

**Marija Golubović**  
Institute of Musicology  
Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts  
Belgrade, Serbia

UDC 78.071.1:929 Liszt F.  
78.071.1:929 Alkan C. V.  
doi: 10.5937/ZbAkU2008097G  
Scientific review

**Nikola Komatović**  
Independent Researcher  
Belgrade, Serbia

## **An Extrovert and a Misanthrope: Comparative Analysis of Virtuoso Aspects and the Impact of Personalities in Franz Liszt's Piano Concerto No. 1 in E-flat Major and Alkan's Concerto for Piano Solo<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract:** Franz Liszt's cosmopolitan spirit, extroverted character and philosophical approach to creation are fully evident in his compositions. In contrast, the opus of his close friend Charles-Valentin Alkan, the relatively neglected „Berlioz of the Piano“, shows the traces of his introverted and seemingly misanthropic temperament. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the solo concerto acquired new characteristics, reflected both in the performer's technique and in the general creative approach. It is generally known that Liszt's Piano Concerto No. 1 in E-Flat Major is an important evolutionary step forward in this genre, while Alkan's Concerto for Solo Piano represents a cross-genre hybrid of a kind.

In this paper we will attempt to answer the question whether it is possible to find common ground between these two extraordinary composers, and if so, determine what it is. In addition, we will try to identify the reciprocal influences between them, the existence of which might be inferred from the historical and biographical data.

**Keywords:** Piano concerto, Charles-Valentin Alkan, Franz Liszt, Virtuosity, Romanticism.

---

<sup>1</sup> An early version of this paper was read at the Royal Musical Association Research Student Conference on January 9, 2015.

### Introduction

Romanticism in music was one of the most chronologically diffused stylistic periods: the earliest representatives of this style were born in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, while the youngest died in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. However, if all stylistic characteristics of this era were to be summarized in individual persons, Franz Liszt and Charles-Valentin Alkan (along with a handful of other composers) would provide a representative section of these trends – so similar yet so different. A possible key for understanding this problem is offered in Alfred Einstein's book *Music in the Romantic Era*, which describes the 19<sup>th</sup> century as an era of „antitheses“, albeit not necessarily of opposites: a peculiar unity of the seemingly irreconcilable: the theatrical and the intimate, the subjective and the objective, the obvious and the mystical, the absolute and the programmatic. Thus, for example, we say Wagner *and* Verdi, although they are usually seen as different artists, but these are differences that build on each other (Einstein 1992: 4-6). Following this logic, Romanticism and the 19<sup>th</sup> century are nothing but the culmination of centuries-old aspirations, which were indeed revolutionary in terms of the means they used, but were aesthetically part of a belated evolution. Even 19<sup>th</sup>-century authors interpret this style as the continuation of a natural evolution that had begun earlier.

Thus, for example, when Eduard Hanslick (1825–1904) published his *Geschichte des Concertwesens in Wien* [History of Concert Life in Vienna] in 1869, he divided this period into four phases: „Patriarchal period“ (1750-1800), „Associations of dilettantes“ (1800-1830), „Virtuoso era“ (1830-1848) and „Associations of artists“ (1848-1868). In his opinion, it was precisely the year of 1830, when the Virtuoso era started, that was particularly important for the Parisian musical life. On July 30, the July or the Second French Revolution broke out, as a result of which the bourgeoisie gained political power. The musical climate of the time was filled with the spirit of rebellion and romanticism, and virtuoso pianists were in hot demand (Hanslick, 1869: XI). That generation of Paris-based pianists, lead by Franz Liszt (1811-1886), included pianists such as Frederick Chopin (1810-1849), Charles-Valentin Alkan (1813-1888), Charles Hallé (1819-1895), as well as their somewhat older colleagues, such as André George Louis Onslow (1784-1853), Friedrich Wilhelm Michael Kalkbrenner (1785-1849) and Pierre-Joseph-Guillaume Zimmermann (1785-1853)<sup>2</sup>.

There is probably no better indication of the different characters of these two creators and contemporaries than a description of two „incidents“ from their lives.

