1871), p. 619, col. [3] (this page misdated 22 December 1871, but the correct date is given on this issue's title page). The first evidence I have that the opera had been *accepted* for performance does not come until 17 October 1872, when the performance had already been postponed—see p.34 below at "further deferred." Then we have "Z divadla," *Hudební listy* (Prague, not the later Brno journal of the same title) 4, No. 51 (18 December 1873), pp. 405-06, here p. 406, col. [1] saying the opera has been:

Téměř po dvě leta slibovaná, do repertoiru přijmutá […].

Translation:

Promised for almost two years, accepted into the repertoire […].

And finally "Národ náš a otázka velkého, důstojného divadla (Dokončení)," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 5, No. 6 (5 February 1874), pp. [23]-25, here p. 24, col. [1], unsigned but certainly by Pivoda, saying the performance was:

[…] slibováno, nemýlíme-li se již před dvěma roky […].

Translation:

([…], promised, if we are not mistaken, already two years ago […].

July 1872, again accusing him of favouring his own works over those by other Czech composers,[25] and gained significant support among members of the co-operative that ran the theatre. In the autumn Smetana asked the cooperative to release him from the position of artistic director of the opera, and announced his intent to depart as chief conductor at the end of his contract in April 1873. Alarmed, Smetana's backers drew up a declaration of support for him published in December 1872 with signatures of twenty-five musicians and persons involved in music, including almost all the significant composers living in Prague at the time—among them Dvořák.[26] In January 1873 Smetana was confirmed in his position as artistic director and principal conductor of the opera with an increase in salary.[27]

Ironically it appears that Dvořák may have had a closer personal relationship with Smetana's nemesis Pivoda than with Smetana himself. As of the summer of 1871, and probably later as well, Dvořák's bride-to-be Anna Čermáková was one of Pivoda's voice pupils.[28] In March 1884 Pivoda as an individual would publish a three-paragraph call to "Czech musical circles" to come en masse to the railway station in Prague to welcome Dvořák home from his first trip to England.[29] And a month later Dvořák would inscribe a copy of the piano-vocal edition of his *Stabat Mater* published by Novello in London to his "friend Mr. Fr. Pivoda."[30]

---

[25] "Zimní saison na českém divadle II: Zpěvohra," *Osvěta* 2, No. 7 ([July] 1872), pp. 548–553.

[26] Also including Karel Bendl, Zdeněk Fibich, Vojtěch Hřímalý, Richard Rozkošný, and Zdeněk Skuherský. See Jindřich Pech et al., "(Zasláno.) Slavné družstvo král. zemského českého divadla v Praze!," *Národní listy* [12], No. 346 (15 December 1872), p. [3], cols. [3–4]. The declaration was originally drawn up in October 1872 and evidently signed by most if not all of the same persons at that time; see Otakar Hostinský, *Bedřich Smetana a jeho boj o moderní českou hudbu: Vzpomínky a úvahy* (Prague: Jan Laichter, 1901), pp. 272–273.

[27] Karel Kadlec, *Družstva Král. českého zemského a Národního divadla: Příspěvky k dějinám českého divadla* (Prague: Družstvo Národního divadla v Praze, 1896), p. 53.

[28] See "Zkouška chovanců druhého roku ústavu varhanického dne 27. a 28. července," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 2, No. 23 (2 August 1871), p. 192. We have many later press reports of her performances as an alto soloist, including one that says she had been trained by Pivoda: see "Koncert v besedě měšťanské," *Národní listy* XXIV/121 (1 May 1884), [morning edition], p. [2], col. [5].

[29] "Hudebním kruhům českým," *Národní listy* 24/No. 82 (22 March 1884), [morning edition], p. [3], col. [5], signed "P . . . da."

[30] This copy is in the Prague Municipal Library under call number V 25918. The inscription reads:
Svému příteli
p. Fr. Pivodovi.
Antonín Dvořák
18 22/4 84.

The First Setting of *King and Collier* Rehearsed, but the Performance Then Scrapped

Let us now return to the story of Dvořák's first setting of *King and Collier*—a critical juncture in Dvořák's career very much connected to Smetana. On 14 April 1872 Smetana conducted the overture in a concert. But preparations for production of the opera itself were greatly delayed. In the Prague journal *Hudební listy* (Musical News) of October 1872 we read that the performance has already been postponed and now will be further deferred until the following summer.[31] But the summer performance, too, would not come to pass, as Dvořák probably knew when in May 1873 he submitted an application (evidently unsuccessful) to the Svatobor Society for financial support. In his letter of application he said he had had no financial gain from any of his works to date, that he had pinned his hopes in this regard on the performance of *King and Collier*, and that the repeated delays thereof had placed him in a very difficult situation.[32] The earliest evidence I have found that rehearsals had commenced appears in mid-August 1873 in a report in *Hudební listy*, likely by Pivoda who in December 1872 had become this journal's de facto editor[33] and whose poison pen aimed at Smetana is here muffled but nevertheless in evidence:

> From the theatre. We can hardly expect any more new musical works in this hobbling season. On the other hand the next season will reportedly open (we are assured this is not an idle promise) with a long-expected and long-postponed new work from the muse of Dvořák. His opera […] *King and Collier* […] is being rehearsed with maximum efforts. The conductor Smetana is devoting all his interest to this new work […].[34]

Two weeks later we learn specifically that *orchestral* rehearsals are underway.[35] But then early in September comes a petulant report in *Hudební listy*—again likely by

---

[31] "Zprávy domácí a z venkova," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 3, No. 42 (17 October 1872), p. [347] (this page in the journal erroneously numbered 247), col. [1].

[32] *Dvořák, Correspondence* (op. cit., note 5), Vol. 1 (Prague: Editio Supraphon, 1987), pp. 119–20.

[33] See "'Dalibor' redivivus," *Národní listy* [12], No. 345 (14 December 1872), p. [2], col. [3] and Hostinský 1901 (op. cit., note 26), pp. 279–280.

[34] *Hudební listy* (Prague) 4, No. 33 (14 August 1873), p. 262, col. [1], unsigned but likely by Pivoda: *Z divadla.* Hudební novinky se již dočkáme s tíží v této letošní, jen jen živořící [sic] sésoně. Za to bude prý zahájena (ručí se nám za to, že tato frase není ledabylou frasí) příští sésona dlouho čekanou a dlouho odkládanou novinkou musy *Dvořákovy*. Jeho opera […] „Král a uhlíř" […] sestuduje [sic] se vší úsilovností. Pan kapelník Smetana věnuje této novince veškeré zájmy své a hodlá operistickým dílem tímto sésonu odevříti [sic].

[35] "Mezi operními novinkami…," *Světozor* 7, No. 35 (29 August 1873), p. 416, col. [2], unsigned.

Pivoda—saying the performance has again been postponed "(for how many times already?)" and that the "artistic leadership of the opera company" (= Smetana) has "in the end unloaded the burden" onto the theatre's "already overworked" second conductor, Adolf Čech.[36] Shortly thereafter we read that the rehearsals will take some time yet because of the unusual complexity of the work and its considerable technical difficulties.[37] Reports that the opera was in preparation continue for at least another two months, to mid-November 1873.[38] But then in mid-December 1873 we learn from *Hudební listy* that the score

> has suddenly been returned to the composer with the comment that it is impossible to perform in public and would *damage* (!?) the voices of some older singers in our company. Could the artistic management [= Smetana] not have determined this unsuitability based on the score when it was submitted to the directorship two years ago?[39]

In 1901 Adolf Čech recalled the situation somewhat differently, as follows:

> After several rehearsals Smetana said to me of Dvořák's opera […]: "It's an important work, full of brilliant ideas, but I think the performance will not come to

[36] *Hudební listy* (Prague) 4, No. 36 (4 September 1873), p. 286, col. [1]:
– *Z divadel.* […] [Z]novu na nějaký čas (po kolikráte již?) odložena *Dvořákova* opera „Král a uhlíř", kterouž artistické vedení opery tolikráte slibujíc obecenstvu, jež má nejprvnější nárok, seznati veškeré svoje dramatické skladatele hudební, konečně se svých beder složilo na druhého, bez toho již všelikými břemeny operními a hudebními na divadle českém přetíženého kapelníka, p. Čecha st. […]
Čech himself would recall in 1901 that his job in connection with this opera was to rehearse the choruses. See his untitled recollections of Dvořák in *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), 23, No. 33–37 (7 September 1901), pp. 266–267, here p. 266. But Smetana in his letter of 15 February 1874 to the editor of *Hudební listy* (see p.36 below at "Smetana responded in") refers in connection with the rehearsals to Čech as conductor and (Karel) Kučera as chorusmaster, without mentioning himself as having participated as conductor.

