

EWA CHAMCZYK

CampusAI

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8424-7814>

Stanisław Moniuszko and Apolinary Kątski: the Slander and the Facts

ABSTRACT: This article examines the complex and dynamic relationship between two prominent 19th-century Polish musicians: composer Stanisław Moniuszko (1819–1872) and violinist Apolinary Kątski (1824–1879). Drawing on extensive correspondence and contemporary accounts, the study traces the evolution of their interactions from initial antipathy to ostensible reconciliation and subsequent professional collaboration. The research focuses on key events that shaped their relationship, including their first encounter, public debates over musical aesthetics, and their work together at the Warsaw Institute of Music. Particular attention is given to the controversial circumstances surrounding Moniuszko's death and subsequent accusations against Kątski. By critically analyzing primary sources, the article challenges some long-held assumptions about their relationship and offers a more nuanced understanding of the personal and professional tensions between these two influential figures in 19th-century Polish musical life. This study contributes to a broader understanding of the social and cultural dynamics within Poland's musical circles during this period and provides new insights into the careers and legacies of both Moniuszko and Kątski.

KEYWORDS: Stanisław Moniuszko, Apolinary Kątski, Henryk Wieniawski, Institute of Music, rivalry, conflict, relations

The relationship between Stanisław Moniuszko (1809–1872) and the virtuoso violinist Apolinary Kątski (1824–1879), founder of the Warsaw Institute of Music, was regarded as conflictual already by their peers. In the subject literature, selected aspects of their acquaintance have been discussed: the moment of their first encounter and Moniuszko's dislike of Kątski, the famous press polemic concerning the superiority of the violinist's mazurs over the mazurkas of Chopin, in which Moniuszko clearly came out on the side of the latter, and also the temporary thaw in relations in 1855, their relationship at the Institute of Music and the connections made between Kątski and Moniuszko's death. The present state of research enables us to offer a more comprehensive account of that relationship, although – due to the lack of new sources from the period in question – a number of questions remain. In the case of Moniuszko, we have at our disposal mainly correspondence showing his perspective over the course of more than 20 years. In the case of Kątski, meanwhile, we have only sporadic sources referring almost exclusively to his contacts with Moniuszko within the context of his employment

at the Institute of Music. The present text will represent the first attempt to present the relations between Stanisław Moniuszko and Apolinary Kątski.

‘Yesterday Kątski arrived. I haven’t met him yet’, wrote Moniuszko (1969, p. 164) in a letter to his wife from Warsaw. This is the first and most neutral mention of the virtuoso to be found in Moniuszko’s correspondence.