In 1845, Franz Liszt read several extremely harsh reviews of the oratorio *Ruth*, which was written by his younger colleague César Franck (1822-1890). These reviews further complicated Franck's material circumstances. It did not take Liszt long to decide

<sup>2</sup> On a sidenote, Hanslick's dominantly negative opinion of Liszt's works is well known, as most clearly attested by his seminal work *Der Musikalisch-Schönen* [On the Musically Beautiful] (Hanslik, 1977: 96).

what course of action to take: he promptly dispatched a number of letters to his other influential colleagues, urging them to intercede with the French nobility on Franck's behalf to ensure more performance opportunities for the young composer, claiming in a polite tone that the critics were not truthful about Franck's music, which he himself described as „truly wonderful“ (Fauquet, 1999: 185-186).

The second incident, from 1880, illustrates how Professor Frederick Niecks (1845-1924) tried to become acquainted with Charles-Valentin Alkan. At the door of Alkan's mansion, his concierge curtly replied that the composer was not at home. When asked when he could be found at home, Niecks received the answer „Never“ (Smith, 2000: I, 70)<sup>3</sup>.

What was the spirit of the time that made it possible for these two seemingly completely different personalities to emerge from the same artistic circle?

### *Liszt's and Alkan's mutual relationship and possible reciprocal impacts*

In order to analyze the style of two remarkable pianists with completely different characters, first we would like to review and compare their possible reciprocal impacts. As illustrated by the examples at the beginning of this presentation, Liszt was a benefactor and an extrovert, while Alkan was a mysterious enigmatic person. Later in life Alkan became a genuine misanthrope, who condemned himself to voluntary seclusion, choosing not to appear in public and to avoid visitors. It is hard to say whether at first that was the spirit of the time or just his romantic streak.

Alkan's biographers speculate that disappointment contributed to this state of affairs: Daniel François Esprit Auber (1782-1871), the head of the Conservatoire, decided not to appoint him as head of the Conservatoire piano department, opting instead for an allegedly less talented Zimmermann's student Antoine François Marmontel (1816-1898), although in his monograph *Les pianists celebres* Marmontel himself describes him as a maestro, a doyen of the French school and an original, intriguing and enigmatic artist (Marmontel, 1878: 118). In addition, he was deeply affected by the death of his close friend Frédéric Chopin in 1849, after which in 1853 he withdrew from public life for almost two decades. Due to many unknown details about the composer's life, it is impossible to ascertain which event served as the trigger for his seclusion, but according to Smotrov there were two possible reasons. The first is the birth of his illegitimate son, Elie Miriam Delaborde (1839-1913), who went on to become a pianist and teacher at the Conservatoire de Paris, especially in view of the fact that Alkan came from a deeply religious Jewish family. The other possible reason could have been the

<sup>3</sup> For the sake of academic honesty, it should be noted that a meeting between Alkan and Niecks did take place a few days later; it was described by the latter as „not merely polite but most friendly“ (Smith, 2000: I, 71).

death of an unidentified lover mentioned in one of Alkan's letters (Smotrov, 2019: 36). Since his isolation period – during which Alkan, among other things, translated the Old and New Testament into French – coincided with reformationist tendencies in Judaism in France, his withdrawal could have also been driven by religious motives (Conway, 2003: 6; Conway, 2011: 231). In contrast, Liszt was a true cosmopolitan, constantly in touch with various distinguished artists of his time, such as Chopin, Hiller, Delacroix, Hugo, Berlioz, Lamartine, Heine etc., drawing his inspiration from them (Rimm, 2002: 23). He was such a powerful and influential figure that he has been described as a famous virtuoso of European renown, a superstar and idol of the era (Hilmes 2016), whose virtuosity, according to Rellstab, was not exhausted in technical mastery but inextricably tied to his personality and intellect (Keiler 2006: 338).

Liszt truly appreciated Alkan, which can be inferred from the fact that he told the Danish pianist Frits Hartvigson (1814-1919) that Alkan had the finest technique he had ever heard, but he preferred to live in seclusion (Walker, 1987: 187). Later in life, Alkan used to mention the influence of the young Liszt on his composition style. When in 1836 Liszt, who was working as a piano teacher at the newly founded Geneva Conservatory, was looking for an assistant, he offered the job to Alkan. Although Alkan declined this post, this certainly contributed to their mutual sense of respect, and later on, Liszt always managed to find the time to visit his French colleague whenever he came to Paris. Another thing that they have in common is that they both abandoned the lifestyle of travelling virtuosi relatively early, only to become fully fledged composers.

