Digression I
Straddling Cultures: Pierson

In England, a largely conservative approach to music manifested itself in the predominance, in the first half of the nineteenth century, of oratorios in the tradition of Georg Friedrich Händel and, more recently, of Felix Mendelssohn. The former moved permanently to London in 1712, where his operas and, somewhat later, his oratorios achieved unprecedented popularity; the latter traveled altogether ten times to Britain where he was acclaimed as both a pianist and composer. Mendelssohn conducted his *Paulus* at the Birmingham Triennial Music Festival in 1837, and his *Elias* was performed for the first time under his direction at the same festival in 1846.

There was nevertheless a sense in Britain that "we *export* as well as *import* men of genius."[1] The remark was made with reference to Henry Hugh Pierson, an English composer who—an "export" from Britain—had resided in Germany since 1839, where he enjoyed a successful career. In 1852—as an extremely controversial (re-)"import"—Pierson's innovative sacred oratorio *Jerusalem*, the first of whose three parts encompassed the sack of the city by Titus, was first publicly performed at the Norwich Festival.

Yet although the oratorio was apparently composed in the latter years of the 1840s mostly in Germany, its place is not with those previously discussed: neither is its textual basis—completely taken from the Bible by William Sancroft Holmes—similar to that of the other oratorios produced in this country, nor does it appear to have originated in conversation with Kaulbach's painting, though it is more than likely that the composer, well-connected among artistic circles in Germany, was aware of it.

Pierson's *Jerusalem* is nevertheless significant to this discussion because it straddles the English and German traditions. Whereas its music has been described as following the recent model of progressive German music, its libretto was firmly anchored in the English tradition of engaging with the destruction of Jerusalem. In this tradition the historical occurrence was re-configured—much more strictly than in Germany—as an eschatological event. It was, moreover, typically contextualized with the notion of the succession of empires and their transition from secular to sacred as well as the apocalyptic vision of the New Jerusalem and the Last Judgment. These were conceived as further manifestations of the same eschatological trajectory.

1 Anonymous, "The Tenth Music Festival," *The Norfolk News* 404 (September 25, 1852): 2–3, 3.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111662954-003

The Perils of German Progressive Music: Pierson's *Jerusalem* in Norwich

Known in Germany as Henry Hugo Pierson (1815–73), or otherwise by his pseudonym Edgar Mansfeldt,[2] the composer—styled by Nicholas Temperley "one of the most original English composers of any period"[3]—was apparently disgruntled with the lack of recognition musical practitioners were given in England at the time. In Germany, in contrast, he experienced an uncommon degree of appreciation. The composer himself claimed that his "works and reputation [were] being well and honourably known all over Germany, the very land of music."[4] Even so, Pierson appears to have had some influential supporters also in his native England, and his oratorio *Jerusalem* was commissioned for the Norwich Festival of 1852. The Festival had been postponed from the previous year because of the Great Exhibition of 1851 and Pierson's *Jerusalem* was performed in private in Norwich already in April 1852.[5] Described by Temperley as a "heroic effort to overcome English prejudices,"[6] the oratorio nevertheless appears to have failed in this regard.

While *Jerusalem* gained the acclaim of the Festival audience and most of the local press, prevalent critical opinion appears to have been strongly biased against the composer and his work. As Robin H. Legge and W. E. Hansell noted in their annals of the Norwich Festival: "Probably no work by an English composer ever called forth so much condemnatory language from the critics."[7] Indeed, the critic for the *Norwich Mercury* maintained that "the very mention" of Pierson's *Jerusalem* suggested "the notion of a dreadful nightmare" and alleged that recollection of the four-and-a-half-hour performance produced "instinctive horror" in the musicians involved in it.[8]

---

2 Pierson borrowed the pseudonym of Edgar Mansfeldt (also Mansfeld) from his German wife's relations, in response to the wish of his father—at the time a high-placed cleric in the Anglican Church—that he should adopt another name if ever he were to compose operatic music, see Robin H. Legge and W. E. Hansell, *Annals of the Norfolk and Norwich Triennial Music Festivals. MDCCCXXIV: MDCCCXCII* (London: Jarrold, 1896), p. 135.