[37] "Zprávy z Prahy a z venkova," *Dalibor*, second series (1873–1875), 1, No. 37 (12 September 1873), p. 303, col. [2], unsigned.

[38] "Divadlo, umění a literatura," *Posel z Prahy* [5], No. 274 (16 November 1873), p. [3], col. [1], unsigned: "Připravuje se: Král a uhlíř." I thank Ondřej Šupka for bringing this report to my attention.
If the opera was indeed still being prepared on 16 November, then it had been in preparation for more than three months, starting no later than the above-cited report in *Hudební listy* of 14 August 1873. As we shall see shortly, Smetana and Adolf Čech would both report a substantially shorter period of rehearsals.

[39] *Hudební listy* (Prague) 4, No. 51 (18 December 1873), p. 405, unsigned:
— *Z divadla.* […] [O]pera „Král a uhlíř" […] byla pojednou skladateli navrácena s douškou, že není schopna veřejného provozování a že by se operou pana Dvořáka hlasy některých starších členů ústavu našeho *pokazily* (!?) Což nemohla správa umělecká posouditi z partitury neuspůsobilost, když dílo svým časem (před dvěma lety) ředitelství předloženo bylo?

> fruition." And he was right. When we had been rehearsing diligently for about four weeks [quite a bit longer according to press reports of the time, as we have seen], Dvořák, who was working with the soloists, reached the conclusion that the whole work was too complicated, that the individual parts presented the singers with almost insurmountable difficulties. Once after a rehearsal he took the score home and we never saw it again […].[40]

So Čech remembered that it was Dvořák himself who gave up on the production, as we find also in several accounts from persons not directly involved.[41] But in an interview with Dvořák in a London newspaper in 1885 we find Dvořák himself quoted as follows: "Persuasion was useless; my opera was abandoned."[42] And Smetana, as we shall see shortly, acknowledged that the decision was his albeit under pressure.[43]

New complaints about Smetana's handling of the matter issued from the pages of *Hudební listy* early in 1874,[44] now almost surely from the pen of Pivoda who had by this time become this journal's editor officially. Smetana responded in a letter to the editor published in the issue of 26 February 1874—the first known item of his correspondence with anyone that alludes to Dvořák, here not yet by name:

> I object to the way you are capitalizing on the claim that only after two years did I declare an opera by a certain domestic composer to be unsuitable for performance. I examined the opera immediately and judged that it would hardly find a path to the hearts of our audience; however, to avoid all manner of attacks

[40] Čech 1901 (op. cit., note 36), here p. 266:
Po několika zkouškách pravil mi Smetana o Dvořákově operní prvotině:
[This was actually Dvořák's *second* opera, but the first one to be accepted for performance.]
"Je to vážná práce, plná genialních nápadů, ale myslím, že to k provozování nedojde." A měl pravdu. Když jsme již asi čtyři neděle pilně studovali, dospěl Dvořák, který studoval se solisty, k náhledu, že celé dílo jest příliš komplikované, jednotlivé partie činí pěvcům takřka nepřemožitelné obtíže. Kdysi po zkoušce odnesl si partituru domů a vícekráte jsme ji nespatřili, […].

[41] See [Ludevít Procházka], "Zpěvohra," *Národní listy* [14], No. 315 (17 November 1874), pp. [2–3], here p. [3], col. [1]; [Václav Juda Novotný], "Česká zpěvohra," *Dalibor*, second series, 2, No. 49 (5 December 1874), pp. 389–90, here p. 390, col. [1]; Kalenský, "Antonín Dvořák, jeho mládí…" (op. cit., note 13), p. 80; Jiránek 1927 (op. cit., note 21), here pp. 132–133; and Josef Bohuslav Foerster, *Poutník* (op. cit., note 7), p. 135.

[42] "Enthusiasts Interviewed: No. XVII.—'Pann' Antonin Dvorak," by "Paul Pry" [= Hermann Klein], *Sunday Times* (London) No. 3,239 (10 May 1885), p. 6, cols. [5–6], here col. [6].

[43] See also Alexander Berndorf, "Vzpomínky starého Plzeňana na tvůrce české opery Bedřicha Smetanu," *Český deník*, 23 (69), No. 112 (23 April 1933) pp. 3–4, reporting what he had been told by his nephew Hanuš Lindacker, a friend of Smetana, according to which "byla […] opera vrácena svému skladateli" (the opera was returned to its composer).

[44] "Národ náš…" (op. cit., note 24).

> from a certain party [undoubtedly meaning Pivoda] that are repeated with every new Czech work, I ordered that it be rehearsed, and until the last possible moment I insisted the opera should be performed. But when I saw the aversion to this work on the part of the whole personnel (I believe conductor [Adolf] Čech, chorusmaster [Karel] Kučera and the whole operatic company could give you the best account of this), when I became convinced that with this one opera (which had been in rehearsal almost six weeks [again, longer judging by press reports from the time]) we would lose so much irreplaceable time that none would remain for other works (especially benefit performances), I finally allowed that for now the opera should be laid aside until a more favourable time.[45]

(But that "more favourable time" for this opera would not come until long after Dvořák's death.) So Smetana had accepted *King and Collier* knowing that it would have no success. And, after major delays in putting the opera into rehearsal, he eventually decided to scrap the performance. It must have been a crushing blow to Dvořák, in his compositional aspirations but also financially—this coming shortly after, on 17 November 1873, he married his already-pregnant bride Anna Čermáková. If perhaps Dvořák felt some resentment against Smetana for having given him false hopes this might be understandable. We can only guess to what degree he accepted Smetana's public explanation of the whole affair.

Smetana Conducts Dvořák's *Third Symphony*

At least Dvořák could take some consolation in the announcement, already on 6 November 1873, that on 29 March 1874 his *Third Symphony* in E flat would be performed under Smetana's baton,[46] which indeed came to pass. An article published in 1923 by Ludvík Kuba reports something that evidently pertains

[45] Letter of 15 February 1874 from Smetana to the editor of *Hudební listy*. First published in edited form, but with no significant change to the meaning, in František Pivoda, "Palčivá otázka naší opery," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 5, No. 9 (26 February 1874), pp. 36–38. The diplomatic transcription in *Smetana: Correspondence* II (op. cit., note 17) on pp. 474–481, here p. 480, is as follows:

> Konečně ohražuji se proti spůsobu, jakým vytloukáte Kapitál z toho, jakobych se až po dvou letech vyslovil, že se opera jistého domácího skladatele k provedení nehodí. – Prohlédl jsem operu tu hned i shledl jsem, že sotva se jí podaří aby cestu si raziti dovedla k srdcím obecenstva našého; však abych předešel všemožným výpadům, jéž se z jisté strany při každé novince domácí opakují, nařídil jsem, aby se študovala, a stál jsem na tom až do nejposlednějšího okamžíku, by se opera tato provedla. Když jsem ale viděl nechuť celého personalu k dílu tomu (doufám, že by pan kapelník Čech [Adolf Čech] pan sbormístr Kučera [Karel Kučera] a celý operní personal nejlépe Vás o tom poučíti mohly) když jsem přesvědčení toho nabyl, že bychom s jedinou touto operou (– študovala se totiž jíž skorem šest neděl –) tolik času nenahraditelného ztratili, že by nám na ostatní díla (zvlášt benefice) více žádného nezbylo, tu jsem konečně povolil, aby prozatím opera tá se poodložila na dobu příznivější.

[46] See "Pražští filharmonikové," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 4, No. 45 (6 November 1873), pp. 359–360.

to this occasion—a story told to him sometime in 1895 or later by his friend Karel Jiránek, a close friend of Smetana in the 1870s who lived with him and his family for a time, brother of Josef Jiránek whose testimony about *Alfred* we cited above. The two brothers heard musicians who were writing out the parts for Dvořák's symphony grumbling that it would be less trouble to write parts for a piece by Liszt or someone else. When the brothers told this to Smetana he was very annoyed, declaring angrily and decisively: "Mr. Dvořák is a very gifted composer."[47]

Dvořák's *Fourth Symphony* and the Second Setting of *King and Collier*

In another concert two months later, on 25 May 1874, Smetana conducted the Scherzo from Dvořák's *Fourth Symphony* in D minor. By that time Dvořák had begun work on his second setting, entirely different, simpler and on the whole more folkish-sounding, of the libretto *King and Collier*, not preserving a single musical motive from the aborted first one. And already on 8 August 1874, even before completion of the opera, we read in *Dalibor* that it will certainly be performed in the coming winter season.[48] This undoubtedly meant performed by the provisional Czech theatre as would indeed come to pass. However, it is not certain that the decision to produce the work was made by Smetana. On 18 July *Dalibor* had reported that Smetana was spending the summer vacation period in a rural area.[49] (He was near Jabkenice, ca. 80 km northeast of the centre of Prague.)[50] And already on 2 July he had begun having serious difficulties with his hearing compounded by bouts of dizziness.[51] Most likely he saw the manuscript of Dvořák's new work at some point, but rehearsals did not begin until around 20 October[52]—just at the time when Smetana became totally deaf. Adolf Čech recalled in 1901:

---

[47] "[P]an Dvořák je velice nadaný skladatel." Ludvík Kuba, "Naše besedy při Smetanově klavíru," *Venkov* 18, No. 124 (31 May 1923), pp. 2–4, here p. 3, col. [4].