### *The new context of virtuosity in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the selected works*

The concept of virtuosity evolved through the Baroque era and acquired a completely different connotation in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in comparison to the one it had had before. To paraphrase Matej Santi, in the 18<sup>th</sup> century a virtuoso was a highly competent artist, who had mastery of all aspects of his work, including both the intellectual and technical features (Santi, 2013:56). As Carl Dahlhaus notes, in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, however, this concept acquired completely different paradigmatic characteristics, which all boil down to the interpretive aspect: the dominance of interpretation takes over the preceding dominance of virtuosity as a broader category (Dahlhaus, 1980: 114). Franz Liszt was the first performer who started giving solo concerts or recitals, as testified by his letter to Princess Belgiojoso after a concert in Rome towards the end of March 1839 (Šobajić, 2001: 100). Because of the way he conceived his concert programs (his concerts increasingly featured other composers' works), we can safely call him the first modern pianist-interpreter. He breaks up with the tradition of *stile brillante*, whose representatives include Ignaz Moscheles (1794–1870), Carl Maria Friedrich Ernst von Weber (1786-1826) and other pianists of the previous

generation, which might have contributed to the fact that the widespread criticism of a certain mechanical quality of pianistic virtuosity did not apply to him. In Liszt's view, virtuosity is necessary insofar as it enables the artist to reproduce what art itself attempts to convey. With that aim, it is unavoidable, and indispensable. For him as a concert pianist virtuosity was a must, but he was also aware that virtuosity could easily corrupt, distort or impair a piece of artistic work if it is established as the principal goal, rather than an interpretation of the composer's idea (Šobajić, 2001: 108).

While comparing this interesting historical and biographical data, we were intrigued to explore how the different characters of these two contemporaries and close acquaintances were reflected on the most important aspect of their opus, i.e. on virtuosity itself. The interweaving of styles and genres is customary for a number of 19<sup>th</sup>-century composers, and in Alkan's case, it is particularly manifest in his *Etudes*, Op. 39, containing *Concerto for Piano Solo* (Etudes 8–10), *Symphony for Solo Piano* (Etudes 4–7) and *Overture* (Etude 11), all of which are characterized by a magnificent orchestral texture. For the purposes of this paper we have chosen Liszt's *Piano Concerto No. 1 in E-flat major* and Alkan's so-called *Concerto for Piano Solo*, from *12 Studies in the Minor Keys*, Op. 39. Although at face value we are dealing with two different genres (a genuine piano concerto vs. three etudes), there are sufficient reasons to draw parallels between these compositions.

One of them is, for instance, the use of markings typical for the orchestra in Alkan's composition. In his *Concerto for Piano Solo* the word „tutti“ appears at the beginning of the first movement and in another few places in the composition, as does the indication „quasi solo“, „quasi celli“, etc. According to MacDonald, these markings are not guidelines for a possible orchestration of the *Concerto*; instead their aim is to challenge the performer as much as possible. Furthermore, this author proposes that this hybrid could have emerged because of Alkan's failure to attract a wider audience, which would have probably allowed him to perform with a real orchestra, and in this finds the link between the composer's personality and musical style:

„How misanthropic to write a piano concerto and give the orchestral part to the soloist as well! But the benefit was a remarkable musical experiment that stretches the resources of the piano beyond itself into the domain of orchestral music. When Alkan wished to compose a quartet or a song or a hymn or a concerto, he composed a work for piano. All the energy that other composers might have devoted to composing for the instrument or voice they had in mind was channelled in Alkan's case towards expanding the piano's expressive language.“ (MacDonald, 2008: 64)

Similarly, Lindeman is also of the opinion that, generally, Alkan's works reflect his highly original and distinctive personality (Lindeman, 1999: 113).

