> Since I have been here, my works have had astonishing sales and I already get sixty guineas for three sonatas; but along with all this I must write in a very easy and sometimes a very vulgar style. So much for your information, in case it should occur to one of your critics to make fun of me on account of any of my things that have appeared here. You won't believe how backward music still is here and how one has to hold oneself back in order to bring forth such shallow compositions, which do a terrific business here. (Loesser 1954, 251)[9]

BEETHOVEN'S PROSPECTIVE SUCCESS

In this and the previous two chapters, I have been concerned with the structural, cultural, and social dimensions of Beethoven's prospective success. In particular, the question I have been exploring is why Beethoven, more than his contemporaries, was well positioned for becoming a new kind of musical talent. The answer lies in Beethoven's situation in the organizational structure of the Viennese musical world and, in particular, his relation to a culturally powerful segment of music sponsors who were becoming increasingly concerned with the *idea* of great music.

The categories and models that the concerns of these patrons implied ("Handel and the Bachs and those few great men . . . who, taking these as their masters, follow resolutely in the same quest for greatness and truth" [A. Schindler 1966, 49]) structured not only the issue of how many musicians could or should be recognized as artistically worthy, but also the shape of what would be recognized as an "appropriate" artistic response. The cultural context of musical life helped to construct the ways that the artistry of a "great" (that is, self-consciously serious, aloof, and historically oriented) musician should be framed. For an artist such as Beethoven, who had unusually close ties to this controlling segment of patrons, the constraints and incentives posed by the incipient canonic ideology were intensified. One popular idea is that Beethoven subsequently "forced" his patrons to take notice of him in new ways, to accord him a new kind of respect previously unheard of: "Thanks to his genius and to his uncompromising personality, Beethoven made himself into a pure composer, and he forced the aristocracy of Vienna to support him at it, more or less on his own terms" (Kerman and Kerman 1976, 190). While not inaccurate, this view is too simple. Though Beethoven's own contribution to his subsequent recognition as a genius was crucial, his success was partly preconditioned. There was both an organizational and an ideological receptivity to the idea of the "great" musician during this time, and these factors were important parts of the matrix in which Beethoven's later recognition and stylistic development occurred.

"From Haydn's Hands": Narrative Constructions of Beethoven's Talent and Future Success

Given his connections, age, and earlier accomplishments in Bonn, Beethoven was a likely candidate for success as a Viennese musical celebrity. How were early claims of his special promise substantiated? And how was the prospective aspect of Beethoven's success (the concerns of key music patrons and the ways Beethoven was connected to these patrons) mobilized to present Beethoven, rather than some other musician, as the master composer? To answer these questions it is necessary to follow specific courses of action—to focus on Beethoven's emerging network of supporters, and, more broadly, to discover the means of producing the culture of Beethoven's success, including what was being said and done for Beethoven, by whom, and under what circumstances.

THE STORY OF "HAYDN'S HANDS"

On the eve of Beethoven's departure from Bonn, several of the composer's friends and patrons commemorated the event by inscribing greetings in an autograph album. As was the custom, many of these entries were highly sentimental, such as Eleonore von Breuning's quote from Johann Gottfried Herder ("Friendship with that which is good / Grows like the evening shadow / Till the setting sun of life") (Thayer and Forbes 1967, 1:115). One of these entries, by Count Waldstein—who, along with the elector, was responsible for Beethoven's journey to Vienna—stands out for its grandiloquence:

> Dear Beethoven. You are going to Vienna in fulfillment of your long-frustrated wishes. The Genius of Mozart is still mourning and weeping the death of her pupil. She found a refuge but no occupation with the inexhaustible Haydn; through him she wishes once more to form a union with another. With the help of assiduous labour you shall receive Mozart's spirit from Haydn's hands. Your true friend, Waldstein. (Thayer and Forbes 1967, 1:115)

Along with the elector Max Franz, Waldstein was one of the most zealous Mozart supporters during the 1780s, and this entry is one of the earliest examples of Mozart's posthumous deification. Yet when it is considered today, this now famous quote is often severed from its cultural context and read instead as if it were merely prophetic—as if it did not help to *create* the phenomenon of Mozart's greatness and Beethoven's promise as heir to that greatness.