[48] "Zprávy z Prahy a z venkova." *Dalibor*, second series (1873–1875), 2, No. 32 (8 August 1874), p. 254, col. [2].

[49] "Zprávy z Prahy a z venkova," *Dalibor*, second series (1873–1875), 2, No. 29 (18 July 1874), p. 228, col. [2]: "*Řiditel opery české p. Smetana* tráví nynější prázdniny na venkovském zátiší."

[50] Olga Mojžíšová and Milan Pospíšil, "Bedřich Smetana 1863–1874," in *Smetana: Correspondence II* (op. cit., note 17), pp. *11–*34, here p. *34.

[51] See his letter of 7 September 1874 to the theatre cooperative and the management of the Czech theatre. *Smetana: Correspondence II* (op. cit., note 17) pp. 546–548.

[52] See "Tyto dny […]," *Dalibor*, second series (1873–1875), 2, No. 42 (17 October 1874), p. 333. col. [1] and "Teatralia," *Národní listy* [14], No. 294 (27 October 1874), p. [2], col. [4].

> In 1874 master Smetana was stricken by his well-known misfortune, and Dvořák placed the rehearsal and direction of his newly-composed opera *King and Collier* in my hands.[53]

By the time of the premiere, conducted by Čech on 24 November 1874, Smetana had left his position with the theatre, never to return, and would never again appear as a conductor anywhere.[54]

Dvořák Embittered?

At this juncture we may return to testimony from Bohuslav Kalenský—this time testimony saying that, based on the whole period of Smetana's work as a conductor in Prague, Dvořák was bitterly disappointed that he did not help him more. We should note that Dvořák's perception may have been influenced to a degree by Pivoda who, as we have noted, was a friend of his.[55] It is also possible that Pivoda influenced Kalenský, who had studied with him in the 1890s and with whom he evidently had a warm personal relationship.[56] Most importantly, perhaps, we have this testimony from articles Kalenský published from 1911 to 1913 in the heat of the "battles over Dvořák"—battles in which Kalenský himself was perhaps the most outspoken (and long-winded) of his defenders. Zdeněk Nejedlý and Josef Bartoš had been attempting to elevate Smetana by denigrating Dvořák, whose fame especially abroad they felt had unjustly overshadowed Smetana's achievement. And Kalenský "fought fire with fire"—claiming that Dvořák was at least as great and admirable a composer as Smetana, probably more so, and countering assertions that Dvořák was ungrateful for the help Smetana gave him early on by asserting that such help had been meagre, much

[53] Čech 1901 (op. cit., note 36), here p. 266:
Zatím v roce 1874 ubohého mistra Smetanu postihlo známé neštěstí, a Dvořák odevzdal studování a řízení nově komponované opery "Král a uhlíř" do mých rukou.

[54] Kalenský wrote that Dvořák resolved to rework places in this, his second setting of the libretto, "po třetí" (literally for the third time, meaning to create a third version), "dle Smetanových pokynů" (according to Smetana's instructions). See "Dvořákiana I" (op. cit., note 19), here p. 39, col. [2]. Dvořák would indeed subject his second setting to a revision—quite a radical one, including drastic revision of the libretto—but not (as far as we know) until 1887. Kalenský's assertion in this matter is highly improbable.

[55] Emanuel Chvála in his article "Vliv díla Smetanova (ku dni 12. května 1909)," *Národní politika* 27, No. 130 (12 May 1909), [morning edition], pp. [1]–2, here p. [1], col. [2] stated with general reference to the time before Dvořák's rise to fame that the notion Smetana did not wish to support his talent was "v pivodovském táboru živeného" (nourished in Pivoda's camp).

[56] See Kalenský's eulogy of Pivoda "Za Frant. Pivodou: Pohřební vzpomínka Boles. Kalenského," *Národní listy* 38, No. 22 (22 January 1898) [morning edition], p. [1]. Kalenský elaborates greatly here on how he himself was a great admirer of the works of Smetana, but hints that Pivoda may have been to some extent right in his objections to Smetana as a person.

less than Dvořák had a right to expect.[57] So we must take Kalenský's testimony in these matters with a large grain of salt. But the interest of that testimony is too great for us to simply ignore it.
Thus in 1911 Kalenský wrote:

> After several years of creative work [Dvořák] longed to receive *moral support* from Smetana through performance of some work of his in concert or in the theatre […]. But Smetana thwarted all Dvořák's hopes: he performed nothing.[58]

I.e. not until 1872 when—as Kalenský knew—Smetana conducted the overture to Dvořák's first setting of *King and Collier*.[59] Kalenský also knew that Smetana conducted the Scherzo from Dvořák's *Fourth Symphony* in May 1874; of his having conducted the *Third Symphony* in March that year Kalenský was perhaps unaware.[60] He continues:

> We must keep in mind that Dvořák […] submitted to him besides three symphonies [definitely his *Third* and *Fourth*, otherwise most likely his *Fifth*, composed in 1875][61] also the "Tragic Overture" [= overture to *Alfred*],[62] the "Overture to a Comedy" [to the first setting of *King and Collier*], the overture *Romeo and Juliet* [composed June–July 1873, never performed, now lost], and the first "Rhapsody"

---

[57] Kalenský published no less than fourteen instalments in a series titled "Dvořákiana" in *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), from 34, No. 5 (25 November 1911), pp. 39–40 to 35, Nos. 12–14 (a compound issue, 4 January 1913), pp. 79–81 and 81–85.

[58] Kalenský 1911 (op. cit., note 19), here p. 39, col. [2]:
Tužbou jeho po několi kaleté [několikaleté] tvůrčí práci byla **mravní podpora** Smetanova koncertním nebo divadelním provedením některého díla jeho […]. Smetana však zklamal všecky naděje Dvořákovy: neprovedl ničeho.

[59] Kalenský had reported that information in "Antonín Dvořák, jeho mládí…" (op. cit., note 13), here p. 81.

[60] I have found no mention of Smetana having conducted Dvořák's *Third Symphony* in anything written by Kalenský.

[61] The *First* and *Second* were both completed in 1865, which was before Dvořák had regular contacts with Smetana to our knowledge. When Dvořák composed the *Fifth* Smetana had lost his hearing and was no longer conducting, but was still living in Prague. When he wrote the *Sixth* in 1880 Smetana was living in Jabkenice.
This statement by Kalenský is the only evidence I have seen that Dvořák ever showed Smetana any symphony of his besides the *Third* and *Fourth*, with the possible exception of a very poorly-documented story told by Alice Masaryková; see note 67 below.

[62] The overture, B. 16a, to *Alfred*, which was called "Tragická ouvertura" for a prospective performance in 1881 that did not come to fruition.

> [the Rhapsody for Orchestra in A minor, completed in September 1874].[63] […] [Dvořák] respected and honoured him to the end of his life, but felt, after decades of experience and acquaintance with Smetana, that in the creator of *The Bartered Bride* he did *not* have a benefactor or supporter. […] Naturally a feeling of disillusionment and bitterness crept into Dvořák's inner being after ten years of efforts to win Smetana's favour.[64]

Kalenský continued his reports on Dvořák's feelings about Smetana in 1912:

> [Brahms] saw and supported that which Smetana had also seen but had smothered in Czech society […]. Dvořák was of course grateful to Brahms to the end of his life, decidedly more so than to Smetana, […].[65]

And in 1913:

> In Dvořák's recollections Smetana's disfavour was very painful, bitter. However, as a great admirer of Smetana the *artist* he was reluctant to speak about it.[66]

Indeed, I have found no credible evidence that Dvořák ever did "speak about it" with anyone other than Kalenský.[67] On the contrary, at least two credible witnesses who knew Dvořák over a long period of time—Emanuel Chvála and

---

[63] The Czech original of this passage (ibid.):
Dlužno uvážiti, že Dvořák […] předložil mu vedle tří symfonií také "Tragickou ouverturu", "Veseloherní ouverturu", ouverturu "Romeo a Julie" (h-moll) a první "Rhapsodii".

