Introduction

Basic information about Haydn and Mozart’s relationship was readily available to interested parties in the long nineteenth century. In his memoirs (1826), the singer and creator of Don Basilio and Don Curzio at the premiere of Le nozze di Figaro, Michael Kelly, reported them playing string quartets together in 1784 – with Carl Ditters von Dittersdorf and Jan Váňhal on second violin and cello – for a small gathering that included composer Giovanni Paisiello and poet and librettist Giovanni Battista Casti as well as Kelly himself. After the ‘musical feast’, moreover, the atmosphere was most convivial: ‘we sat down to an excellent supper, and became joyous and lively in the extreme’.1 Mozart documented a rendition of his newly completed set of string quartets with Haydn when dedicating them to his compositional elder and ‘very dear friend’ in Viennese publisher Artaria’s first edition of September 1785.2 And Haydn reciprocated Mozart’s admiration in famously stating to Mozart’s father Leopold, who was present at a read-through of the last three quartets of the set on 3 February 1785: ‘Before God and as an honest man I tell you that your son is the greatest composer known to me either in person or by name. He has taste and, more than that, the greatest compositional knowledge’.3 Haydn also extolled Mozart’s remarkable musical virtues to Prague-based Franz Roth two years later, turning down the opportunity to write an opera for the city in part out of fear of unfavourable

2 For the first edition of Mozart’s ‘Haydn’ quartets, containing the dedication, see Mozart, Sei Quartetti per due violini, viola e violoncello composti e dedicati al Signor Giuseppe Haydn . . . dal suo amico W. A. Mozart (Vienna: Artaria, 1785). Mozart’s widely read biographer Franz Niemetschek drew attention to the dedication of the quartets to Haydn as early as 1832, identifying it as a sign of Mozart’s esteem and of Mozart taking the trouble to earn Haydn’s praise. See Niemetschek, Leben des K. K. Kapellmeisters Wolfgang Gottlieb Mozart (1798), ed. E. Rychnovsky (Munich: Bibliothek zeitgenössischer Literatur, 1987); trans. Helen Mautner as Life of Mozart (London: Hyman, 1956), pp. 33–4. For original and translated versions of the dedication, see also MDL, p. 220; MDB, p. 230; MBA, vol. 3, pp. 404 and LMF, pp. 891–2. Translations from MDL and MBA, and all other foreign-language sources, are my own unless otherwise indicated.
3 This quotation was first published in Friedrich Schlichtegroll’s biography (1793); it was communicated in a letter from Leopold to daughter Nannerl (16 February 1785, given in MBA, vol. 3, p. 373 and LMF, p. 886, from which this translation is adapted) and among the information passed on to Schlichtegroll to facilitate his work. See Schlichtegroll, ‘Den 5. Dezember: Johannes Chrysostomus Wolfgang Gottlieb Mozart’, in Nekrolog auf das Jahr 1793 (Gotha: Justus Perthes, 1793), pp. 82–112, at 107–8. See also Niemetschek, Life of Mozart, pp. 59–60.
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comparison with Mozart (although practical and logistical matters, such as fulfilling a commission for a faraway place with unfamiliar singers when already busy with other compositional tasks, also appear to have contributed to Haydn’s decision).4 One of Haydn’s earliest biographers, Albert Christoph Dies (1816), obtaining information directly from interviews with the composer in his final years, recorded a lachrymose farewell on the occasion of Haydn’s departure for London in December 1790:

Mozart on this day never left his friend Haydn. He dined with him, and said at the moment of parting, ‘We are probably saying our last farewell in this life.’ Tears welled from the eyes of both. Haydn was deeply moved, for he applied Mozart’s words to himself, and the possibility never occurred to him that the thread of Mozart’s life could be cut off by the inexorable Parcae within the following year.5