3 Nicholas Temperley, "Henry Hugo Pierson, 1815–73. 1," *The Musical Times* 114.1570 (December 1973): 1217–20, 1219.

4 Legge and Hansell, *Annals*, p. 142.

5 See ibid., p. 136.

6 Temperley, "Henry Hugo Pierson, 1815–73. 1," 1219.

7 Legge and Hansell, *Annals*, p. 138.

8 Anonymous, "Norwich Musical Festival," *Supplement to the Norwich Mercury* (September 25, 1852): 5–6, 6.

The leading conservative critic James William Davison, scenting favoritism, suggested that the oratorio had been accepted by the Festival committee only in deference to "a very influential patron."[9] Henry Fothergill Chorley, a critic of similar authority, alleged moreover that

> more than ordinary pains have been taken to excite interest and bespeak favour in behalf of the work and of its author. Every machine by which it is thought possible to make a reputation has been put in motion.[10]

Chorely noted derisively that, as one of those "machines,"

> a pamphlet was circulated of analysis and preparation, intended by many high assumptions, conveyed in graceful and transcendental phrases, to give the cue to sympathy, and to prepare the world for the appearance of a new and poetical genius.[11]

The critic presumably refers to the pseudonymously published *A Descriptive Analysis of "Jerusalem"* (1852),[12] whose author—presenting himself as "Amicus Patriæ"—seeks to justify the innovative approach of the composer. The pamphlet, in which Pierson in all likelihood had a hand, is in effect a lengthy application to his oratorio of the sentiment quoted in its epigraph from the Reverend Frederick W. Robertson's *Two Lectures on the Influence of Poetry on the Working Classes* (1852):

> Let old forms and time-honoured words perish with due honor [*sic*], and give us fresh symbols and new forms of speech to express not what our fathers felt, but what *we* feel.[13]

The insistence on finding forms of artistic expression in keeping with the times signifies a clear rejection of the traditional oratorio which is motivated with the notion of progress, but which also recognizes the need for adequate self-expression as essential to humanity.

---

9 [James William Davison], "The Norwich Musical Festival," *The Musical World* 30.40 (October 2, 1852): 626–32, 632.

10 [Henry Fothergill Chorley], "The Norwich Festival," *Athenæum* 297.1300 (September 25, 1852): 1038–39, 1039.

11 Ibid.

12 Amicus Patriæ, *A Descriptive Analysis of "Jerusalem," A Sacred Oratorio* (Norwich: Bacon and Kinnebrook, [1852]).

13 Ibid., p. [3]; see also Frederick W. Robertson, *Two Lectures on the Influence of Poetry on the Working Classes* (Brighton: King, 1852), p. 59; emphasis added by Amicus Patriæ. The epigraph suggests that in a musical sense the "fathers," presumably Händel and Mendelssohn, should also be overcome.

Despite all these efforts, Chorley judged that Pierson, "[h]owever ambitious he may write, [. . .] must be content to be little heard and less admired."[14] The conservative critic described Pierson's music as "crude, puerile and uncouth," though he conceded that "the general sound is sometimes vigorous and brilliant."[15] Chorley nevertheless insisted that he was "fatigued by pretensions" and "balked by flagrant and needless eccentricities."[16] Less venomously phrased but just as damaging was Davison's observation in the *Times*, and reiterated in the *Musical World*, that

> *Jerusalem* is the work of a musician who thinks for himself, and does not borrow from or imitate others, and whose strivings after originality, if not resulting in success, the cause must be attributed to imperfect scholarship and a mistaken view of the true und unchangeable principles of art.[17]

Pierson's independence of thought, apparently an abomination to Davison, was described by the pseudonymous critic Vernon in the *Musical World* instead as "the characteristic generally of greatness."[18] And yet, further elaborating the image of Pierson as wayward and dangerously iconoclastic, Davison noted in the same journal with some disdain that the composer

> belongs to the "word-painting" school, or the "aesthetic," as the admirers of Richard Wagner, Robert Schumann, &c. have dubbed it. We much regret, however, to find a man who evidently thinks seriously and writes con amore giving himself to a false idol, which, if worshipped universally, music would soon cease to be an art.[19]

The association of Pierson with progressive German music was clearly intended to taint him and his work and ultimately to cast both as foreign. The critic for the London *Morning Post* accordingly advised Pierson "to avoid as pestilential the sophistical theories of the modern German and French visionaries."[20]

In his largely positive review, once again in *The Musical Times*, George Alexander Macfarren, too, acknowledged that Pierson's oratorio "is not without example in some works of German authors unknown in this country."[21] Yet Macfarren

14 [Chorley], "Norwich Festival," 1039.