[64] Ibid., p. 39, col. [2]:
[…] Vážil a ctil ho do poslední chvíle života, ale cítil, po desetiletých zkušenostech a známosti se Smetanou, že v tvůrci „Prodané nevěty" příznivce a podporovatele – **nemá**. […]
p. 40, col. [1]:
[…] Pocit rozčarování a hořkosti vloudil se pochopitelně v nitro Dvořákovo po marném, desetiletém ťukání na srdce Smetanovo.

[65] "Dvořákiana III: Až do třetího pokolení… (Pokračování)," *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), 34, No. 15 (9 February 1912), pp. 118–120, here p. 119, col. [2]:
Viděl a podporoval to, co sice již dříve také viděl, ale dusil v české společnosti mistr Smetana: z boží milosti veliké nadání „hudebního proletáře". […] Dvořák byl ovšem Brahmsovi vděčen do smrti, rozhodně více nežli mistru Smetanovi, […].

[66] Kalenský 1913 (op. cit., note 20), here p. 83, col. [2]:
Pro Dvořáka nepřízeň Smetanova byla ve vzpomínkách velmi bolestná, trpká. Jako veliký ctitel **umělce** Smetany však nerad o ní mluvil.

[67] The closest thing I have to such evidence is a story that is very poorly documented, told by Alice G. Masaryková in her booklet *Hudba ve Spillville* (New York: Zprávy Společnosti pro vědy a umění, 1963), p. 11: that Dvořák once brought a symphony of his (unspecified) to Smetana seeking his opinion and Smetana returned it several weeks later with the string tied across it exactly as it had been when he brought it to Smetana.

Libuše Bráfová—reported that they never heard him criticize Smetana in any way.[68]

1875–1878: Dvořák Ascendant—Perhaps Arousing Smetana's Envy?

Only a few months after Smetana's departure from public life under tragic circumstances came an event that by contrast augured the future international fame of Dvořák. January 1875 brought the announcement that he would receive one of the grants for artists awarded by the Austrian government.[69] One wonders whether Smetana did not feel a pang of envy, having himself failed in his application for the same type of grant submitted in September 1865.[70] (But no envy of Dvořák on Smetana's part is documented until more than four years later, related to fees from publishers; see on p. 49 below at "we encounter the first.")

In October of 1879, by which time Dvořák had received a government grant five times, Smetana would submit another application himself, again without

---

[68] Emanuel Chvála, *Z mých pamětí hudebních*, ed. Filip Karlík and Jiří Kopecký (Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, 2020), p. 175:

Jen k Smetanovi vzhlížel vždy s plnou úctou, i v době, kdy byl proti němu popuzován a vyhráván. Ať se tvrdí cokoli jiného, zůstávám při tom, že Dvořákovi nenapadlo stavěti se proti Smetanovi. Snad ze všech lidí, s kterými v životě blíže jsem se znal a přátelsky obcoval, Dvořák nejméně dovedl se opanovati a nejméně uměl se přetvařovati. I nejlehčí stín nějakého antagonismu proti Smetanovi byl bych na něm snadno byl postřehl.

Translation:

Only to Smetana did he always look up with full respect, even during the time when he was being provoked against him. Let anyone deny it, I stand by my belief that it never occurred to Dvořák to oppose Smetana. Perhaps of all people whom I knew well during my life and with whom I had friendly contacts, Dvořák was least able to control himself and to pretend. I would easily have noticed even the slightest shade of any antagonism toward Smetana in him.

Libuše Bráfová, "Rieger, Smetana, Dvořák," *Osvěta* 40 (1910), Nos. 1–7, here No. 1, p. 24:

Přečasto byla jsem přítomna hovorům Marie Červinkové s Dvořákem. Ani slůvka nepříznivého o Smetanovi při tom nepadlo.

Translation:

On innumerable occasions I was present for conversations between Marie Červinková and Dvořák. No unfavourable word about Smetana was ever spoken.

Červinková is known to have met Dvořák on numerous occasions from 6 January 1880 to 28 January 1891. She may have met him again in September or October 1894.

[69] See "Kleine Chronik," *Neue Freie Presse* (Vienna), No. 3731 (15 January 1875), p. [1], col. [1], then "Zprávy z Prahy a z venkova," *Dalibor*, second series (1873–1875), 3, No. 4 (23 January 1875), p. 27, col. [2].

[70] See his letter of application dated 19 September 1865. *Smetana: Correspondence II* (op. cit., note 17), pp. 94–97. Letter unpublished until its appearance in Milan Kuna, "Žádosti Bedřicha Smetany o umělecké stipendium," *Hudební věda* 25 (1988), No. 2, pp. 120–131, here p. 122, which study provides detailed information about the circumstances.

success.[71] Certainly a reason for Smetana's failure may have been that these grants were awarded preferentially to artists who were young;[72] already in September 1865 Smetana had been forty-one years old, eight years older than Dvořák was when he received his first grant early in 1875.

A year after announcement of Dvořák's first grant came news of another prize he had received, albeit more modest, from the Umělecká Beseda (Artists' Society) in Prague, for the best new chamber work submitted in a competition. It was his *String Quintet in G major* with double bass from 1875. *Národní listy* (National News) reported in February 1876 that he had been awarded the prize, then in March that the quintet would be performed that month as indeed happened.[73] Perhaps this encouraged Smetana to write his string quartet *Z mého života* (From My Life), composed later that year, which however would receive no prize and would wait well over two years for its first public performance on 29 March 1879.

In April 1876 came the premiere of Dvořák's opera *Vanda*, given in this first production five times through June 1877. We know not whether Smetana gained any familiarity with this work (still unpublished today), let alone what he thought about it; he was mostly in Jabkenice around the time of the first performances. Then in November 1876 came the premiere of Smetana's *Hubička* (The Kiss), given seven times in that month alone then many more times during the remainder of the 1876–1877 season.[74] Of Dvořák's opinion on *The Kiss* we have only very indirect testimony in a letter Eliška Krásnohorská wrote to Smetana in February 1878:

> Perhaps you remember how after *The Kiss* you told me that Dvořák—I don't remember now in what manner—had expressed some kind of disrespect for this work of yours.[75]

---

[71] Letter of application dated 5 October 1879, unpublished until its appearance in *Bedřich Smetana: Correspondence III (1875–1879)*, ed. Olga Mojžíšová, Milan Pospíšil, Jana Vojtěšková, and Jiří K. Kroupa (Prague: Národní muzeum and KLP, 2023), pp. 587–588. Concerning the circumstances see Kuna 1988 (Ibid.), here pp. 125–131.

[72] Kuna 1988 (op. cit., note 70), here p. 121. In an article published in 1879 Eduard Hanslick even named youth as one of the *requirements*. See "Concerte," *Neue Freie Presse* (Vienna) No. 5474 (23 November 1879), morning edition, p. [1]–2, here p. [1], col. [1].

[73] See the column "Spolkové zprávy" in *Národní listy* 16, No. 32 (2 February 1876), p. [2], col. [4] and 16, No. 76 (17 March 1876), p. [2], col. [4].

[74] Concerning performances of both operas see Smaczny [and Ottlová] 1994 (op. cit., note 6), pp. 77–82.

[75] Letter of 27 February 1878. *Smetana: Correspondence III* (op. cit., note 71), pp. 373–376, here p. 374: Snad se pamatujete, jak Jste mi po „Hubičce" vypravoval, že Dvořák – nevím již jakým způsobem – dal na jevo jakousi nevážnost k Vašemu dílu.

From December 1876 we have a letter from Smetana to Josef Srb that includes the first instance of his mentioning Dvořák by name documented in a period source. There is no sign of envy; on the contrary, hesitating to commit himself to set a particular poem to music for Prague's Hlahol choir, Smetana suggests and speaks highly of Dvořák along with two other relatively young Czech composers as possible alternatives:

> I think that besides [Karel] Bendl the younger talents Dvořák and [Zdeněk] Fibich might also serve you better than I, a wretched deaf musician in retirement. They are of [i.e. they possess] great talent, a robust, happy mind, and rich fantasy.[76]

The end of 1877 brought another landmark in the rise of Dvořák's career. We could certainly forgive Smetana if he felt a tinge of envy when reading in *Hudební a divadelní věstník* (The Musical and Theatrical Herald, another journal edited by Pivoda) that, thanks to a recommendation by Brahms, a set of twelve (actually thirteen) duets by Dvořák would be published in Germany[77]—this at a time when no sizable work by Smetana had been published since the piano-vocal score of *The Bartered Bride* in 1872,[78] and nothing at all outside Prague since some small solo piano pieces issued by not-especially-renowned German publishers in the 1850s. Nor did Smetana have any publications in the immediate offing: not until a year later in December 1878 would any more of his music appear in print, and that only a piano medley of tunes from his opera *Tajemství* (The Secret).[79] In 1874 Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig had refused his offer of four short orchestral works.[80] By contrast on 1 April 1878 *Hudební a divadelní*

---

[76] Letter of 20 December 1876 to Josef Srb, from Jabkenice. *Smetana: Correspondence III* (op. cit., note 71), pp. 259–260, here p. 260:
Myslím, že mimo Bendla by Vám mohli též mladší talenty Dvořák a Fibich snad lépe posloužit, než-li já ubohý hluchý musikant na odpočinku. Jsouť velikého talentu, bujaré šťastné myslí, \a bohaté/ fantasie.