In this chapter, I try to recover that social and cultural context—the circumstances under which this particular piece of Beethoven mythology originated. My purpose is to point out that the telling and retelling of a story about Beethoven's potential was a condition of his eventual success. The anecdote provided a particular type of publicity, and it created a resource for the subsequent favorable reception of Beethoven's works; recounting the story of Beethoven's talent, in other words, was a means of dramatizing Beethoven as someone who had received approval and acceptance from a famous teacher. Waldstein's entry in Beethoven's autograph book is significant because it is the first in a series of stories told about Beethoven's relationship with Haydn. In all of these anecdotes, Beethoven is portrayed as Haydn's prodigy, as receiving "from Haydn's hands" the mantle of Mozart and, more broadly, the honorific of budding "master" composer.[1]

Briefly summarized, the "Haydn's hands" story conveys how the "father" of the Viennese tradition (indeed, Haydn was affectionately known by musicians during this period as Papa Haydn) was bequeathing his accumulated musical wisdom to the musician who was to become his heir. Significantly, during the early 1790s this story did as much for Haydn as it did for Beethoven. At that time, Haydn's reputation varied according to location. Only in London was he revered as a "great" man, though later Haydn's London reputation reflected back on his standing in Viennese society.[2] To tell a story about Beethoven receiving Mozart's spirit from Haydn's hands was also a way of constituting Haydn as great within the Viennese musical world. Simultaneously, it further articulated

the notion of greatness itself within this world, a point I discuss in the conclusion to this chapter.

In addition to the Waldstein entry described earlier, there are four additional extant versions of this story. The first comes from Beethoven's teacher, Christian Gottlieb Neefe, who contributed the following to Cramer's *Magazin der Musik* in 1783: "Louis van Betthoven [*sic*] . . . of most promising talent. He plays the clavier very skillfully and with power, reads at sight very well. . . . This youthful genius is deserving of help to enable him to travel. He would surely become a second Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart were he to continue as he has begun" (Solomon 1977a, 26). This account is interesting because it was articulated early in Beethoven's career—a full decade before he came to study with Haydn. Beethoven is depicted as a "promising" and "youthful genius." Written during the height of Mozart's popularity in Vienna, this account presents Beethoven as a prodigy and promising talent, but also as a talent not yet proved. Beethoven would "surely become" a second Mozart (who was greatly admired by the Bonn court and hofkapelle) *if* he were given the proper advantages, such as training and travel.

This more modest portrait of Beethoven's abilities is partly related to Beethoven's age (he was thirteen at the time) and to the fact that during the 1780s the meaning of the term *genius* in musical discourse was being transformed. Even in northern Germany, where the language of genius was first restructured and took on its modern form, the category of genius in musical discourse of the 1780s most often referred to an individual's "spirit" or unique characteristics (as in the phrase, "the genius of Mozart"). During the early 1780s, it was still possible to speak of genius of anyone; genius was not yet an exclusionary term in musical life and did not refer to superiority, to magnitude, or to the extraordinary, superhuman and, increasingly, male ability to be creatively dominant (see, for example, Murray 1989 and Battersby 1990).

During the 1790s, the meaning of the term *genius* began to change, as is evident in the next extant version of the "Haydn's hands" story. Like Waldstein's, it also originates in Bonn. It is a letter to Charlotte Schiller from B. L. Fischenich, a professor at the University of Bonn, dated 23 January 1793:

> I am enclosing a musical setting of the Feuerfarbe and I would like to know your opinion of it. It is by a young man from here, whose musical talents are praised everywhere and whom the Elector has sent to Haydn in Vienna. He is also going to set Schiller's *Joy* with all the verses to music. I expect some-

> thing perfect [from him] for, as far as I know, his ambitions are for the great and the sublime. Haydn has hitherto reported that he would turn over grand operas to him and would soon have to give up composing. Normally he does not bother with such trivialities as the enclosed (song), which he only composed at the request of a lady. (Landon 1970a, 59)