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.

17 [James William Davison], "The Norwich Music Festival," *The Times* 21230 (September 25, 1852): 8; see also [Davison], "Norwich Musical Festival," 630.

18 Vernon, "The Norwich Festival," *The Musical Times* 5.101 (October 1, 1852): 75–6, 75.

19 [Davison], "Norwich Musical Festival," 628.

20 Anonymous, "Norwich Musical Festival," *The Morning Post* 24575 (September 25, 1852): 5.

21 G[eorge] A[lexander] Macfarren, "Jerusalem, An Oratorio by Henry Hugh Pierson," *The Musical Times* 5.100 (September 1, 1852): 51–54 and 59, 52.

in the same review also challenged "the supposed necessity to imitate Handel in Oratorio-writing"[22] which ultimately prompted Davison's and Chorley's categorical rejection of the composer. The latter, for instance, censured Pierson's perceived audacity by emphasizing that *Jerusalem* includes "a 'Hallelujah' in which Dr. Pierson has not shrunk from direct competition with Handel."[23] Yet the Norwich audience of *Jerusalem* rising to the "joyous strain" of Pierson's "Hallelujah,"[24] a practice otherwise reserved for Händel's eponymous work, suggests that the modern composer at least did not fail the "direct competition" in the appreciation of the lay public.[25] Macfarren, too, insisted that Pierson "is entitled to the support of his countrymen, who can only be honoured in his success."[26]

Implicitly explaining his choice of pseudonym, the author of *A Descriptive Analysis of "Jerusalem"* went even further and hailed in Pierson "a light which promises the dawn of a new day for English music."[27] The "friend of the fatherland" castigates English complacency and prejudices in musical matters even as he asserts the composer's English origins and submits his oratorio to public approval:

> His [i.e., Pierson's] elementary instruction was obtained from good English masters, his subsequent career has been one of individual study and observation, and now having grasped all the varied resources that the present state of his art places at his command, he comes before his countrymen from a distant land (where his power is already acknowledged) earnestly and fearlessly obeying the promptings of his own spirit, quietly defying the prejudice which, it must be confessed, has long reigned against the English in musical matters, and ready to trust to the fair dealing and sound judgment which, in spite of such prejudice, rarely fails eventually to bestow, through public applause, the just award.[28]

The composer's trajectory suggested here by the author confidently follows the narrative pattern of the quest and the hero's triumphant return. Yet this was not to be.

22 Ibid., 51.

23 [Chorley], "Norwich Festival," 1039.

24 Anonymous, "Norfolk & Norwich Musical Festival. Mr Pierson's 'Jerusalem'," *The Musical Times* 5.101 (October 1, 1852): 76–8, 77.

25 The encore of the Hallelujah was apparently ordered by the Lord Bishop of Norwich, see Lowell Mason, *Musical Letters from Abroad: Including Detailed Accounts of the Birmingham, Norwich, and Dusseldorf Musical Festivals of 1852* (New York: Mason Brothers, 1854), p. 275; the author denied it any merit.

26 Macfarren, "Jerusalem," 59.

27 Amicus Patriæ, *Descriptive Analysis*, p. 29.

28 Ibid., p. 12.

The issue was confounded by the circumstance that in 1852, unusually, the Festival committee had in fact accepted two oratorios for the occasion,[29] the other being William Richard Bexfield's *Israel Restored* (1851).[30] Largely composed in accordance with the tradition of Händel and the more recent example of Mendelssohn, and thus eschewing the innovative principle invoked by Amicus Patriæ, Bexfield's oratorio had first been performed less than a year before by the Norwich Choral Society to restrained critical acclaim.[31] A native of Norwich, while Pierson was stigmatized as a "stranger,"[32] the young autodidact (1824–53) was now set up as a rival of the composer from 'abroad.'