Almost a year later, on 19 April 1852, Moniuszko’s opinion of Kątski was considerably more defined. The artists scheduled to perform in Vilnius included – as Moniuszko (1969, p. 177) informed Józef Sikorski – ‘the contemptible Apolinary Kątski’ and ‘Les frères Wieniawski’, whose arrival he was ‘most fervently’ anticipating. It was probably the brothers Józef and Henryk Wieniawski who represented the bone of contention between Kątski and Moniuszko. Soon afterwards, Moniuszko (1969, p. 179) wrote to Sikorski: ‘Know only that Kątski is persecuting me, the Wieniawskis as well’, and a week later he informed Aleksander Walicki (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 180): ‘Kątski, the Wieniawskis, [Samuel] Kossowski, [Kazimierz] Łada, Christiani, Mahler, Wiernik... they all scuffle over money and I’ve already suffered a few bumps and bruises from the repercussions’. Those events have not been entirely explained to this day. In his monograph devoted to Moniuszko, Aleksander Walicki (1873, p. 97) declared that the composer, ‘noting the Wieniawskis’ greater talent, took their side, and he expressed his opinion distinctly in the *Kuryer Wileński* (1851, May 4). It is worth noting that Walicki is referring here to an article which Moniuszko published in the Vilnius newspaper a year earlier, during the Wieniawski brothers’ visit to the city in May 1851. In the subject literature, this text is often mistakenly linked to the events of 1852 (Reiss, 1986, p. 39). Walicki (1873) also added: ‘I have in my possession from those times a letter in Moniuszko’s own hand describing the whole affair, but the subject is too thorny for me to be able to print it at present. Perhaps the right time will come for that too. Moniuszko’s attitude towards those artists dates from that moment’. In Walicki’s correspondence held in the National Library and the Library of the Warsaw Music Society, however, I did not find the letters he mentioned. Jan Karłowicz, writing his *Rys żywota Stanisława Moniuszki* [A brief life of Stanisław Moniuszko] (Rudziński, 1955, p. 261), points out that ‘he did not like that Apolinary Kątski, who in the spring of 1852 first arrived in Vilnius and caused a storm, and he considered that [Kątski] only knew how to play dazzling things, ostensibly difficult, but in essence rather trifling. That reached Kątski’s ears’. Karłowicz then describes events relating to a supposed reconciliation between the two men, which should be dated to 1855, and to which I will return below. Witold Rudziński (1954, p. 131) also discerns the bone of contention between Moniuszko and Kątski among the events that took place within the context of the Wieniawski brothers. In his view, ‘When Kątski began obsessively attacking the Wieniawskis in certain salons, Moniuszko took their side, expressing quite a harsh opinion of Kątski’s method. That caused considerable irritation between Moniuszko and Kątski’. Rudziński (1955, p. 302) rather critically sums up that first contact between Moniuszko and Kątski, stressing that ‘The contretemps with Kątski arose in the artistic domain. Moniuszko was unwilling and unable to recognise Kątski’s methods of self-publicity; hence, contrary to official Vilnius opinion, he stood – together with a small group of friends – on the side of the

Wieniawskis. It is another thing that with regard to his own emotional stance, he strongly exaggerated in this affair, assuming a life-long mistrust of Kątski, and that sentiment, together with various grievances that arose at that time, would accompany him to the end of his days'.

That antipathy was not mollified, and indeed was perhaps even stoked, by a solemn letter that Kątski (1852) addressed to Moniuszko along with name-day wishes on 20 May 1852, the day after the premiere of the latter's two operas *Cyganie* [Gypsies] and *Bettly*.

I am very sad not to be able to embrace you most warmly today and at the same time offer you my loftiest and sincerest wishes on a day so pleasant not only for your family, but also for each of your numerous friends and admirers. The impressions that I carried away yesterday after your elevated and tender music will forever remain in my heart as a souvenir of one of the most beautiful moments of my life. It gladdens us all that if the Germans can boast Mayerbeer [sic], the Italians Rossini and the French Auber, we can boast Moniuszko! Such is the conviction of everyone who attended yesterday's presentation of your marvellous works. I repeat once again that I cannot regret enough that the state of my health deprives me of the genuine pleasure of seeing you and expressing more vividly and in person the adoration which your enchanting music has aroused.

Despite this, Moniuszko's judgment had already been made. On 11 June 1852, in a letter to Aleksander Walicki (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 182), he allowed himself this profile of Kątski:

unquestionably a strong violinist, he could undoubtedly hold a place among the finest in Europe were it not for the unfortunate boundless charlatanism that with him extends even to classical music. As a composer – very clumsy in his large-scale works, very clever in trifles, unbearable in mazurs and even in their performance. As a man – a great connoisseur of idiots, and full of tricks by means of which he leads them by the nose. [...] He behaved despicably towards me, which first of all entirely ruptured our relations – and that he also did for effect, which profited him quite handsomely. A very sparing intellectual education, with an ear for Parisian life. No love of art. I pity the man!