In this description, the notion of Beethoven's talent is aligned with the northern German concept of the sublime. With it, the idea that Haydn is to "pass on" the tradition to Beethoven is elaborated through a discussion of how the "master" (Haydn) has now intimated that the pupil is destined to surpass him. In this respect, Fischenich's version can be understood as elaborating Waldstein's observation that the spirit of Mozart found "a refuge but no occupation" with Haydn. Haydn is, in other words, constituted in Waldstein's and Fischenich's accounts as a medium or vessel through which Beethoven's (implicitly superior) talent will be cultivated.[3]

It seems unlikely that Haydn himself would echo this line of thought. Yet, ten months later, in a rather formal letter to the Bonn elector, Max Franz,[4] Haydn goes so far as to describe Beethoven as destined to become "one of Europe's greatest composers" and observes that when this occurs, he (Haydn) will be "proud to be able to speak of [himself] as [Beethoven's] teacher":

> Serene Electoral Highness! I humbly take the liberty of sending Your Serene Electoral Highness some musical works . . . of my dear pupil Beethoven, with whose care I have been graciously entrusted. I flatter myself that these pieces, which I may recommend as evidence of his assiduity over and above his actual studies, may be graciously accepted by Your Serene Electoral Highness. Connoisseurs and non-connoisseurs must candidly admit, from these present pieces, that Beethoven will in time fill the position of one of Europe's greatest composers, and I shall be proud to be able to speak of myself as his teacher. [23 November 1793] (Landon 1959, 141)

Of the four accounts considered so far, the first three were by Bonn-based writers (Waldstein, Neefe, Fischenich) and the fourth, by Haydn, was addressed to the Bonn-based elector of Cologne. It would be natural, in the 1790s as today, for Bonn's culturally active residents[5] to desire one of their local talents to succeed in the larger cultural milieu of Vienna, and to find stories about Beethoven's promise originating from his "home town" is hardly surprising. More significant is that these stories came to be repeated in Vienna, and that, in being retold, they imported into Viennese musical discourse aspects of a northern German concep-

tion of "serious" music which—van Swieten's interests aside—was not yet a pervasive part of aristocratic Viennese musical life.

Haydn appears to have been the first Viennese-based writer to employ this originally Bonn-based imagery of musical greatness and of Beethoven's status as heir to such greatness. Haydn would have functioned as a culturally powerful promoter of these concepts. That he appears to have been one of the first to circulate such imagery is also significant, because a strong northern German tradition during the eighteenth century criticized Haydn for not being serious enough. Why was Haydn apparently willing to adopt such a discourse and advocate this version of Beethoven's talent?

The first extant telling of the Haydn-Beethoven story offered by a Viennese observer to Viennese recipients was published in Schönfeld's 1796 *Jahrbuch:*

> Beethoven, a musical genius, has chosen Vienna as his residence for the past two years. . . . He seems already to have entered into the inner sanctuary of music, distinguishing himself for his precision, feeling and taste; consequently his fame has risen considerably. A living proof of his true love of art lies in the fact that he has put himself in the hands of our immortal Haydn in order to be initiated into the holy secrets of the art of music. The latter great Master, during his absence, has turned him over to our great Albrechtsberger. What cannot be expected when such a great genius places himself under the guidance of such excellent masters! (Landon 1970a, 59)

Schönfeld's book was a compendium of musical personalities during the early 1790s, and this entry would have been the first extant version of the story prepared explicitly for public consumption. This account disseminated to a wider musical audience a means of constituting the Beethoven-Haydn relationship that the world of aristocratic Beethoven supporters "already knew."[6] The fact that Schönfeld's version of the "Haydn's hands" story was similar to the preceding accounts of the Haydn-Beethoven relationship would suggest that, by the middle 1790s, Schönfeld was making use of a quasi-public form of accounting for Beethoven's relation to Haydn, one that was already circulating within the relatively well-integrated Viennese aristocratic music world. While this point remains speculative, it is reasonable to suggest that, over the previous three years, there had been talk among aristocrats about Beethoven's relation to Haydn, and that this talk functioned as a means of registering Beethoven's special promise. Certainly, music loomed large as a newsworthy topic for aristocrats in both Bonn and Vienna,[7] and there

would have been plenty of material for discussion: the two composers had collaborated in a public concert in 1795, and by 1796 Beethoven had dedicated his first published piano sonatas to Haydn. During the 1790s Beethoven and Haydn were, at least occasionally, programmed together at private salons.[8]