As Pippa Drummond observes, the increasing intensity of this rivalry was "fuelled by advance notices and analyses in the national press."[33] The whipped-up rivalry between both composers was in fact a competition between traditional and progressive which extended far beyond the acerbic debate in professional journals, which has been described by Howard E. Smither as "a fascinating case study of English conservative criticism."[34] In one of his contributions to the debate, Davison noted that a "multiplicity of unpleasant occurrences [sprang] out of the jealousy that existed between the friends and adherents of the rival composers" which he likened to a "war" in the streets of Norwich.[35]

Though initially variously performed in Norwich and London, Pierson's oratorio nevertheless died a slow death in England. When, shortly after the composer's own passing, excerpts from *Jerusalem* were revived at the Norwich Festival of 1875, critical views about the oratorio collated in the *Musical Standard* confirmed not only the ambivalence with which this work was still perceived but demonstrated also the regard extended to Pierson in Germany. The music critic of the *Telegraph* was quoted saying that "'Jerusalem' is practically numbered among extinct things and therefore to arm with sword and spear and gird viciously at it would be equivalent to the profitless labour of whipping a dead

29 See [James William Davison], "The Norwich Musical Festival," *The Musical World* 30.39 (September 25, 1852): 609–13, 609.

30 For the piano reduction, see William Richard Bexfield, *Israel Restored: An Oratorio* [piano reduction] (London: The Composer, 1852); the librettist is not known, the text may have been written by Bexfield himself.

31 Anonymous, "Dr. Bexfield's Oratorio—'Israel Restored'," *The Musical World* 26.43 (October 25, 1851): 684–5.

32 [Davison], "Norwich Music Festival," 7.

33 Pippa Drummond, *The Provincial Music Festival in England, 1784–1914* (2011; London and New York: Routledge, 2016), p. 96.

34 Smither, *History of the Oratorio*, IV, 291.

35 [Davison], "Norwich Music Festival," 7.

horse"; he concluded: "Thus passed 'Jerusalem' from the living and active world of music."[36]

This obituary was countered three weeks later with a passage extracted from the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*. I quote this here at length because it is indicative of the different reception of Pierson's work in Germany:

> Pierson holds a very peculiar position in his native land, which offers considerable resemblance to that which Wagner a few years ago held in Germany. Whilst a small band of enthusiastic followers hold and declare Pierson to be a tone-poet of the first rank, the great number of the critics of this composer are absolutely hostile towards him; they allow that Pierson was a man of unusual talent, but he had not the slightest respect for established form; he was led astray in Germany; he is a musician of the future; and this, according to English notions, is to pass sentence of death upon him. In our opinion Pierson's "Jerusalem" is a creation of the highest significance, which however will not receive its deserts in this country, until the old ban shall have been broken, and the superstition that Church music died out with Mendelssohn shall be thoroughly exploded.[37]

Pierson and the Sacred Oratorio

No full score of *Jerusalem* appears to have survived, but an undated piano reduction was published by Novello in London, presumably in 1852.[38] In his preface, Pierson acknowledges that his work on the oratorio was hastened by the ill health of his friend William Sancroft Holmes (1815–49) who had arranged the text selection from the Bible and who died in autumn 1849 in Bern in Switzerland.[39] The composer emphasizes that his was a "sacred" oratorio, its words "derived entirely from Scripture." He not only claims that Holmes's selection "is one of extraordinary beauty and unusual scope" but insists "that in this compilation a more regular dramatic action will be found than in any other of the strictly-sacred Oratorios extant,—this being effected by the interesting collocation of the different pas-

36 Anonymous, "Norwich Music Festival," *The Musical Standard* 9ns.582 (September 25, 1875): 207–8, 208. A similar observation had already been made by Lowell Mason who alleged, in the context of his discussion of Pierson's *Jerusalem*, about many English oratorios that "[t]hey are born, speak once or twice perhaps, then die, are buried, and soon forgotten," *Musical Letters from Abroad*, p. 276.

37 Anonymous, "Foreign Musical Intelligence," *The Musical Standard* 9ns.585 (October 16, 1875): 262–3, 263; for the German original, see Anonymous, "Norwich," *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 71.41 (October 8, 1875): 402.

38 See Henry Hugh Pierson, *Jerusalem: A Sacred Oratorio* [piano reduction], the words selected from the Holy Scriptures by the late W. Sancroft Holmes (London: Novello, [1852]); the composer's preface is dated September, 1852.