[77] "Domácí zprávy a dopisy," *Hudební a divadelní věstník* 1, No. 23 (10 December 1877), p. 182. This report was actually premature: Dvořák had only heard from Eduard Hanslick that Brahms *would* recommend the duets to his publisher (Simrock in Berlin). But he would indeed recommend them, and Simrock would indeed publish them.

[78] Since then only the prelude to *Libuše* in June 1875 and a single aria from *The Kiss* with piano accompaniment in November 1876. See Karel Teige, *Skladby Smetanovy: Kommentovaný katalog všech skladeb mistrových v chronologickém postupu* (Prague: Fr. A. Urbánek, 1893), pp. [36]–96 passim. As of 18 December 2025 online at:
https://ndk.cz/view/uuid:89eaf240-6f91-11dd-af57-000d606f5dc6?page=uuid:49d61c10-a0ba-11e8-99aa-005056827e51&fulltext=Libu%C5%A1e

[79] See again Teige 1893 (ibid.).

[80] See *Smetana: Correspondence II* (op. cit., note 17), pp. 492–496. Letter unpublished until its appearance in 1994 in a Stargardt antiquarian catalogue.

věstník brought news that Brahms's publisher Simrock (having already agreed to publish thirteen of Dvořák's *Moravian Duets*) had *commissioned* a work by him: a set of dances (the *Slavonic Dances*).[81] Then in November *Národní listy* reported that *another* Berlin publisher, Bote und Bock, was preparing "a number of his chamber and orchestral works" for publication.[82]

Meanwhile January 1878 had brought the announcement of another grant awarded to Dvořák by the Austrian government—his fourth in as many years.[83] And the same month saw the very successful premiere of his opera *Šelma sedlák* (The Roguish Farmer).[84] One of the reviews of the opera on this occasion was by the prominent music critic Emanuel Chvála (1851–1924), who in 1914 remembered that Dvořák had discussed the review with him and had agreed "that Smetana was a shining example for Czech opera," also that he had appealed to that model in the matter of Chvála's objections pertaining to closed numbers in opera, extended ensembles, repetition of words, etc.[85]

Alas Chvála had another, less pleasant recollection pertaining to this time period:

> [O]n the wings of the *Moravian Duets* and *Slavonic Dances* his [Dvořák's] name spread through the world, whereas Bedřich Smetana, the builder and leader of the Czech musical movement, did not get beyond the boundaries of his homeland though he stood at the summit of his artistic oeuvre. This period saw the beginning of efforts to sow discord between the two masters and to nourish it, from one side, by pointing to the injustice of fate toward Smetana and the supposed

[81] "Domácí zprávy hudební a dopisy," *Hudební a divadelní věstník* 1, No. 34 (1 April 1878), p. 270, col. [2]:
[…] poctěn byl i skladatel [Dvořák] důvěrou a objednávkou se strany světové firmy *Simrokkovy* [sic], aby pro její vydavatelský podnik napsal několik československých tanců a p.

[82] Václav Juda Novotný, "Koncert skladatele Ant. Dvořáka," *Národní listy* [18], No. 269 (7 November 1878), p. [1], here cols. [4–5]:
Bote a Bock chystá právě řadu jeho komorních a orkestrálních prací k tisku.

[83] "Domácí zprávy hudební a dopisy," *Hudební a divadelní věstník* 1, No. 27 (10 January 1878), p. 207, col. [1].

[84] The English title of this work in Burghauser's thematic catalogue, *The Cunning Peasant*, is not a good translation of the original Czech title and is even more misleading in relation to the story of this opera. I prefer to use the title *The Roguish Farmer*, suggested by Jan Smaczny.

[85] Karlík/Kopecký 2020 (op. cit., note 68), p. 186:
[…] přisvědčoval k tomu, že Smetana pro českou operu je zářivým vzorem, ale zároveň dovolával se tohoto vzoru v příčině mých výtek, týkajících se uzavřených čísel v opeře, rozložených ansámblů, opakování slov aj.

> overestimation of Dvořák's work abroad, and from the other side by suspicion of undervaluation of Dvořák's works and envy in observing their successes.[86]

Perhaps an example of such sentiments on the part of Smetana's supporters, or at any rate an effort to give him solace at a time when it seemed he was underrated compared with Dvořák, was a letter written to Smetana on 27 February 1878 by Eliška Krásnohorská containing a detailed critique of Dvořák's new opera,[87] to which Smetana responded on 1 March:

> You aptly expressed what he lacks: "general education." — He is a musician and, though very talented, nothing more.[88]

This is the only evidence we have of Smetana having criticized Dvořák as a composer (unless we count his above-cited expectation that the first setting of *King and Collier* "would hardly find a path to the hearts of our audience"). It is important to note that Smetana himself, completely deaf, had certainly not heard *The Roguish Farmer*, nor at this point in time is he likely to have seen its musical notation, which would not be published until 1882. During the several months before writing this letter to Krásnohorská—through the period of rehearsals of the opera and the first group of five performances (27 January to 15 February 1878)—he had been mainly away from Prague, in Jabkenice. From the continuation of his letter to Krásnohorská it appears he had not even seen the libretto, save excerpts she had quoted to him.[89] And what music by Dvořák *did* Smetana know as of March 1878? Of vocal compositions, apart from the first setting of *King and Collier* (in rehearsals) the only substantial work he is likely to have heard was the setting for chorus and orchestra of the *Hymnus* from Vítězslav Hálek's *Dědicové Bílé Hory* ("Ode" from *The Heirs of White Mountain*) which had

---

[86] Karlík/Kopecký 2020 (op. cit., note 68), p. 172:
Dvořák rostl den ze dne, na křídlech *Moravských dvojzpěvů* a *Slovanských tanců* neslo se jeho jméno světem, zatím co Bedřich Smetana, buditel a vůdce hudebního hnutí českého, nedostal se za hranice své vlasti, ač stál na vrcholu své umělecké tvorby. Do této doby spadá počátek snah zasíti nesvár mezi oba mistry a živiti jej s jedné strany poukazováním na nespravedlivost osudu k Smetanovi a k domnělému přeceňování díla Dvořákova cizinou, z druhé strany podezříváním ze znehodnocování skladeb Dvořákových a ze závistného sledu jejich úspěchů.

[87] *Smetana: Correspondence* III (op. cit., note 71), pp. 373–376.

[88] Letter of 1 March 1878. *Smetana: Correspondence III* (op. cit., note 71), pp. 376–380, here p. 378:
Co mu schází, jste treffně vyjádřila: „všeobecná vzdělanost." – Je hudebníkem, ač velmi talentovaným, dále nic více.

[89] In Chvála's memoirs from 1914 we do find a passage that seems to indicate Smetana was familiar with *The Roguish Farmer* at some point in time. See on p. 47 below at "Smetana had been taken aback."

been performed just once, in March 1873. The only music Dvořák composed after 1873 that we can be sure Smetana knew in any way as of March 1878 was the Scherzo from his *Fourth Symphony*. Very little had been published—of vocal music only the set of six songs from 1872 to texts from the *Dvůr Králové Manuscript* and thirteen of the "Moravian Duets" (as issued in Prague—their famous publication by Simrock being still in the offing).

From two different sources—alas mutually contradictory—we have testimony concerning Dvořák's own feelings about the relation of *The Roguish Farmer* to music by Smetana. Kalenský reported in his article from 1913 that Dvořák had told him:

> In composing *The Roguish Farmer* I was not thinking of Smetana at all. […] If Smetana were not seventeen years older than I and had not preceded me with *The Bartered Bride*, I myself would have been the founder and creator of Czech national opera.

And Kalenský himself added:

> Dvořák considered some traits of his own works that are indisputably similar and related to Smetana to be quite accidental, unconscious.[90]

But Chvála recalled in 1914:

> Dvořák knew […] how Smetana had been taken aback by reminiscences of *The Kiss* in *The Roguish Farmer*.[91] We spoke about that and Dvořák did not even attempt to defend himself against the charges. In the matter of the reminiscences, he said like the inherently good-hearted fellow he was: "He's right, we've all learned

[90] Kalenský 1913 (op. cit., note 20), here pp. 83–84:
„Já? Já si při skládání „Šelmy sedláka" na Smetanu vůbec nevzpomněl". […] „Kdyby Smetana nebyl o sedmnácte let starší mne a nepředešel mne „Prodanou nevěstou", byl bych *já* zakladatelem a tvůrcem české národní zpěvohry". […]
Dvořák pokládal některé rysy své tvořivosti, nesporně podobné a příbuzné Smetanovi, docela náhodnými, nevědomými.