Echoes of Moniuszko's (1969, p. 200) antipathy surfaced later, too, in September 1854, in a letter to Józef Sikorski, when he discerned the reason for his lack of financial success in the events of two years previously. He wrote that 'I'm still suffering keenly from the unfathomable satanic machinations of Apolinary Kątski with his band of bootlickers (led by Adam Kirkor – Jan ze Śliwina)'. The situation had still not improved a year later, when in June Moniuszko (1969, p. 203) wrote to Sikorski. that 'my audience still cannot break the spell of the scheming aimed against me three years ago, during our memorable first visit from Apolinary Kątski'. Yet the mention of the violinist was not by chance, since Kątski had returned to Vilnius at that time, as Moniuszko (1969, p. 205) duly noted: 'Nothing is happening here except Apolinary K., who has been clowning around with our audiences for several days. He gave one concert for 3 roubles and one rouble. The hall was incredibly packed, but rather suspiciously, since on the first price chairs were sat a bootless rabble, and right at the back figures well known for their grumbling bellies. He played like a porter, and stupid things. [...] Don't take up with him too closely, because as a man he's a booby, and as an artist a zero'.

It soon turned out, however, that Moniuszko's opinion of Kątski's playing was to change. According to Jan Karłowicz (Rudziński, 1955, p. 261), Kątski, having learned of Moniuszko's unfavourable view, decided to convince him that he was capable of performing works of true worth. With that aim in mind, he invited around a hundred people to the Charitable Society, where he was renting a flat, and 'approached Moniuszko with a request that he might also deign to attend and also choose two pieces that he might recommend playing'. As Karłowicz noted (Rudziński, 1955, p. 262), 'Moniuszko was glad to discover this better new side of Kątski's playing, praised him and embraced him. More than one bottle of champagne was drunk to celebrate the reconciliation between the two maestri. From that moment on, their relations became seemingly better, but only seemingly...'. Yet it is not certain to what extent the events described by Karłowicz reflect the reality. The fact remains, however, that on 22 October 1855 the violinist gave a concert after which – as Moniuszko (1969, p. 210) wrote to Sikorski – Kątski. 'Approached me again, and henceforth we are to forget our mutual offence'. Yet for Moniuszko that represented a genuine challenge, since he wrote: 'I hope that the Holy Spirit will boost me in that onerous task' (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 210). The two men were to be united by Dr Julian Titius to whom Moniuszko (1969, p. 210), addressed the following words:

Dear Julian! Were we to overlook our Maestro [Kątski] in procuring for him participation in the matter of support for the poor musicians and even poorer music of Vilnius, I have no doubt that we would sorely aggrieve him. Even if that were not the case, then his good heart, like his much-acclaimed talent, will forgive our obtrusion. I also have no doubt that our dear conciliator [Titius] will gladly assume the role of intermediary on behalf of our patroness of music with one of her most august chosen few. Kreutzer's concerto [performed by Kątski] lifted me into seventh heaven. Only yesterday did Vilnius hear Kątski for the first time. Let us hope that it was able to comprehend and appreciate the fact!

This watershed moment in the relations between Kątski and Moniuszko is often passed over with silence in the subject literature. Even if that reconciliation – as it soon turned out – was superficial and short-lived, it is worth clearly noting this coming together. Henceforth, the paths of Moniuszko and Kątski were continually crossing, even if they did not meet in person: 'On my first day at the Klewsczyńskis', I met Apolinary Kątski's wife', as Moniuszko informed his own wife about events in St Petersburg in February 1856, adding 'She is a very coarse lady who pats men she hardly knows on the belly. Apolinary, ailing considerably, was in Vitebsk, then to Mohilev, whence he will be returning to St Petersburg and is to give 8 concerts during Lent. I don't know how it will go, since his popularity somehow looks different close-up here than from afar. He and his brother Antoni fight like cat and dog. But here everyone respects him as a great artist' (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 213). During this time, Moniuszko made no secret of his liking for Kątski. He wrote to Adam Kirkor (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 236), for example, 'Please pass my warm greetings to Apolinary and thank him for his solicitude over my biography'. This is a reference to a musical text planned for publication in St Petersburg, to the editorial work on which Antoni Kątski, and probably also Apolinary, was to contribute.