Two weeks after Mozart’s death, and writing from London to his Viennese friend Maria Anna von Genzinger, Haydn explained: ‘I look forward tremendously to going home and to embracing all my good friends. I only regret that the great Mozart will not be among them, if it is really true, which I trust that it is not, that he has died. Posterty will not see such a talent again in 100 years!’ And a few weeks later, he reported to Mozart’s fellow mason, Johann Michael Puchberg: ‘For some time I was beside myself about his death, and I could not believe that Providence would so soon claim the life of such an indispensable man’.6

Details such as these, apparently documenting a warm friendship irrespective of the actual amount of time Haydn and Mozart were able to spend together,7 stimulated and inspired the nineteenth-century imagination. In a diary entry on Mozart from November 1815, for example, the German art historian and collector Sulpiz Boisserée made two references to the composer’s relationship with Haydn. He reported Mozart saying to Haydn ‘I’ll exempt you, but all other composers are real asses’, and Haydn explaining to Mozart ‘If you had written nothing but Don Juan, it would have been enough’. For that Mozart dedicated his beautiful violin quartets to him.8 The former is almost certainly spurious – Mozart admired other composers, past and present – and the latter

---


7 As Maynard Solomon reminds us, Haydn and Mozart could not have met frequently in the late 1780s up to their last meeting in 1790, on account of the occasional nature of Haydn’s visits to Vienna from Eszterháza; see Solomon, Mozart: A Life (New York: HarperCollins, 1995), pp. 313–14.

8 See MDL, p. 443, MDR, pp. 515, 516 (in different translations).
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chronologically impossible, since the ‘Haydn’ quartets appeared in print two years before the *Don Giovanni* premiere. Making a litany of additional errors – *Die Zauberflöte* as Mozart’s only operatic success in Vienna, *Die Entführung* written in Munich at seventeen, *Don Giovanni* in six weeks, and *Axur* for Francis II’s wedding (by Mozart) – Boisserée’s diary entry will have been summarily dismissed, ignored altogether, or laughed off stage by generations of critics and scholars. Yet it captures a pervasive nineteenth-century image of Haydn and Mozart together – two exalted individuals, whose mutual admiration underscored the ‘amenities and modesty of true genius’ and whose fates in effect were intertwined. (‘We hear the angels singing in this music’, Schubert used to say about symphonic adagios by Haydn and Mozart, according to a mid-nineteenth-century biographer.) And it is a reminder that ‘fictional’ or quasi-fictional interpretations by non-specialists are as capable as serious ‘factual’ ones by experienced musicians of representing important reception-related trends, and as a result that a reception study is well served by embracing a wide rather than narrow range of critical sources.

*Haydn and Mozart in the Long Nineteenth Century: Parallel and Intersecting Patterns of Reception*, the first extended study of the combined reception of these two totemic figures in the 1800–1900 years after their deaths, places a broad range of written sources under the microscope, determining how reputations, images, and narratives for the two composers converge, diverge, develop at different speeds, and influence one another. *Inter alia* popular, serious, short and long biographies and a diverse body of fiction, as well as specialized and general, learned and less learned books and articles stimulate new, holistic understandings of Haydn and Mozart’s musical, cultural, and historical significance in the Germanic, French, and Anglophone worlds. In addition to assessing sources in which the two are implicitly or explicitly associated, I analyse and compare reception in critical areas germane to both composers, such as biography and scholarship, the reception of sacred and instrumental works, and the celebration of milestone anniversaries

9 See the account of Haydn and Mozart in Cleave’s *London Satirist and Gazette of Variety*, vol. 1, no. 10 (16 December 1837), p. 4. (Originally published in The Musical World.)