Schönfeld's report, though published in 1796, appears to have been written sometime between January 1794 and August 1795, because Schönfeld speaks of Haydn being abroad: Haydn, "during his absence, has turned [Beethoven] over" to Albrechtsberger. Written about two years after Waldstein's and Fischenich's accounts, Schönfeld's description of the Haydn-Beethoven relationship elaborates these earlier versions. Beethoven is now identified as a "musical genius" who, having "put himself" in the hands of "immortal Haydn" (and Albrechtsberger as well), is entering the "inner sanctuary" of music and continues to promise even further greatness. Equally telling here is that the space allocated in this publication to Beethoven is second only to that devoted to Haydn, and four or more times greater than that given to any other musician listed.

Discussions of Beethoven and his link to Haydn are remarkable because no other Haydn pupil—before, after, or during these years—was depicted in terms that could be said to resemble even remotely those employed to describe Beethoven's relation to Haydn.[9] The closest any other musician came to being similarly discussed appears to have been Haydn's much less grandiloquent account of his plans to help one of Mozart's sons. In a letter to Michael Puchberg in January 1792, Haydn wrote, "I wrote the poor woman [Mozart's widow] three weeks ago, and told her that when her favorite son reaches the necessary age, I shall give him composition lessons to the very best of my ability, and at no cost, so that he can, to some extent, fill his father's position" (Landon 1959, 125). Compared to those for Beethoven, Haydn's testimonials for his other pupils were far more low key. In 1800, for example, Haydn wrote the following on behalf of Johann Spech:

> I, the undersigned, acknowledge and certify that my pupil Herr Johan [*sic*] Spech, under my direction and supervision, has mastered advanced composition, and consequently everything which concerns the vocal and instrumental branches; I further certify that he has made sufficient progress therein to enable him to preside over any music school, not only as director but also as a teacher of pianoforte and organ. I herewith testify to this. (ibid., 174)

Only one other Haydn pupil is even mentioned in Schönfeld (the publication appeared too early for Neukomm and too late for Pleyel, who had

by this time left Vienna and was concertizing in London). This is Paul Wranitzsky, of whom Schönfeld says only, "Director of Prince Lobkowitz's Kapelle, he is our premier artist on the violin. He has produced excellent students to which Mr. Schuppanzigh and Mr. Turke clearly attest" ([1796] 1976, 67–68).

It is difficult, as Walter Benjamin once put it, "to brush history against the grain" (Buck-Morss 1977, 48). Seen from the perspective of twentieth-century musicology, Beethoven's status as a talent, as discussed in versions of the "Haydn's hands" story, seems self-evident. Spech, while undoubtedly competent, appears as a less imaginative, inventive, and colorful figure. It seems only "right" (and a matter of common sense) that Beethoven received a qualitatively different and more highly articulated form of praise from his teacher. If we are willing to suspend this commonsense view, however, we can recover at least three new ways in which the emergence of the "Haydn's hands" anecdote can be explored.

First, our own evaluations of Beethoven are made in retrospect. Beethoven's identity as a genius, as we perceive it, has been clarified through a rich variety of cultural practices that have accumulated over time, beginning with the 1790s. At first, however, Beethoven's worth was contested. There were people (including Haydn himself) who had at least occasional doubts about Beethoven's claim to genius. It is too simple to explain the emergence of the "Haydn's hands" story solely as a result of the quality and promise of Beethoven's works, even if, from our present point of view, the reality of Beethoven's worth (and his contemporaries' inferiority) seems axiomatic. Second, we can ask questions about how Beethoven may have been better placed for producing the kind of work most likely to be hailed as special, and we can compare Beethoven's situation with that of Haydn's other pupils (as was done with Dussek in chapter 4). Spech, for example, had fewer resources for asserting himself as a more than merely competent musician. Third and finally, we can ask how Haydn may have been in a situation where he was constrained to contribute to the "Haydn's hands" version of Beethoven's abilities, or where it may have advanced his interests to produce effusive statements of Beethoven's worth, regardless of what he may actually have thought of his pupil.