In the late spring of 1857, a fierce polemic erupted on the pages of the *Gazeta Warszawska* and *Ruch Muzyczny* between Józef Ignacy Kraszewski and Józef Sikorski partly concerning a comparison between Kątski's mazurs and the mazurkas of Fryderyk Chopin, in which Kraszewski – rather rashly – awarded the palm to the former's compositions. Moniuszko could not look on passively. In *Ruch Muzyczny*, he published an article responding to Kraszewski's views (Moniuszko, 1857), writing: 'I esteem and revere the Apolinary Kątski's talent for all it is worth. I love his mazurs as my own. Yet to place them alongside the mazurs of Chopin, to compare the two – that has yet to occur to me, as I was never deceived by the modest name of mazurka given to the profound thought of a poem captured in a few bars of music. [...] Chopin's mazurs are gems of universal music; Kątski's mazurs dear only to us, like the flowers of our land, which we are accustomed to from childhood; they are far removed one from the other, although close to our hearts'. This situation seems to have remained solely within the confines of the press and did not have any direct bearing on the contacts between Kątski and Moniuszko, who in July 1857 informed his wife from Warsaw (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 266) that 'Apolinary Kątski was here too, constantly with me'.

The image of Kątski must have been very close to Moniuszko, since he evoked it when describing his impressions from a trip to Paris in June 1858. From there, he sent his wife (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 311) an account of a meeting that happened in Weimar: 'It's a small town, but its inhabitants have included Szyndler [Schindler], Go[e]the, Herder, Wieland and today: Monsieur Liszt. To give you the briefest, but most accurate idea about this gentleman, I will say only that he is the model of Apolinary Kątski. Everything was fine while he played like no other on the piano. But since he abandoned execution and devoted himself to composition, which he is as good at as I am at dancing, that guise is almost risible, or at least strips him of all charm'.

After Moniuszko moved to Warsaw, his contacts with Kątski became quite frequent. As he informed his wife in July 1858 (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 322), not concealing his fears with regard to the planned institution of higher musical education: 'I see Kątski constantly, and he's constantly busy with the Conservatory. We just don't know what will come of it, although that's not my concern, since the General [Abramowicz] even told me to have no thoughts of getting involved with Kątski. Though not so that we might have no other income besides the theatre'.

Before Kątski set about recruiting staff for the future Institute of Music, he offered Moniuszko assistance with staging *Halka* in St Petersburg. With that aim in mind, he apparently drew on connections that he had fostered over a number of years as Solo Violinist to His Imperial Majesty at the court there. The *Kurier Warszawski* wrote on 18/30 August 1860 (1860) about the plans to stage *Halka* in St Petersburg:

Through the efforts of the director of the Institute of Music, Mr Apolinary Kątski, who is currently staying in St Petersburg, an opera by the local director and favourite composer S. Moniuszko under the title *Halka* will be staged in the autumn at the Imperial Mariinsky Theatre on terms very favourable to its composer, with whom Mr Kątski has been authorised to deal.

Those procedures clearly failed to meet with Moniuszko's approval. As he wrote to Alexander Dargomyzhsky (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 400), 'Knowing how Mr Kątski works, I very much doubt the veracity of that information. I must advise you that since my opera *Halka* appeared on the Warsaw stage, my standing has hugely improved. The public is referring to my opera in the finest terms. This has caused Mr Kątski, having ceased to persecute me, as he did for some time, that is, in his pomp, to curry my favour [...] No one but you can help me more easily avoid the ridicule that awaits me if I allow myself to be drawn into my compatriot's deviousness'. *Halka* was finally staged at the Mariinsky Theatre in St Petersburg almost ten years later, on 4/16 February 1870. Yet Kątski's ultimate contribution to that affair has yet to be adequately discussed.