[91] Conceivably Smetana was only reflecting something Krásnohorská had written to him in her above-mentioned letter of 27 February 1878 (see note 75 above). Here in Smetana: *Correspondence III*, pp. 374–375:
[V]šeobecně se všech stran musí [Dvořák] slyšet, že si vzal „Hubičku" za vzor, […]. Ty věci, které si vypůjčil od Vás, upomínají jen jednou na Hubičku, a ostatně vždy velmi silně na Prodanou nevěstu; […].
Translation:
Dvořák has to hear in general from all sides how he took *The Kiss* as a model, […]. The things he borrowed from you remind one only once of *The Kiss*, and otherwise always very strongly of *The Bartered Bride*.

> from him; if he saw a reminiscence, he also saw what I have of my own. Smetana will certainly do me no wrong."[92]

1878–1879: A Flurry of Statements by Smetana about Dvořák

By far the greatest concentration of particular occasions to which we can attach a statement by one of our composers about the other comes in the period from December 1878 to December 1879, all of these statements having been written or reportedly spoken by Smetana about Dvořák. Most are entirely favourable; only two, pertaining to the *Slavonic Dances* and the *Third Slavonic Rhapsody* as we shall see, imply some criticism of his artistic agenda or his character.

In December 1878 Smetana wrote a letter to Prince Rudolf Turn-Taxis, who had asked him for recommendations of new vocal music by Czech composers. Apart from his own works Smetana suggested also "Bendl, Fibich, Dvořák, etc." who "have written considerable quantities" thereof.[93]

In February 1879 Smetana wrote to Karel Frič that he lacked sufficient strength to set a certain libretto to music and added:

> I would […] suggest the composers Dvořák or Fibich. Both have such physical strength that they could easily handle such a tiring task. They are both fresh youngsters.[94]

Having learned about publication of the first set of Dvořák's *Slavonic Dances* (issued by Simrock around the beginning of October 1878)[95] and perhaps of numerous performances thereof that soon followed in Germany, Nice, and England, Smetana expressed sincere pleasure in this news—according to an article published in 1908 by his friend František Bayer (1854–1936)—saying he was happy

---

[92] Karlík/Kopecký 2020 (op. cit., note 68), p. 175:
[V]ěděl [Dvořák], […] jak se [Smetana] pozastavil nad reminiscencí z *Hubičky* v *Šelmě sedláku*. Mluvili jsme o tom, a Dvořák se ani neohražoval proti výtkám. V příčině reminiscence prohodil ve svém vrozeném dobráctví. "Pravdu má, všichni učili jsme se od něho, viděl-li reminiscenci, také viděl, co mám ze sebe. Smetana jistě mi neublíží."

[93] Letter of 25 December 1878. *Smetana: Correspondence* III (op. cit., note 71), pp. 465–467, here p. 466:
[…] v poslední době v tomto genru pracovali mladší skladatelové: Bendl, Fibich, Dvořák a. t. d. dosti a dosti.

[94] Letter of 10 February 1879. *Smetana: Correspondence III*, pp. 490–492, here p. 491:
Litují velice, že mně není dopřáno, svých sil na tak mohutném líbrettě okusit […].
[…]
Já bych pro „Ahasvera" navrhl komponisty Dvořáka aneb Fibicha. Oba mají tolik fysických sil, že by lehce tak namahavý ukol na sebe vzíti mohli. Jsout oba čerstvý junáci. –

[95] See "Prag," *Allgemeine Deutsche Musik-Zeitung* (Berlin) 5, No. 40 (4 October 1878), p. 337, col. [1].

that Czech music was being disseminated abroad, but also that he regretted he did not know this music: "our younger composers" should "at least show their printed works to old Smetana, when he cannot hear them."[96] Bayer recalled that Smetana said this at the home of Josef Srb, that Srb contacted Dvořák asking him to send some of his published music to Smetana, and that on the very next day Smetana was able to examine the score of the *Slavonic Dances*. On 27 April 1879 Smetana wrote to Srb from Jabkenice:

> I am very pleased by the gift from Mr. Dvořák; please convey to him my warm thanks.[97]

Apparently he had the dances already five days earlier when he wrote to his publisher František Augustin Urbánek suggesting he issue an advance announcement of his own *Czech Dances*:

> Whereas Dvořák names his pieces only under the general title "Slavonic Dances," without a person knowing which ones they are or whether such dances even exist, we would show what specifically named dances we Czechs have![98]

But if he thus objected to Dvořák's vague nomenclature, he admired his musical technique in the *Slavonic Dances*: Bayer recalled hearing him praise them without reservation, exclaiming that Dvořák worked with themes here "just like Beethoven."[99] Bayer also doubted that Smetana had anything unfavourable to say about Dvořák's music at any time later.

In August 1879 we encounter the first known intimation that Smetana regarded Dvořák's successes abroad as something to be coveted, when he wrote to Josef Srb:

---

[96] "Smetana a Dvořákovy 'Slovanské tance'," *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), 31, No. 29–36 (30 April 1909), p. 258, here col. [1]:
[…] že by měli "mladší páni skladatelé starému Smetanovi své vytištěné práce alespoň ukázati", když jich slyšeti nemůže.

[97] *Smetana: Correspondence* III (op. cit., note 71), pp. 534–535, here p. 535, as a postscript, without context: "Dárek p. Dvořáka mne velice těší; račte mu vyřidit moje vřelé díky."

[98] Letter of 22 April 1879. *Smetana: Correspondence III* (op. cit., note 71), pp. 527–528:
Kde Dvořák jmenuje své kusy jen pod vše obecným názvem "Slavische Tänze" aniž by člověk věděl, které to jsou, a jest-li vůbec takové existujou, ukázali by jsme, jaký tance určitě jmenované mý Češi máme!

[99] Bayer 1909 (op. cit., note 96), here p. 258, col. [2]:
Byl jsem přítomen, když práci Dvořákovu bez výhrady pochválil: řekl mimo jiné doslova, že tu Dvořák s thematy pracuje "zrovna po Beethovensku".

> […] I ask for a little explanation.
> I'd like to find out how much Dvořák receives from Simrock for his works. He himself has never confided this to me, although I asked him once.

(Smetana must have asked Dvořák about this in some personal meeting or correspondence that is otherwise undocumented.)

> So please keep it a secret that I am the one who wants to know. I just want to have some guideline available for how I could conduct myself with publishers.[100]

And a week later, having perhaps received some information from Srb though not exactly what he wanted, he wrote to his publisher Urbánek giving somewhat imprecise and questionable amounts Dvořák had received not from Simrock but from two other Berlin publishers—Schlesinger and Bote & Bock—then comparing the value of his own works to that of Dvořák's:

> I can myself assert that my compositions have as much value as Dvořák's, especially for the future, without sinning against the rules of modesty.[101]

From late November 1879 we have another letter to Smetana from Krásnohorská decrying what she portrayed as the general overvaluation of Dvořák compared with Smetana.[102] Perhaps this influenced him in his own letter written a month later to Ludevít Procházka:

> That rogue presents all manner of instrumental effects as his own invention and as something new. For example two harps alone beginning a movement, the orchestra entering only later, and other similar things that Smetana, i.e. I, already had in my compositions![103]

---

[100] Letter of 20 August 1879. *Smetana: Correspondence III* (op. cit., note 71), pp. 568–569:
[…] prosim o malé vysvětlení. –
Rád bych totiž se dozvěděl, mocli Dvořák za své skladby od Simrocka dostává. On sám mně se tim nikdy nesvěřil, ačkoliv jsem se ho jednou ptal. – Prosím Vás tedy, aby jste si to podržel pro sebe, že já to chci vědět. – Já tim pouze chci mit jakýsi regulativ po ruce, jak bych se mohl chovat naproti nakládatelům.

[101] Letter of 27 August 1879. *Smetana: Correspondence III* (op. cit., note 71), pp. 570–571, here p. 570:
A že moje skladby cenu takovou jako Dvořákové mají, zvlášť pro budoucnost, mohu sám tvrdit, aníž bych se prohřešil proti pravidlům skromností.

[102] Letter 26 November 1879. *Smetana: Correspondence III* (op. cit., note 71), pp. 601–604.

[103] Letter of 23 December 1879. *Smetana: Correspondence III* (op. cit., note 71), pp. 616–617, here p. 617:
[Č]tverák uvádí všeliké effekty v instrumentaci co vlastní vynalesi a novinky, jako k. př. 2 harfy samotný začinajíce větu, na to pozdější teprv vpadne orchester, a jíné podobne věci, ktere zatim Smetana, já totíž, už dříve ve svých skladbach měl!