HAYDN'S REPUTATION AND PUPILS DURING THE 1790s

After Prince Nikolaus Esterhazy died in 1790, the new prince, Paul Anton, disbanded the Esterhazy kapelle. Free to travel, Haydn made the

first of his two extremely successful London visits in 1791–92. He attended the Handel commemoration in Westminster Abbey and, in July 1791, traveled to Oxford, where he received the honorary Doctor of Music degree. He then returned to Vienna, where he supplemented his pension with earnings from teaching, the proceeds of occasional benefit concerts, and lucrative publication fees. In 1794–95, he visited London again.

During the 1790s, Haydn was comfortably placed between "old" and "new" worlds, the world of aristocratic sponsorship and that of musical entrepreneurship. In 1794, after the death of Prince Paul Anton Esterhazy, the new prince, Nikolaus the younger, requested Haydn to return as kapellmeister, and Haydn reentered Esterhazy employ after his second London tour. Since the princely residences were now in Vienna and Eisenstadt (Esterháza had been given up after the elder Prince Nikolaus's death), Haydn could continue to live in a suburb of Vienna (not in the Esterhazy household) for most of the year, spending summers at Eisenstadt.

Although Haydn's reputation among his Viennese contemporaries was considerably enhanced after his two foreign concert tours, even as early as 1790 his standing in Vienna was special in comparison with his fellow musicians. At the same time, Haydn's Viennese repute was not without problems: as noted in chapter 3, musicians in Vienna—even the most renowned—did not yet command respect as autonomous professionals. By 1790 Haydn was in the peculiar position of being one of Europe's most famous musicians while at home his reputation was changing qualitatively, moving away from his previous identity as musical "servant." Haydn's Viennese fame is substantiated by his standing in the Viennese concert repertory and by the large number of his works published by Artaria. His repute was boosted by recognition abroad: even before Haydn's first visit to London, the eminent English music historian Charles Burney referred to Haydn in the concluding chapter of his *General History of Music* (London, 1789) as follows (the passage was written in 1786):

> I am now happily arrived at that part of my narrative where it is necessary to speak of HAYDN! the admirable and matchless HAYDN! from whose productions I have received more pleasure late in my life, when tired of most other Music than I ever received in the most ignorant and rapturous part of my youth, when everything was new, and the disposition to be pleased undiminished by criticism or satiety. ([1789] 1935, 958)

For a young musician during the 1790s, study with Haydn provided an excellent way of launching a career. In the final decades of his life (1790–1809), Haydn took on comparatively few students (his fees were high for those who could afford to pay). Because of the select number of pupils and the prestige this conferred, association with Haydn often provided an entrée to aristocratic circles. Even in those cases where it did not, when musicians were thrown back on their own resources for professional survival, to be identified as a pupil of Haydn was, in itself, capable of increasing the chances of future success, whether as an itinerant concert artist or as a composer in the provinces.

Two of the most successful Haydn pupils during the 1780s were the Wranitzsky brothers, Paul (1756–1808) and Anton (1761–1820). Born in Moravia, both Wranitzskys established Viennese careers. A brief examination of the features of these careers clarifies some of the typical strategies available to aspiring provincial musicians, arriving in Vienna initially unconnected to aristocrats or to aristocratic ensembles. Like Dussek, both Wranitzskys attended grammar school at a local monastery. Paul (the elder brother) then studied theology at Olomouc and, in 1776, entered the theological seminary in Vienna, where he served as choirmaster (Postolka 1980b, 539). He studied music with an unknown teacher (perhaps J. M. Kraus, kapellmeister to the Swedish court) before coming to Haydn sometime around 1783. Two years later, he was appointed music director to Count Johann Esterhazy, the brother of Haydn's patron. During the 1790s (after the Esterhazy kapelle was temporarily dissolved), Paul Wranitzsky served as leader of the orchestra at the Burgtheater and Kärthnerthor theater, the two court-controlled theaters in Vienna.