On 7 November 1860, despite General Abramowicz's ban on theatre musicians being employed elsewhere, Kątski offered Moniuszko a higher class in composition and instrumentation, as well as choral singing. In spite of his negative reply of 23 November, Moniuszko declared (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 403) that 'were some exceptional talent capable of benefitting from my assistance to be found, however, I offer to assist it gratuitously in private lessons'. As Witold Rudziński (1961, p. 729) points out in his detailed discussion of Moniuszko's work at the Institute of Music, 'the social instinct in Moniuszko, the habit of assessing human actions from the point of view of the general good, was too strong to allow personal animosities to completely eclipse the value of Kątski's success for the nation. Hence Moniuszko expresses his readiness to work free of charge with the Institute should a suitable candidate be found and donates whole bundles of sheet music to the Institute's library. Kątski, meanwhile, is beyond reproach: he propagates Moniuszko's works in his concertos (especially *Bajka* [Fairy tale]), seeks his cooperation and helps him in minor affairs'. Indeed, on 22 December 1863, Kątski approached Moniuszko once again with a different request: this time, that he take over a choral singing class due to the sudden resignation of Adam Münchheimer. Four days later, he received the following reply (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 454): 'I consider it my duty to serve the Institute, brought into being with the recognition of the entire country. Since today no obstacle arises on the part of the Theatre Board, I accept the call to take up the indicated allocation of cooperation'. It is worth stressing that the Theatre – despite agreeing to Moniuszko working at the Institute – reserved the right to priority treatment, as a result of which, in the event of a clash of duties, Moniuszko was obliged to act to the school's disadvantage. The initial hiatus in the Theatre's activities worked in favour of the Institute, but as the season gained pace, letters to the Conservatory's inspectorate with requests for leave or for lessons to be postponed, as well as information relating to late attendance, became a frequent practice. Before long, Moniuszko was writing to Józef Brzowski (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 455): 'Due to the first orchestral pencil rehearsal of the new opera, I will no doubt be a little late for today's rehearsal of the Mass. Hence I enclose the key with a request for Mr Śliwiński, until I arrive, to rehearse with the choir at the piano: the Credo from *et resurexit*, the Sanctus and the Agnus'. The more Moniuszko neglected his duties, the more his irritation with Kątski grew. At the beginning of 1865, Moniuszko left for Lviv, planning a trip from there to Prague. This clashed with his work at the Institute, so he turned to Kątski with a request

for a three-week leave. On returning from Lviv, on 16 March 1865, in a letter to Edward Ilcewicz (Rudziński, 1961, p. 733) he clearly stated: 'I am bidding a firm farewell to the Institut[ute]. We will see how God rewards this virtue'. And indeed, on 20 March, Moniuszko tendered his resignation from the Institute, which – after some delay – was supported by Kątski, who passed his employee's request to the Government Commission. Moniuszko, without waiting for formal acceptance of his resignation, which came on 4 January 1866, abandoned his work at the Institute, and he continued to be suspicious of Kątski's attitude: 'So I too prefer Kątski's persecution to his wheedling, which sooner or later turns into some moral syphilis', he wrote to Ilcewicz (Rudziński, 1961, p. 733). In August 1866, when August Freyer resigned from his post as teacher of harmony and counterpoint, Kątski again approached Moniuszko with a request that he take up the vacancy. The reply, dated 31 August 1866 (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 506–507), was positive: 'I have the honour of declaring my readiness to take up that [post] in accordance with the conditions for teachers set out in the Institute's statute and in agreement with Mr Freyer as regards the timetable of the courses of study'. Again we note the start of a rich correspondence relating to leave, lateness, postponing lessons and salary. On 15 February 1867 Moniuszko wrote (Moniuszko, 1969, p. 519): 'Dear Director, Due to the expenses accompanying my daughter's wedding, I am obliged to bother you with a request for my January salary, without which I cannot in any way manage. I hope that you won't refuse and will forgive me'. Kątski agreed to this and other requests made by Moniuszko. His understanding should perhaps be put down to his own former practices while in service at the imperial court in St Petersburg: during 14 years' service, his total leave amounted to 8 years, 4 months and 20 days (Antonczyk, 2014).