11 North American criticism, vibrant in the nineteenth century, is included in my study. For a recent general overview, see Mark McKnight, ‘Music Criticism in the United States and Canada up to the Second World War’, in Christopher Dingle (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Music Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 293–316. While Italian reception of Haydn and Mozart is not covered in this book, Italian sources are discussed from time to time when closely related to Germanic, French, or Anglophone ones. With written sources as my focus, I do not address other nineteenth-century points of connection between the two composers, such as arrangements of their musical works; on this topic directed at Haydn and Mozart, see, for example, Nancy November, *The Culture of Musical Arrangements in Europe, 1750–1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).
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(which often inspire a diverse range of critical activity). While nineteenth-century Mozart reception—and to a lesser extent Haydn reception—has been regularly viewed in recent decades through the lens of national or regional cultures, and Germanic nationalistic impulses naturally played a part in promoting the achievements of both men, a cross-cultural perspective focussing on German, French, and Anglo writings is essential to the task at hand. For example, in line

---

12 Haydn’s operatic output was little known in the nineteenth century (although the beginnings of interest at the fin-de-siècle is reported in Chapter 1); operatic criticism therefore does not provide a major focus for my study.

with the international dimension to literary and cultural romanticism as well as the international inclinations of some nationalistically orientated writers, biographies of the composers often quickly traverse linguistic cultures — or are embedded in more than one from the start — including Stendhal’s on both Haydn and Mozart from 1814 and Alexandre Oulibicheff’s on Mozart from 1843. Writing in French, Stendhal extensively plagiarizes Giuseppe Carpani’s Italian biography of Haydn (1812) and Théophile Frédéric Winckler’s Notice biographique sur Mozart (1801), which itself adapts Friedrich Schlichtegroll’s short German account of Mozart’s life from 1793; his biographies are then swiftly translated into English (1817) and widely circulated in Anglophone countries. And Oulibicheff, a Russian writing in French, gains more critical traction for his biography once translated into German a few years after the original publication than on initial appearance in French; extended extracts are published in English a decade or so later as well. Admittedly, Stendhal and Oulibicheff resonate internationally in especially pronounced ways. But, as we shall see, internationally orientated anniversary celebrations, translations of substantive biographies, popular profiles, anecdotes and fictional stories, and frequent summaries and reviews of foreign-language publications all foreground the trans-national, trans-cultural significance and implications of nineteenth-century Haydn and Mozart reception.

The consideration of a wide range of popular and serious writings across more than a century, without a priori merit-based judgement on grounds of (for example) genre or author status, brings seriously into question master narratives that have consistently accrued to Haydn and Mozart nineteenth-century reception — Haydn’s in particular. To be sure, doubts were repeatedly expressed about Haydn and his music during the century after his death, perhaps motivated in part by the continued popularity of his music in the concert hall. As we shall see in Chapter 1, Haydn’s reputation also fell behind Mozart’s in the first decade of the 1800s when critical conditions for Mozart — such as early biographical and critical work packing a punch and the Requiem casting its narratological and musical


15 Stendhal’s and Oulibicheff’s biographies are discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 respectively.

spell—saw him gain the upper hand. And Mozart’s supremacy over his compositional elder, or general nonpareil status, was still being articulated a century later. Alfredo Untersteiner (1906) described him as ‘doubtless the greatest musical genius that ever lived, that man whom without exaggeration we might call the incarnation of music’.17 And Henry Hadow (1904), while complimentary about the Creation, stood back in awe of the Requiem (a work sometimes compared to the Creation in the long nineteenth century): ‘[it] is as far beyond praise as it is beyond criticism; we might as readily pronounce upon the Parthenon or the Vatican Hermes. It is of that kind of genius about which we wonder, not how it accomplishes its aim, but how it has ever come to exist at all.’18 Nevertheless, the near ubiquitous idea that Haydn fell precipitously in the long nineteenth century, as a respected but old-fashioned figure who had nothing to say to present-day artists, critics, and audiences, is significantly misleading. Haydn’s sorry fate is highlighted time and again in scholarly commentaries of recent times: his ‘spectacular rise in...popularity [in his lifetime] was only matched by his equally spectacular eclipse [in the nineteenth century]’; he had a ‘simplified legacy perpetuated throughout the nineteenth century’; he was ‘soon seen as innocent, old-fashioned, and enervated...[belonging] to an older, obsolete epoch’ and was not evaluated objectively; and his art ‘[to] nineteenth-century minds seemed all too happy to dwell in nature – to discover and disclose its properties through patient experiment – rather than to surpass it by force of personality or possession’, thus rendering critics incapable of ‘[reconciling] Haydn to its views on original genius’ and finding him ‘[irrelevant] to the core aesthetic issues’ of the era instead.19 Moreover, at the centenary in 1909, ‘if Haydn were praised, most often it was patronizingly: as if he were an esteemed “museum piece”, once an active force in the artistic doings of the world, but now “played out”. Thankfully, in 2009, we are closer to the emotion, and the accurate insight, of 1809’.20 (In Chapter 5, I argue for 1909 activities as a culmination of developing themes in Haydn scholarship.) Leon Botstein and Bryan Proksh advance extended cases for Haydn’s nineteenth-century demise. While Haydn remained respected,