The harps Smetana has in mind are at the beginning of his symphonic poem *Vyšehrad* (two harps) and Dvořák's *Third Slavonic Rhapsody* (just one). *Vyšehrad* had been performed in December 1877 in a concert that also included the first known performance of Dvořák's *Romance in F minor*; it was late in the following year that Dvořák composed his *Third Slavonic Rhapsody*. Dvořák is not known to have said anything to anyone about whether his idea of opening the piece with harp alone was or was not original.[104]

Smetana Conspicuous by His Absence

Published in six installments from December 1879 to February 1880 in Leipzig's *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* (Musical Weekly) was the first substantial biographical essay on Dvořák,[105] written with use of material the author had asked Dvořák to supply and for which he thanked him,[106] although that material itself is missing today. Mentioned in this essay as having been noteworthy in Dvořák's acquisition of knowledge of musical literature are Beethoven (twice), Mendelssohn, Schumann, and Schubert.[107] Mentioned as having been of help to him are his close friend Karel Bendl,[108] Joseph Joachim,[109] (Johann) Herbeck, Hanslick, and Brahms—the last three of these as members of the jury that awarded Dvořák his grants from the Austrian government,[110] Brahms then also as having recommended Dvořák's music to Simrock and yet again as having furthered his international career in general.[111] Nowhere in the essay do we find the name Smetana.

Is this surprising? Perhaps Dvořák really was to some extent, as reported by Kalenský, embittered by Smetana's failure to help him more than he did, and disinclined to give him credit. It is true, however, that Dvořák was in general less indebted to Czech composers than most secondary literature would have us believe. This literature has always shown a strong tendency to exaggerate his

[104] An analogous case is that of two works beginning with timpani alone: Smetana's *Slavnostní předehra* (Festive Overture) in D major, Op. 4, from 1848–1849 and Dvořák's *Te Deum* from 1892. But Dvořák is very unlikely to have known that work by Smetana.

[105] Hermann Krigar, "Anton Dvořák: Eine biographische Skizze," *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* XI/1–2, XI/4, and XI/6–8 (26 December 1879 – 13 February 1880).

[106] See letters from Hermann Krigar to Dvořák of 7 December 1879 and 17 February 1880. In *Dvořák, Correspondence* (op. cit., note 5), Vol. 5 (Prague: Editio Supraphon, 1996), pp. 214 and 226.

[107] *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* XI/6 (30 January 1880), p. 67.

[108] Ibid.

[109] *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* XI/8 (13 February 1880), p. 91, col. [2].

[110] *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* XI/6 (30 January 1880), p. 67, col. [2].

[111] *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* XI/6 (30 January 1880), p. 68, col. [1] and XI/8 (13 February 1880), p. 91, col. [2].

"Czechness," a tendency motivated by national pride in the case of writings by Czechs, while foreigners have often succumbed to a pattern whereby composers other than Germans, Italians, and French are automatically categorized as "nationalists," outside the "mainstream" of European music.[112]

In Part II of this study we shall consider further occasions when Czech composers are notably absent when Dvořák mentioned those who had influenced or helped him.[113]

We have now covered the large majority of known statements made by either composer about the other, and all evidence of their attitudes toward each other pertaining specifically to points in time before 1880. It is clear that they were not close personal friends. But the balance of evidence indicates they were also not enemies. Dvořák may have felt that Smetana should have given him greater support in his career. Smetana may have felt a degree of envy of Dvořák's successes. But they admired each other's work and apparently bore no serious grudges; Dvořák acknowledged Smetana's influence on his own compositions. In Part II of this study (to follow in the next issue of *Musicologica Olomucensia*) we shall consider Dvořák's and Smetana's few known written statements about each other during the final years of Smetana's life, other verbal evidence of their attitudes toward each other pertaining to periods from 1880 onward or not related to any ascertainable time, and possible musical testimony of their relation to each other in parallels between works composed from 1874 to 1900, none of this fundamentally altering the conclusions we have just formulated, rather on the whole confirming them, though offering some interesting twists.

Bibliography (for this first part of the study)

Published Articles and Books

Anonymous:

"'Dalibor' redivivus," *Národní listy* [12], No. 345 (14 December 1872), p. [2], col. [3].

"Divadlo, literatura a umění," *Pokrok* [2], no. 52 (22 February 1870), pp. [2–3].

"Divadlo, umění a literatura," *Posel z Prahy* [5], No. 274 (16 November 1873), p. [3], col. [1].

"Domácí zprávy a dopisy," *Hudební a divadelní věstník* 1, No. 23 (10 December 1877), p. 182.

[112] See David R. Beveridge, "Antonín Dvořák and the Concept of Czechness," *Clavibus unitis* 7 (2018), no. 1, pp. 11–26 (https://www.acecs.cz/media/cu_2018_07_01_beveridge.pdf), also in the *Journal of Czech and Slovak Music* (England), 30 (2021), pp. 42–68.

[113] "Enthusiasts Interviewed" (op. cit., note 42), here col. [6]; Dvořák's letter of 8 January 1898 to Eusebius Mandyczewski, in *Dvořák, Correspondence* (op. cit., note 5), Vol. 4 (Prague: Bärenreiter Editio Supraphon, 1995), pp. 112–13.

"Domácí zprávy hudební a dopisy," *Hudební a divadelní věstník* 1, No. 27 (10 January 1878), p. 207, col. [1].

"Domácí zprávy hudební a dopisy," *Hudební a divadelní věstník* 1, No. 34 (1 April 1878), p. 270, col. [2].

"Tyto dny […]", *Dalibor*, second series (1873–1875), 2, No. 42 (17 October 1874), p. 333. col. [1].

"Hovorna," *Pokrok* [2], no. 61 (3 March. 1870), p. [3], cols. [2–3].

"Kleine Chronik," *Neue Freie Presse* (Vienna) No. 3731 (15 January 1875), p. [1], col. [1].

"Literatura a umění," *Národní listy* [12], No. 25 (26 January 1872), p. [3], cols. [2–3].

"Mezi operními novinkami…," *Světozor* 7, No. 35 (29 August 1873), p. 416, col. [2].

"Prag," *Allgemeine Deutsche Musik-Zeitung* (Berlin) 5, No. 40 (4 October 1878), p. 337, col. [1].

"Pražští filharmonikové," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 4, No. 45 (6 November 1873), pp. 359–360.

"Spolkové zprávy," *Národní listy* 16, No. 32 (2 February 1876), p. [2], col. [4].

"Spolkové zprávy," *Národní listy* 16, No. 76 (17 March 1876), p. [2], col. [4].

"Teatralia," *Národní listy* [14], No. 294 (27 October 1874), p. [2], col. [4].

"Z českého divadla," *Světozor* 5, No. 52 (29 December 1871), p. 619, col. [3].

"Z divadla," *Hudební listy* (Prague, not the later Brno journal of the same title) 4, No. 51 (18 December 1873), pp. 405–06.

"Zkouška chovanců druhého roku ústavu varhanického dne 27. a 28. července," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 2, No. 23 (2 August 1871), p. 192.

"Zprávy domácí a z venkova," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 3, No. 42 (17 October 1872), p. [347] (this page in the journal erroneously numbered 247), col. [1].

"Zprávy z Prahy a z venkova," *Dalibor*, second series (1873–1875), 1, No. 37 (12 September 1873), p. 303, col. [2].

"Zprávy z Prahy a z venkova," *Dalibor*, second series (1873–1875), 2, No. 29 (18 July 1874), p. 228, col. [2].

"Zprávy z Prahy a z venkova," *Dalibor*, second series (1873–1875), 2, No. 32 (8 August 1874), p. 254, col. [2].

"Zprávy z Prahy a z venkova," *Dalibor*, second series (1873–1875), 3, No. 4 (23 January 1875), p. 27, col. [2].

Bayer, František. "Smetana a Dvořákovy 'Slovanské tance'," *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), 31, No. 29–36 (30 April 1909), p. 258.

Berndorf, Alexander. "Vzpomínky starého Plzeňana na tvůrce české opery Bedřicha Smetanu," *Český deník*, 23 (69), No. 112 (23 April 1933) pp. 3–4.

Beveridge, David R. "Antonín Dvořák and the Concept of Czechness," *Clavibus unitis* 7 (2018), no. 1, pp. 11–26 (https://www.acecs.cz/media/cu_2018_07_01_beveridge.pdf), also in the *Journal of Czech and Slovak Music* (England), 30 (2021), pp. 42–68.

Bráfová, Libuše. "Rieger, Smetana, Dvořák," *Osvěta* 40 (1910), Nos. 1–7.