Both pianists have very distinct interpretative styles, but nonetheless, certain parallels can be found. To quote Irving:

„This new tradition of composing concertos in order to exploit a superior instrumental technique was one which soon gained detractors in the theoretical establishment. Indeed, the plethora of ‘formalist’ writings that emerged in the generation after Beethoven’s death (for instance, by Czerny and A. B. Marx) might be interpreted in part as an attempt to reclaim the ‘moral high ground’ for formalism in the face of virtuosity’s remarkable success, personified above all by Alkan, Liszt and Paganini.“ (Irving 2004: 195–196)

What is typical of both is the orchestral sound in their piano compositions, something they inherited from their illustrious predecessor Beethoven. This can best be seen in the thickness and complexity of texture in these works, as well as in the use of the whole piano range. Robert Rimm believes that Liszt took a number of compositional and technical procedures from Alkan (Rimm, 2002: 21). We shall attempt to give a short overview of the style characteristics of these two pianists and composers.

Alkan’s pianistic style can safely be called more Classicistic than Liszt’s, whose style is exceptionally progressive. The very layout of Alkan’s text looks neater. In Alkan’s work *stile brillante* is still present, as well as the technique *jeuperlé*, which Liszt successfully abandoned, escaping virtuosity criticism. While with Alkan this texture builds large segments (some of which are several pages long), Liszt uses such passages as short quasi-cadenzas.



Example 1a. Alkan’s *Concerto for Piano Solo* – 1<sup>st</sup> mov (Etude Op. 39 No. 8): *stile brillante*



**Example 1b. Liszt's *Piano Concerto in E-flat major*: stile brillante**

The orchestral quality of sound can also be seen in the way they treat passages in arpeggiated chords, where they visually suggest the harp: Liszt even used the marking „quasi arpa“.



**Example 2a. Alkan's *Concerto for Piano Solo* – 1<sup>st</sup> mov (Etude Op. 39 No. 8): arpeggiated chords**



**Example 2b– Liszt's *Piano concerto in E-flat major*: arpeggiated chords**

Since we are talking about two composers that belong to the Romantic Period, it goes without saying that they were not adverse to lyrical moments, but they express them differently: Liszt's second movement begins with a long, sung, Belliniesque melody, but Alkan's phrases are shorter, more ornate and under the influence of Chopin, both with the melody with arpeggiated accompaniment and with the block-chord texture with the melody in the upper voice that stands out.





Example 3a. Alkan's *Concerto for Piano Solo* – 1<sup>st</sup> mov (Etude Op. 39 No. 8): lyric elements



Example 3b. Liszt's *Piano Concerto in E-flat major*: lyric elements

In Liszt's work we can find a figuration that visually bears semblance to Alberti bass, but where the two lines are clearly separated, while Alkan stays true to its Classicistic form.



Example 4a. Alkan's *Concerto for Piano Solo* – 1<sup>st</sup> mov (Etude Op. 39 No. 8): Alberti bass





Example 4b. Liszt's *Piano Concerto in E-flat major*: quasi Alberti bass

Alkan's toccata moments, present in both allegro (brisk) movements, the first and the third, raise some interest as well, as they are repeated several times in the course of the *Concerto* and are at times of considerable length. In Alkan's work motoric „toccata“ complexes can be found in several variants depending on the used element of piano technique: 1) chords and single-tone lines; 2) alternating double octaves/bi-tones; 3) chords.



Example 5a. Alkan's *Concerto for Piano Solo* – 3<sup>rd</sup> mov (Etude Op. 39 No. 10): toccata moments



**Example 5b. Liszt's *Piano Concerto in E-flat major*: toccata moments**

On the other hand, as illustrated in the example 5b, Liszt adhered to a short segment, which is a variation of the opening theme in the 4<sup>th</sup> movement, or the transformation of the theme in the 2<sup>nd</sup> movement. The distinctive melody of the main theme now appears in the highest segment, accompanied by a toccata feature before the earlier hymn-like orchestra response gets „broken up“ by a passage and skilfully moved to the left hand segment.

Similarities and parallels in these composers' styles can be found according to Liszt's concept known today as *the method of technical variants*. In his opinion, the texture of pianistic music as a whole can in essence be seen as „a small number of patterns that are key to everything“. Liszt's „key to everything“ lies in technical formulas. They contain one or two elements of the pianistic technique, which are then combined differently. In order to illustrate this method, we shall give an example from each of the compositions that illustrate a combination of an arpeggiated chord and double notes, where the upper tones in the double notes carry the melody.