Botstein argues, he was ‘condemned to a form of aesthetic and cultural irrelevance’ and, with an essentially static reception (unlike Mozart’s evolving one), ‘was not appropriated as a source of inspiration and emulation’. Having moved away from rational philosophical ventures, the nineteenth century ‘found the music of Haydn cold, lacking in the human qualities most often linked to the perception of subjectivity’. Similarly, for Proksch, the ‘collapse of Haydn’s reputation commenced quickly after his death in 1809, spurred on by a shift to Romantic aesthetics and emotionalism, . . . [culminating] in the final decades of the century with his relegation to a position of an empty figurehead in music history’. Ultimately, views of Haydn reception along these lines are based on an unduly narrow and selective range of reception-related material and framed by unwarranted biases. Proksch admits to focussing on ‘big names’ because lesser-known critical figures ‘simply would not have had the potential to influence opinion on a large scale’. Setting aside ontological issues (how is a ‘big name’ defined, does the status transfer straightforwardly from one type of work to another, such as composition to critical writing, and is influence determinable without a thorough examination of critical sources?), selection and judgement by rank is likely only to simplify processes of reception by prioritizing serious sources over others and by unnecessarily reducing the pool of criticism under consideration. Botstein externalizes an accusation often implicit elsewhere that the nineteenth century did wrong by Haydn. The collective views of nineteenth-century writers were insufficiently historical, he argues, which leads them astray: ‘When we try to understand Haydn from the perspective of the eighteenth century rather than the nineteenth, we rapidly realize that Haydn’s music carried for its listeners and its music carried for its listeners and its music carried for its listeners and its music carried for its listeners . . . [twentieth] century, must be dissolved and scraped away’. Not only does Botstein overly condense nineteenth-century opinion, he also prioritizes virtues of his present (historical study) rooted in the perceived beliefs, inclinations, and intentions of Haydn and Haydn’s time over those from an intervening period that

13 Proksch, Reviving Haydn, p. 123.
15 Botstein, ‘Nineteenth-Century Reception of Joseph Haydn’, p. 34.
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are not necessarily grounded in historical considerations. (Judging by Mozart’s re-orchestrations of *Acis and Galatea, Messiah, Alexander’s Feast* and *Ode for St. Cecilia’s Day* in 1788–90, where the updating of Handel to impart contemporary relevance takes precedence over Handel’s own intentions,26 historical concerns similar to our own were not paramount in the late eighteenth century either.) Haydn’s music did not always sit comfortably with nineteenth-century German idealism – a high-minded aesthetic embrace of serious and spiritual artistic contemplation linked to philosophical principles and predilections – since its entertainment value ‘tended to make him a suspicious commodity’; he was also considered ‘much too cheerful’ in religious outlook and associated with unserious salon culture.27 But orientation towards this aesthetic, which has typically shaped scholarly thinking on Haydn’s nineteenth-century position and status, should not be our exclusive concern, both for comparison with Mozart and for gauging diverse reactions to Haydn’s life and music across a large geographical and cultural area and over an extended period of time (‘The Music Century’) during which music journalism, criticism, scholarship, professional instruction, commerce, and publicity first came to fruition and art music audiences increased hugely as a result of the middle class not the aristocracy being situated at the heart of the enterprise.28 Beethoven was undeniably the principal agent and beneficiary of idealism, ‘the cornerstone for music’s newly defined status as a “serious” art form’,29 exerting an enormous influence on musical and critical thought in the nineteenth century and beyond: his ‘heroic style’ [values] have become the values of music; and he ‘came to be viewed [in the nineteenth century] as the epitome of the...