The year 1868 marked the end of the first cycle of tuition at the Institute, which entailed the need to secure funds for the next period and the temporary suspension of activities. Hence on 20 June, Kątski again asked Moniuszko to join the Institute's teaching staff, to which the latter readily agreed, on 24 June. As Rudziński (1961, p. 738) notes, the whole year 1869 passed calmly, without any altercations or setbacks, but 'everything began to spoil in 1870, when theatrical life and its attendant obligations picked up considerably and began to clash with school activities'. From February to May that year, Moniuszko remained on leave, due to a sojourn in St Petersburg, and he cancelled or altered lessons nine times. We note a similar figure in 1871, while over the first five months of the subsequent year, Moniuszko cancelled lessons at least four times. The fact that the Institute could never be sure whether its professor would not let it down at what was for him an important moment naturally created a rather uncomfortable and unhealthy atmosphere. And that was supposedly one of the factors that led to Moniuszko's death.

The notion that Moniuszko's death was in some measure connected with the figure of his 'eternal foe' Apolinary Kątski is quite well known. In the subject literature, one finds a number of versions of the events of 4 June 1872, which are discussed at length by Rudziński (1961, p. 738). Aleksander Walicki mentions among the causes Kątski's refusal in the question of some unspecified protection which Moniuszko requested. Maria Kalergis, meanwhile – as Rudziński

puts it – ‘deftly skims over the facts preceding Moniuszko’s death’, and Antoni Maruszewski, a pupil of Kątski’s, almost 35 years after the events, writes a quite detailed memoir in which he casts both artists in an exceptionally positive light. Moniuszko’s death triggered an avalanche of antipathy towards Kątski. The very same day, a group of people gathered outside the Institute clearly accusing him of contributing to the tragedy. That opinion held sway for a long time in the Warsaw environment, as can be gauged from a photograph of a caricature depicting Kątski as a bat-winged devil, on the back of which Aleksander Walicki noted: ‘Immediately after Moniuszko’s death, such drawings appeared showing Apol. Kątski sowing death in the guise of the devil. For he played a part in Moniuszko’s demise’.¹

Kątski, meanwhile, wrote a letter of condolences that same day to Aleksandra Moniuszko and began collecting funds in aid of the composer’s family. He was soon forced to take up his own defence. On 6 June he sent a letter to the Supervisory Board in which he referred robustly to the accusations against him (Rudziński, 1961, p. 776):

This calumny can be summarised in several main points. 1. That the late Moniuszko had an incident with me at the Conservatory on the day of his death due to excuses made over non-attendance of lessons, 2. That I entered into an agreement with Mr Żeleński for him to take up a teaching post at the conservatory and that thereby the defunct learned of my intention to dismiss him and replace him with Mr Żeleński, 3. That at the Supervisory Committee I opposed a rise of one hundred roubles proposed for the post in 1872 to the Teacher of Instrumentation and Composition, namely, the late Moniuszko, of which he also learned. I protest most firmly against those three points, and not wishing to continue to carry out my duties at the Warsaw conservatory if those accusations are not explained in a manner that admits of no doubt whatsoever, I implore the Supervisory Committee to appoint a delegation from among its members with the aim of conducting an official investigation so that I might take advantage of such in defence of my innocence and robustly prove the defamatory and tendentious calumny of ill-intended individuals.

The committee investigated the matter within ten days and on 17 June sent a reply to Kątski (Rudziński, 1961, p. 777), in which the following was noted:

On the day of his death, that is, 4th inst., the late Moniuszko was not at all at a lesson at the Institute, and that same day at 8 a.m. he sent a letter to Miss Leontyna Kleyn asking for someone to stand in for him; that Mr Żeleński declared that the director had not entered into any relationship with him with regard to any participation in the work of the Conservatory or stand-in position and had not talked with the director about either lessons there or about anything pertaining to those subjects; finally, that with regard to a rise in the salary received by the late Moniuszko, you yourself as director proposed such a rise for the year 1872 and insisted on it in your representation to a meeting of the Supervisory Committee.