#### *Similarities with regard to virtuosity, harmony, form and genre*

Alkan's notions of tonal structure are indicative, with an unstable tonality within a form. This composer undoubtedly lags behind Liszt regarding compositional technique: his ideas are frequently straightforward, his harmonic language and modulation technique are not always subtle and diverse, but resemble textbook formulaic patterns, his melodies are consistent with the general characteristics of the Romantic Movement, his pianistic texture is often gloomy – it is rough and unrefined. This „imperfect“ music does, however, possess a certain inexplicable attraction and some whimsical charm.

It is well-known that in his *Piano Concerto No. 1* Liszt combines the sonata form and the sonata cycle. What is more, the piece is governed by the monothematic principle, according to which all thematic material is more or less derived from the initial motif.

Although this „economical“ approach to the use of thematic material is present in Alkan's *Concerto for Piano Solo* as well, it is a significantly more traditional form, with a clear sonata principle in the first and third movements, while the second movement is conceived as a song form.

We should keep in mind, however, that from a formal point of view Liszt's *Concerto* is a piece in which all movements are tied into one whole, while on the other hand Alkan's *Concerto* is comprised of three separate compositions that are nonetheless unimaginable out of the three-movement cycle.

Another unusual fact about Alkan's Etude Concerto is a great disproportion in regard to the movement length: the 1<sup>st</sup> movement is at least twice as long as the remaining two movements together (!). It is noteworthy that the number of bars in the 1<sup>st</sup> movement of this *Concerto* alone exceeds the number of bars in the whole Beethoven's *Hammerklavier* Sonata Op. 106, which is generally considered one of the longest pieces in pianistic literature.

When it comes to instrumentation, there is one conspicuous difference between the two: Liszt's *Concerto* includes, as expected, the orchestral medium, while Alkan's *Concerto*, as its very name suggests, is written for a solo piano. Consequently, Alkan gains a key advantage in terms of pianistic technique: he indicates in the score itself for which orchestral instrument certain segments are intended.

While this is perfectly clear in the orchestral solo exposition phase, throughout the movement the „orchestral“ and the „piano“ part are very skilfully alternated and intertwined. This requires a high mastery level from the performer. Alkan's love of the orchestral medium has been associated with his personal appreciation of Hector Berlioz (1803-1869) and particularly the latter's *Treatise on Instrumentation* (*Grand traité d'instrumentation et d'orchestration modernes*, 1844) (Schilling, 1987: 41). However, according to the data available to us, there is no evidence that Alkan wished to orchestrate this piece, although some other composers did that, even during his lifetime. One of the better known examples was the German composer and virtuoso pianist Karl Klindworth (1830-1916), whose work on an orchestration of the *Concerto* attracted Alkan's interest (Schilling, 1987: 41).<sup>4</sup>

Coupled with the already complex Romantic pianistic technique, the fact that the orchestra and the soloist are merged into one medium seems to be the additional reason why this piece was considered to be exceptionally challenging for performers, and why it was not until 1969, more than a century after it had been written, that it was recorded for the first time by John Ogdon, and it is questionable whether Alkan himself had ever performed it.

Apart from being quite virtuoso in style, a significant characteristic of Liszt's *Concerto* is its impeccable orchestration. All composers from the Parisian circle

---

<sup>4</sup> A contributing factor might have been the involvement of the famous German conductor Hans von Bülow (1830-1894), who had access to Alkan's salon and also regularly communicated with Klindworth (Schilling, 1987, 41).

assigned a more or less secondary role to the orchestra, but Liszt treats both mediums virtually equally, with the orchestral timbre and technique approaching the quality found in symphonies and symphonic poems. The reason for this lies in the fact that Liszt had extensive experience in writing symphonic music, whereas his colleagues from the same circle were not well versed in that genre.

*Differences within the same aspects. Influence of the personal character perhaps?*

Another issue that needs addressing is whether and to what extent different characters of these two composers influenced their work, in accordance with their contemporary life circumstances, the aforementioned biographical data, the general spirit of the time and similar technical aspects in their work.

Although this approach leaves ample space for the implementation of a, for instance, „full-blooded“ hermeneutical analysis, we will only highlight a few obvious facts about this question. First, the understanding of Romanticism as a „multipolar“ era opens the possibility for an in-depth analysis of Liszt and Alkan as contemporaries of similar understandings regarding genre, instrumentalization and, most importantly, virtuosity, and yet artists of very different personal characters.