39 Ibid., preface.

sages, without the aid of *dramatis personæ*."[40] Pierson furthermore asserts that he considered

> all attempts to construct an Oratorio upon the basis of a modern poem as more or less futile, and, moreover, as an approximation to the secular character of the Opera, from which the Oratorio should be separated by a broad line of demarcation.[41]

Pierson's objective appears to have been to enrich the scriptural text with dramatic character while nevertheless eschewing any textual interventions beyond the rearrangement of his biblical sources and thus to retain their "sacred" dimension in contradistinction to more operatic productions. As such, Pierson's *Jerusalem* is very different from the other oratorios on the subject produced in Germany over the course of the nineteenth century. As noted previously, their libretti had been precisely such "modern" poems as disparaged by Pierson. They were based predominantly on historical sources and, as suggested above, on the pervasive influence of Wilhelm von Kaulbach's artistic engagement with the historical episode in his monumental painting of the destruction of Jerusalem. The only exception to this practice was Ferdinand Hiller's oratorio on the destruction of the First Temple whose text had similarly been based on the Bible by Salomon Ludwig Steinheim and whose engagement with Kaulbach, as I argue above, I suspect to have been critical and antagonistic.

On Pierson's oratorio, Kaulbach's painting appears to have had no impact. If he was familiar with the artist's work which, given its prominence, is not unlikely, it nevertheless did not influence in any perceptible way his own rendering of the subject. In this context, it is crucial to remember that Holmes—of the Suffolk landed gentry—had his antecedents, like Pierson, in England. This emerges also from his text selection which reflects the English preoccupation with the comprehensive eschatological trajectory from the fall of Jerusalem to the restoration of the Jews and, ultimately, the establishment of the New Jerusalem.

Indeed, the scriptural passages assembled by Holmes to form the libretto for Pierson's *Jerusalem* encompass the destruction of Jerusalem foretold by Moses and by Jesus and "depicted" in chapter I; the destruction lamented, and restoration promised, in chapter II; and, finally, in chapter III, the Battle of Armageddon, the New Jerusalem, the Last Judgment and the salvation of the righteous, concluding with the universal praise of the Lord. They range from Deuteronomy to the Psalms to the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, and Zecha-

40 Ibid.
41 Ibid.

riah; to the gospel of Luke; to the Pauline epistles to the Romans and to Timothy; and, finally, to Revelation.

As might be expected from its eschatological trajectory, following on the introduction with passages from Luke and Deuteronomy, the first part of the oratorio is mostly made up of the prophets, mainly Isaiah and Jeremiah; the second part is assembled predominantly from Jeremiah and Lamentations; and the majority of the third part collates passages from Revelation. As observed also by the composer in his preface, Holmes's reliance on rearranged but otherwise intact Scripture for the textual basis of Pierson's *Jerusalem* largely precludes the addition of *dramatis personæ*, such as the figures of the Beautiful Jewess and the Wandering Jew which, following Kaulbach's monumental painting, were either incorporated in or, as argued in the previous part, strategically elided from the German oratorios on the subject. Nor is there any reference to Mary of Bethezuba's teknophagy which is otherwise quite prominent in the English tradition of engagement with the destruction of Jerusalem.

Holmes achieved a large degree of narrative cohesion and consistency with his collation of scriptural passages. However, the result of his intervention is also a re-configuration which, while in spirit it may articulate the eschatological trajectory inscribed into the Christian canon of biblical books, nevertheless represents a process of exegesis which compromises the integrity of its individual textual components. The destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, a post-biblical historical event, is re-contextualized through the conflation with originally disparate passages, which frequently refer to the destruction of the First Temple. This, no less than the lack of a historicizing identification of place and time, as for instance in Blumner, emphasizes the symbolic and universally applicable dimension of Pierson and Holmes's effort.

Pierson nevertheless expanded the semantic range of his libretto by musical means beyond the purely religious basis of the scriptural text. For instance, the composer inserted, as an extratextual element, a symphony with the aim of "*Representing the March of the Roman Army against Jerusalem.*"[42] With the full score lost, no exact assessment of the orchestration can be made. Even so, typical enough of the conventions, the symphony is suffused with a strong military flavor which is evoked by musical patterns evidently derived from the original inclusion of timpani and brass. The ascending chromatics, in the meantime, suggest increasing proximity, urgency, and menace.

The Roman March is particularly interesting in this context, because the responses it elicited indicate the nature of the debate which arose around the inno-

42 Ibid., n. p.; see also pp. 41–3.

vative composer and his work. The American music director Lowell Mason, traveling in Europe in 1852 in order to attend various music festivals, described the Roman March curtly as "feeble and ineffective."[43] Mason similarly disparaged the oratorio's introduction, and some of his points may perhaps also apply to his perception of the Roman March: "The drums and trumpets may tell of the exposure and danger of the favoured city, or of coming war, but beyond this we could not interpret."[44] Mason clearly felt at a loss.