Burghauser, Jarmil. *Antonín Dvořák: Thematic Catalogue, Bibliography, Survey of Life and Work*, 2nd ed. (Prague: Bärenreiter Editio Supraphon, 1996).

Čech, Adolf. Untitled recollections of Dvořák, *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), 23, No. 33–37 (7 September 1901), pp. 266–267.

Chvála, Emanuel. "Vliv díla Smetanova (ku dni 12. května 1909)," *Národní politika* 27, No. 130 (12 May 1909), [morning edition], pp. [1]–2.

Chvála, Emanuel. *Z mých pamětí hudebních*, ed. Filip Karlík and Jiří Kopecký (Olomouc: Vydavatelství Univerzity Palackého, 2020).

Foerster, Josef Bohuslav. *Poutník (Paměti díl I.)* (Prague: Aventinum, 1929).

Hanslick, Eduard. "Concerte," *Neue Freie Presse* (Vienna) No. 5474 (23 November 1879), morning edition, p. [1]–2.

Hostinský, Otakar. *Bedřich Smetana a jeho boj o moderní českou hudbu: Vzpomínky a úvahy* (Prague: Jan Laichter, 1901).

Jiránek, Josef. "Vzpomínky na Dvořáka," *Za hudebním vzděláním* (Plzeň) 2, no. 8 (1 April 1927), pp. 131–134.

Kadlec, Karel. *Družstva Král. českého zemského a Národního divadla: Příspěvky k dějinám českého divadla* (Prague: Družstvo Národního divadla v Praze, 1896).

Kalenský, Boleslav. "Antonín Dvořák, jeho mládí, příhody a vývoj k usamostatnění," in *Antonín Dvořák: Sborník statí o jeho díle a životě* [ed. Boleslav Kalenský] (Prague: Umělecká beseda, 1912), pp. 3–112.

Kalenský, Boleslav. "Dvořákiana I: Prof. dr. Zd. Nejedlý a Dvořák," *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), 34, No. 5 (25 November 1911), pp. 39–40.

Kalenský, Boleslav. "Dvořákiana III: Až do třetího pokolení… (Pokračování)," *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), 34, No. 15 (9 February 1912), pp. 118–120.

Kalenský, Boleslav. "'Hudební klub' o Dvořákovi," *Dalibor*, third series (1879–1927), 35, no. 12–14 (4 January 1913), pp. 81–85.

Kalenský, Boleslav. "Za Frant. Pivodou: Pohřební vzpomínka Boles. Kalenského," *Národní listy* 38, No. 22 (22 January 1898) [morning edition], p. [1].

[Klein, Hermann.] "Enthusiasts Interviewed: No. XVII.— 'Pann' Antonin Dvorak," by "Paul Pry" [= Hermann Klein], *Sunday Times* (London) No. 3,239 (10 May 1885), p. 6, cols. [5–6].

Kretschmann, Theobald. *Tempi passati: Aus der Erinnerungen eines Musikanten* (Vienna, Teschen, and Leipzig: Verlag von Karl Prochaska, 1910).

Krigar, Hermann. "Anton Dvořák: Eine biographische Skizze," *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* XI/1–2, XI/4, and XI/6–8 (26 December 1879 – 13 February 1880).

Kuba, Ludvík. "Naše besedy při Smetanově klavíru," *Venkov* 18, No. 124 (31 May 1923), pp. 2–4, here p. 3, col. [4].

Kuna, Milan et al., eds. *Antonín Dvořák, Correspondence and Documents: A Critical Edition.* Vol. 1 (Prague: Editio Supraphon, 1987. Vol. 3 (Prague: Editio Supraphon, 1989). Vol. 4 (Prague: Bärenreiter Editio Supraphon, 1995). Vol. 5 (Prague: Editio Supraphon, 1996), pp. 214 and 226.

Kuna, Milan. "Žádosti Bedřicha Smetany o umělecké stipendium," *Hudební věda* 25 (1988), No. 2, pp. 120–131.

Löwenbach, Jan. "Smetana contra Dvořák," *Čas* 25, 1911, no. 337 (6 December 1911), 5–6.

Martinec, František and Jaroška, J. *Almanah královského a zemsk. českého divadla v Praze na rok 1869* (listing performances in 1868) (Prague: self-published, 1869).

Masaryková, Alice G. *Hudba ve Spillville* (New York: Zprávy Společnosti pro vědy a umění, 1963).

Mojžíšová, Olga et al., eds. *Bedřich Smetana: Correspondence II (1863–1874)*, (Prague, Národní muzeum and KLP, 2020).

Mojžíšová, Olga et al., eds. *Bedřich Smetana: Correspondence III (1875–1879)* (Prague, Národní muzeum and KLP, 2023), pp. 587–588.

Mojžišová, Olga Mojžíšová and Pospíšil, Milan. "Bedřich Smetana 1863–1874," in *Bedřich Smetana: Correspondence II (1863–1874)*, (Prague, Národní muzeum and KLP, 2020), pp. *11–*34.

Nejedlý, Zdeněk. *Zdenko Fibich: Zakladatel scénického melodramatu* (Prague: Nákladem vlastním, Tiskem B. Outraty v Jičíně, 1901).

Nejedlý, Zdeněk. *Zpěvohry Smetanovy* (Prague: J. Otto, 1908).

[Novotný, Václav Juda.] "Česká zpěvohra," *Dalibor*, second series, 2, No. 49 (5 December 1874), pp. 389–90.

Novotný, Václav Juda. "Koncert skladatele Ant. Dvořáka," *Národní listy* [18], No. 269 (7 November 1878), p. [1].

Pečman, Rudolf. *Útok na Antonína Dvořáka* (Attack on Antonín Dvořák) (Brno: Filozofická fakulta Masarykovy univerzity, 1992).

Pich, Jindřich, et al. "(Zasláno.) Slavné družstvo král. zemského českého divadla v Praze!," *Národní listy* [12], No. 346 (15 December 1872), p. [3], cols. [3–4].

[Pivoda, František]. "Hudebním kruhům českým," *Národní listy* 24, No. 82 (22 March 1884), [morning edition], p. [3], col. [5], signed "P … da."

[Pivoda, František]. "Národ náš a otázka velkého, důstojného divadla (Dokončení)," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 5, No. 6 (5 February 1874), pp. [23]–25.

Pivoda, František. "Některé myšlenky o české opeře, jejím utvoření, rozkvětu, zachování a působení," *Osvěta* 2, No. 2 ([February] 1872), pp. 135–140.

Pivoda, František. "Palčivá otázka naší opery," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 5, No. 9 (26 February 1874), pp. 36–38.

[Pivoda František, probably]. "Z divadel," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 4, No. 36 (4 September 1873), p. 286, col. [1].

[Pivoda, František, probably]. "Z divadla," *Hudební listy* (Prague) 4, No. 33 (14 August 1873), p. 262, col. [1]

Pivoda, František. „Zimní saison na českém divadle II: Zpěvohra," *Osvěta* 2, No. 7 ([July] 1872), pp. 548–553.

[Procházka, Ludevít]. "Zpěvohra," *Národní listy* [14], No. 315 (17 November 1874), pp. [2–3].

Smaczny, Jan [and Ottlová, Marta]. "Daily Repertoire of the Provisional Theatre Opera in Prague: Chronological List," in *Miscellanea musicologica* 34 (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1994).

Suk, Josef. "Bedřich Smetana a Ant. Dvořák," in *Almanach na památku tisícího provedení Prodané nevěsty*, ed. Zdeněk Nejedlý (Prague, 1927), pp. 92–93, as reprinted in *Živá slova Josefa Suka*, ed. J. M. Květ (Prague: Topičova edice 1946),

Šupka, Ondřej. *Antonín Dvořák: Portrait Člověka* (Antonín Dvořák: A Portrait of the Man). (Prague: Akademie klasické hudby, 2025).

Teige, Karel. *Skladby Smetanovy: Kommentovaný katalog všech skladeb mistrových v chronologickém postupu* (Prague: Fr. A. Urbánek, 1893)

Manuscript Sources

Dvořák, Antonín. Inscription to František Pivoda in the Novello piano-vocal score of his *Stabat Materi*, print in the Prague Municipal Library under call number V 25918.

Kalenský, Boleslav. Unpublished second draft of "Antonín Dvořák, jeho mládí, příhody a vývoj k usamostatnění" (see above), in his papers in the Czech Museum of Music, box 7, here pp. 23–25.

Kalenský, Boleslav. Unpublished foreword dated 15 February 1910 to *Antonín Dvořák: Sborník statí o jeho díle a životě* [ed. Boleslav Kalenský] (Prague: Umělecká beseda, 1912), in his papers in the Czech Museum of Music, box 7.