Probably the key thing that enables us to draw a parallel – apart from the closeness of genre – is the year in which the two concertos appeared (1857). At that time, Alkan had already withdrawn from the public eye and was starting to sink into misanthropy. Liszt was still working as a Kapellmeister and piano tutor in Weimar (before retreating to a monastery), thus remaining in contact with a wide array of various artists. The fact that Liszt's *Concerto* is orchestrated according to the dominant trend at the time stands witness to this.

On the other hand, Alkan obviously stopped keeping up with the contemporary music life and dedicated himself to the independent exploration of the pianistic sound. He was able to sense where his life had been heading for and he realized that he had no power to change it. Admitting to his desperation, he wrote in 1861: „I'm becoming daily more and more misanthropic and misogynous...nothing worthwhile, good, or useful to do...no one to devote myself to. My situation makes me horribly sad and wretched. Even musical production has lost its attraction for me for I can't see the point or goal“ (Rimm, 2002: 23).

Such a lifestyle and musical practices may have resulted in his personal technical perfectionism, but on the other hand, the fact that he wrote an Etude Cycle which lasts for approximately two hours (while Liszt's *Transcendental Etudes* as a whole last for about sixty five minutes) and which was performed only occasionally due to its

technical complexity implies that his absence from the scene largely contributed to the creation of his *Concerto for Piano Solo*.

### Conclusion

Finally a rather logical question arises: how is it possible that two men who were almost polar opposites in terms of their personalities and lifestyles wrote exceptionally virtuoso works that represent the very apex of 19<sup>th</sup>-century pianism? Let us recall the well-known fact that Romanticism is full of names of different artists who strayed into extremes: some led extravagant lives (such as Lord Byron), while others were in many aspects reminiscent of monks.

In this regard, Franz Liszt was probably a rare exception that ventured into both extremes.

As for Alkan, some biographical comparisons place this composer into the same category as his other great contemporary and friend: César Franck, with whom he shared philosophical and esthetical views (Fauquet, 1999: 355).<sup>5</sup> Generally speaking, the artist's need for self-isolation transcends the Romantic era: a pertinent example is Ljubica Marić (1909-2003), a 20<sup>th</sup>-century Serbian composer who went through a period of „creative silence“ in the 1950s, which subsequently had a highly beneficial effect on her later work.

Since Liszt and Alkan worked in a period that was itself characterized by extraordinary virtuosity, it seems logical that both composers wrote technically highly complex works. However, while in Alkan's case his extreme virtuosity seems to have been the result of withdrawing from the world and an escape from reality (the first movement of the *Concerto* demands almost superhuman piano skills from the performer), for Liszt virtuosity was a very natural path, a trait of his time that allowed him to leave a deep mark not only in the pianism of the 19<sup>th</sup> century but in its entire history. It is in this way that the perception of these two very different yet creatively close artists as polar opposites (misanthrope – extrovert) arises, which again corresponds to Einstein's understanding of Romantic polarities.

Liszt's *Concerto* conveys openness to new ideas, willingness to explore a new sound, and supreme technical skills typical of this composer, all of which proves that this is one of the most significant works of this type ever. On the other hand, Alkan's reservation and high individuality perceptible in the pianistic technique, form and genre illustrate that the years of absence from public life significantly contributed to

---

<sup>5</sup> It is interesting that he was persuaded to return to the scene by his close friend Franz Liszt, while he dedicated one of his first works after that – *Grande Pièce Symphonique* – to none other than Alkan (Fauquet, 1999:354).