The critic for the local *Norfolk News*, in turn, waxed almost lyrical in his appreciation of the march. His comments are quoted at length here because they illustrate very well the conflict between traditionalists and progressives which was played out with regard to Pierson's oratorio:

> A mere musician, composing a march descriptive of the approach of an invading army, would first reflect that he must have a decided melody in common time, proper for a regimental band. Of course it must have drums and trumpets; but, as he is writing an oratorio, he gives divisions to the violins, which a regimental band could not execute, and he divests his music of common-place vulgarity. He now rises with his subject, and bethinks him of beginning *pianissimo*, that the march may first be heard at a distance (like marches behind the scenes in a theatre,) introducing instruments and crescendos, till he has brought the whole orchestra to a fortissimo, where the climax ends with a flourish of drums and trumpets. What more could an audience expect? Nothing. They are satisfied. Satisfied? Say rather, delighted; and were it not an oratorio, they would give vent to their feelings in a storm of applause.[45]

Yet according to the critic, the audience of such music does not realize what it is missing:

> Now let us imagine how a musician, who is also (what every musician ought to be) a poet, would set himself about the same task. What is passing through his mind whilst he is preparing to write? At first he hears no march, but a faint stream of sound, which might be mistaken for the murmur of the distant ocean. As it comes nearer, it makes itself no further intelligible than by exciting a vague and mysterious feeling of alarm. At length he becomes sensible of the enemy's approach; he hears the tramp of men, the clashing of arms, the prancing of horses; in the midst of all this he detects fragmentary snatches of military music. He endeavours to express what he has mentally heard by musical notation. When he has done so, he appeals to an audience who may, or may not, understand him. He says he has written a march, but he has really painted the approach of an invading host. Now the imaginary case we have last put, describes what we conceive to have been done by Mr. Pierson.[46]

43 Mason, *Musical Letters from Abroad*, p. 272.
44 Ibid.
45 Anonymous, "The Tenth Music Festival," 3.
46 Ibid.

Pierson, apparently not a "mere musician" but also a poet, is extolled by the critic for his imaginative approach which articulates the historical situation and the anxieties it evokes with much more authenticity and immediacy than the traditional approach. Intriguingly, the critic resorts to a pictorial metaphor when he insists that the composer has, in fact, delivered a painting of the invading host; this is effectively the endorsement of modern program music against traditional abstract music. As such the critic cuts to the heart of the debate in England about Pierson's music and, while giving descriptions of both approaches, not only emphatically takes sides but seeks to offer a convincing rationale intelligible to all.

While Pierson's composition may have been indebted to the progressive German school of music, the text of his libretto was 'archetypally' English in its trajectory toward the New Jerusalem.[47] References to the New Jerusalem were also included in the German oratorios discussed in the previous chapter, but the significance afforded to the idea in Holmes's libretto is unprecedented in the German context. Yet it aligns fully with earlier English approaches to the destruction of Jerusalem. For this reason, and because the English tradition—if mostly in other media and genres—produced engagements with the subject which became productive as models also in the German context, I will explore in the following chapter representations of the destruction of Jerusalem in English literature of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

47 It should be noted that the German response to Pierson's *Jerusalem* was also not exclusively positive. The oratorio was not frequently performed; it moreover also garnered some negative criticism. Carl Kipke, for instance, in *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, was no less scathing than his English colleagues, but for the exact opposite reason: "There is everything as it is prescribed by the 'academy'; nothing is to be found which dad or granddad would not have done in the same way,—in short—the 'cliché' rules from beginning to end [Da ist Alles, wie es die 'Schule' vorschreibt; Nichts findet man, was nicht schon Papa oder Grosspapa auch so gemacht haben würden,—kurz—die 'Schablone' herrscht von Anfang bis zu Ende]." With respect to the libretto Kipke opined: "The time of *such* libretti is gone; we demand also from a poetic text meant for musical composition a firmer, more ingenious texture and are no longer content with a succession of mere quotations from the Bible [Die Zeit *solcher* Libretti ist vorüber; wir verlangen auch von einer zur musikalischen Composition bestimmten Dichtung ein festeres, sinnvolleres Gefüge und begnügen uns nicht mehr mit einer Reihe von blossen Bibelcitaten]." C[arl] K[ipke], "Kritischer Anhang," *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* 8.14 (March 30, 1877): 208.