In this statement, there is no disputing that Moniuszko was not at the Institute on the day of his death. Whatever the details of the matter, the conflict with the Institute was held to have been one of the direct causes of the catastrophe. As

¹ Photograph of a caricature of Apolinary Kątski with a note written by Aleksander Walicki appended to a letter of condolences written by Kątski (1872) to Aleksandra Moniuszko.

Rudziński (1961, p. 776) notes, however, 'blaming Kątski for Moniuszko's death, as the Institute director's opponents did, was unjust and injurious [...] in the Moniuszko–Kątski conflict, one must emphasise once again Kątski's diligent and constant efforts to settle their differences. On Moniuszko's side, the mistrust was clearly stifled, but distinct. The tension led to an eruption which, besides hastening the catastrophe, caused the incredibly difficult and injurious situation in which Kątski found himself' – and which had a significant effect on the reception of his person in later times as well.

To sum up, the relationship between Stanisław Moniuszko and Apolinary Kątski was marked by a sort of dynamism: from initial distinct antipathy, through ostensible reconciliation, to appropriate contacts undermined by frustration resulting from the roles in which the two artists found themselves: the director and his employee, who was also an active composer. It may seem that Moniuszko – contrary to much evidence – never forgave Kątski and never came to trust him. Given Moniuszko's gentle disposition, that sounds rather surprising. In his correspondence, we find no other person with regard to whom he was so critical, caustic and ill-disposed. On the other hand, we have only part of Kątski's correspondence, mainly concerning matters linked to the Institute of Music. Among the letters known to me, I found no mention of Moniuszko except for the above-quoted passage from Vilnius from 1852. Echoes of those relations affected – so we may conclude – both artists, leading to Stanisław Moniuszko's death and to the anathema which was henceforth attached to the name of Apolinary Kątski. Those relations still arouse doubts and leave many questions unanswered. Yet it is worth noting that in light of the collected materials, Kątski comes across as innocent of Moniuszko's death, although conflicts did occasionally arise between the two men. The reason for this remains, for the time being, a mystery.

Translated by John Comber

References:

Antonczyk, W. (2014). *Muzycy polscy jako nadworni soliści carów Rosji* [Polish musicians as court soloists to the tsars of Russia]. In S. Kowalska (Ed.), *Rola i wkład Polaków w kreacje dziedzictwa kulturowego innych narodów* [The role and participation of Poles in forging the cultural heritage of other nations]. Poznań – Kalisz: Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.

Kątski, A. (1872). [Kątski to Aleksandra Moniuszko]. Library of the Warsaw Music Society (WTM D 69/10).

Kątski, A. (1852, May 20). [Letter to Moniuszko]. Library of Warsaw Music Society (WTM 1272/M).

Kirkor, A. H. (1852). *Apolinary Kątski – na pamiątkę pobytu w Wilnie* [Apolinary Kątski: in memory of his stay in Vilnius]. Vilnius: Drukier Józefa Zawadzkiego.

Kurier Warszawski. (1860, August 18). P: 1285.

Kurier Wileński. (1851, May 4). n/a: 273–275.

Moniuszko, S. (1857, May 29/June 10). Parę uwag z powodu listów I. J. Kraszewskiego [A few remarks because of the letters of I. J. Kraszewski]. *Ruch Muzyczny*, 11: 84.

Moniuszko, S. (1969). *Moniuszko. Listy zebrane* [Moniuszko: collected letters] (W. Rudziński, Ed.). Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne.

Reiss, J. (1985). *Wieniawski*. Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne.

Rudziński, W. (1954). *Moniuszko*. Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne.

Rudziński, W. (1955). *Stanisław Moniuszko. Studia i materiały*. Część I [Stanisław Moniuszko: studies and materials, part 1]. Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne.

Rudziński, W. (1961). *Stanisław Moniuszko. Studia i materiały*. Część II [Stanisław Moniuszko: studies and materials, part 2]. Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne.

Walicki, A. (1873). *Stanisław Moniuszko*. Warszawa: Nakładem Autora.