the creation of compositions from this period. The fact that they are seldom performed even today because of their challenging technical demands clearly shows how seclusion from public life can be conducive to the development of a highly personal style.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Burnstein, L. Poundie. 2006. „*Les chansons des fous: On the Edge of Madness with Alkan*“ In: N. Lerner and J. N. Straus (eds.) *Sounding Off: Theorizing Disability in Music*. Routledge.
2. Conway, David. 2003. *Alkan and his Jewish Roots (Part 2 – Alkan and Judaism)*. Alkan Society Bulletin No. 62, 2- 11.
3. Conway, David. 2011. *Jewry in Music: Entry to the Profession from the Enlightenment to Richard Wagner*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Dalhaus, Carl. 1980. *Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Laaber: Laaber Verlag.
5. Einstein, Alfred. 1947. *Music in the Romantic Era*. New York: Norton.
6. Fauquet, Joël-Marie. 1999. *César Franck*. Paris: Fayard.
7. Hanslick, Eduard. 1869. *Geschichte des Concertwesens in Wien*. Wien: W. Braumüller.
8. Hanslik, Eduard. 1977. *O muzički lijepom*. Beograd: BIGZ.
9. Hilmes, Oliver. 2016. *Franz Liszt: Musician, Celebrity, Superstar*. New Haven-London: Yale University Press.
10. Irving, John. 2004. „The invention of tradition“, In: J. Samson (ed.): *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth Century Music*. Cambridge University Press.
11. Keiler, Allan. 2006. „Ludwig Rellstab's Biographical Sketch of Liszt“, In: C. H. Gibbs, D. Gooley (ed.): *Franz Liszt and His World*. Princeton-Oxford: Princeton University Press, 335 – 360.
12. Lindeman, Stephen D. 1999. *Structural Novelty and Tradition in the Early Romantic Piano Concerto*. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press.
13. MacDonald, Hugh. 2008. *Beethoven's Century. Essays on Composes and Themes*. NY: University of Rochester Press.
14. Marmontel, Antoine-François. 1878. *Les pianistes célèbres*. Paris: Heugel et fils.
15. Rimm, Robert. 2002. *The Composer-Pianists: Hamelin and The Eight*. Portland, Oregon: Amadeus Press.
16. Santi, Matej. 2013. „Geigerische Virtuosität im Raum“, In: P. Boenke, C.S. Knotik (ed.): *Virtuosität*. Vienna: Mille Tre Verlag.
17. Schilling, Britta. 1987. „Charles Valentin Alkan: un solitaire dans le Romantisme français“, in: *Romantisme: Revue du dix-neuvième siècle*. Paris: CDU-SEDES.
18. Smith, Ronald. 2000. *Alkan: The Man, the Music*. (2 vols. in one). London: Kahn & Averill.
19. Смотров, Вениамин Егорович. 2019. *Шарль Валантен Алькан* (диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата искусствоведения), <http://sias.ru/upload/ds-smotrov/disser-smotrov.pdf> (14.04.2020)
20. Šobajić, Dragoljub-Dragan. 2001. *Franc List: stvaralac i izvođač*. Beograd: Fakultet muzičke umetnosti.
21. Walker, Alan. 1987. *Franz Liszt: The virtuoso years, 1811 – 1847*. Cornell University Press.



**Ekstrovert i mizantrop: komparativna analiza virtuoznih aspekata i uticaja ličnosti u „Klaviromskom knocertu br. 1“ u Es-duru Franca Lista i Alkanovog „Koncerta za solo klavir“<sup>6</sup>**

**Apstrakt:** Kosmopolitski duh Franca Lista, ekstrovertnost i filozofski pristup stvaranju, u potpunosti su vidljivi u njegovim kompozicijama. Suprotno tome, opus njegovog bliskog prijatelja Šarla-Valentina Alkana, relativno zanemarenog „Berlioza klavira“, pokazuje tragove njegovog introvertnog i naizgled mizantropskog temperamenta. U 19. veku, forma koncerta je stekla nove karakteristike koje su se ogledale u tehnici izvođača, kao i u opštem kreativnom pristupu. Opšte je poznato da je Listov „Koncert za klavir br. 1“ u Es-duru važan evolutivni iskorak u ovom žanru, dok Alkanov „Koncert za solo klavir“ predstavlja svojevrсни žanrovski hibrid. Ovaj rad će pokušati da odgovori na pitanje da li je moguće naći dodirne tačke između ova dva izvanredna kompozitora i, ako je tako, utvrditi ih. Pored toga, pokušaće se prepoznati njihovi međusobni uticaji, o kojima se može zaključiti iz istorijskih i biografskih podataka.

**Ključne reči:** klavirski koncert, Šarl-Valentin Alkan, Franc List, virtuoznost, romantizam.

---

6 Rana verzija ovo grada je pročitana na Studentskoj istraživačkoj konferenciji *Kraljevskog muzičkog udruženja* 9. januara 2015. godine.