engaged or committed artist, one who expressed through music his affinity with the radical, humanitarian thought of the age of revolution, and bequeathed to his successors an unprecedented sense of the ambition and pretension of the musical work, its quest for epic status. But Beethoven’s remarkable impact, much discussed in modern scholarship, often did not come at Haydn’s expense. The qualitatively charged narrative of musical progression from Haydn to Mozart to Beethoven, regularly considered dominant in nineteenth-century critical discourse on the Viennese triumvirate and embedded in Hegelian ideas of historical development as well as fuelled by the century’s scientific discoveries, improvements in living standards, technological advances, and German idealism, is in fact only one of a number of narratives gaining critical traction over the course of our period; as will be demonstrated, it rules the roost in mid-century decades, but is implicitly or explicitly challenged earlier and later. Haydn regularly resists a clear-cut third place among the exalted musical trio.

The perception of Haydn’s – and Mozart’s – relevance to the nineteenth century lies at the heart of my study of reception, as a common denominator for all critical discourse (including contemporary reviews of new publications as an indicator of the value of the publications – and of Haydn and Mozart more generally – at that time, as opposed to value determined by us today). As has been explained, modern-day performances of centuries-old music constructed according to modern-day values ascribe a contemporaneity to the music that should be esteemed and appreciated. By extension, markers of contemporaneity for Haydn and Mozart in nineteenth-century critical discussion, the past resonating

in the nineteenth-century present, lend significance to the composers in a changed and evolving culture, especially if – as has been boldly asserted – no one in the nineteenth century could evade the sense that a torrential watershed had intervened between the age of Mozart and Haydn and the present. 34 (Canonic status for Haydn and Mozart in the concert hall, through which they and other canon figures acquire in William Weber’s words ‘authority over musical composition and taste’, neither ensured contemporary critical relevance nor provided insulation against reproach, as confirmed by Haydn’s case. 35) As we shall see, sources questioning Haydn’s relevance are consistently and powerfully countered – implicitly or explicitly – by vibrant, imaginative, thoughtful, and engaging writings across the critical spectrum and in every decade. Haydn speaks to the nineteenth century, then, in a considerably more powerful and persuasive voice than thus far has been acknowledged.

General perspectives on nineteenth-century Mozart reception are similarly problematic to those on Haydn, albeit not to the same extent. While Haydn was more susceptible than Mozart to accusations of old-fashionedness, Mozart had to contend with them from time to time, although not in ways suggested by some modern-day critics. Neither a ‘waning of interest in Mozart’s music’ precipitating a ‘crisis around 1830’ nor an ‘accepted notion during the second half of the nineteenth century’ of Mozart as ‘mannered and dated’ ultimately bear up to scrutiny, 36 especially once a catholic attitude towards sources of reception is adopted. (Similarly, the idea that ‘recognition of Mozart’s romantic appeal never became overt in his [nineteenth-century] biographies 37 is rooted in an ontologically restricted view of Mozartian biography.) Botstein suggests that ‘[there] was more extensive praise of Mozart spoken and taught than music heard’ in the late nineteenth century, 38 but fails both to explain how the