Anton read philosophy and law at Brno and arrived in Vienna in 1783, at the age of twenty-two (Beethoven's age on leaving Bonn), where he was appointed choirmaster to the Theresianisch-Savoyische Akademie in Vienna. Once in the capital, he continued musical studies with Mozart, Haydn, and Albrechtsberger. According to Milan Postolka, during the 1790s (after the Theresianisch Akademie was disbanded), Anton was employed by the younger Prince Lobkowitz, first as konzertmeister, composer, and music teacher and then, after 1797 as kapellmeister to Lobkowitz's private orchestra. When Prince Lobkowitz assumed the directorship of the Viennese court theaters, he appointed Anton Wranitzsky director of the orchestra. In 1814 Anton also became director of the orchestra at the Theater an der Wien.

Both Wranitzskys had first-rank reputations as violinists and violin teachers; perhaps the most well known of Anton Wranitzsky's pupils were Ignaz Schuppanzigh and Joseph Mayseder, who later served, respectively, as first and second violinists in the Schuppanzigh Quartet, known especially for its performances of Beethoven's works.[10] Both Wranitzskys composed many symphonies, concerti, and works for chamber ensemble; Paul was also the author of eight ballets, six singspiels, two operas, and one operetta.

One of Haydn's most successful pupils during the 1790s was Sigismund Neukomm (1778–1858). Unlike most of Haydn's pupils, Neukomm was Austrian, born in Salzburg. His father was a schoolmaster and his mother, a singer, was related to Michael Haydn (Franz Joseph's younger brother). According to Rudolph Angermüller (1980, 121), Neukomm first studied music with a Salzburg Cathedral organist and then with Michael Haydn before entering gymnasium in 1790. Going on to study philosophy and mathematics at Salzburg University, Neukomm became honorary organist at the university church and then choirmaster at the Salzburg court theater. In 1797 he went to Vienna to study with Haydn and began a period of apprenticeship that lasted seven years, during which time he supplemented his Viennese income with music teaching (one of his pupils was Mozart's son, Wolfgang Amadeus the younger). In these respects, Neukomm's background is similar to the Wranitzskys'; unlike them, however, Neukomm was unable to secure a position in a private kapelle (increasingly difficult during the end of the century) and he left Vienna in 1804 for Saint Petersburg, where he embarked on a foreign concert tour. He returned to Vienna in 1808 and visited the ailing Haydn daily. In 1809—in the company of many fellow Viennese musicians whose opportunities were impeded by the private and relatively small scale of Viennese concert life—Neukomm emigrated to Paris, where he remained for the rest of his life. In 1814, he took up the position of pianist to Prince Talleyrand and was eventually invested as Chevalier of the Légion d'honneur in 1815. During his time in Vienna, Neukomm composed intermezzi, a one-act opera, and instrumental phantasies, among, presumably, other works.

Much less is known about the Haydn pupils Franciszek Lessel (c. 1780–1838), Paul Struck (1776–1820), Johann Spech (c. 1767–1836), Peter Hänsel (1770–1831), and Francesco Tomich (1759–after 1796). Lessel, born in Poland, became a pupil of Haydn in December 1799 (see Nowak-Romanowicz 1980, 693). Unlike the Wranitzsky brothers, whose corpus of works survives only in manuscript, there are extant

published versions of some of Lessel's compositions. The Viennese publications include three pianoforte sonatas (op. 2, 1800), a flute quartet (op. 3, 1806) published by Artaria, and two flute duets, also published by Artaria. Lessel went to Vienna, like Beethoven, with the distinction of having already enjoyed some aristocratic patronage (in Poland). He went to Vienna to study medicine but was accepted by Haydn as a pupil at the turn of the century. He then remained in Vienna until 1810 before returning to his native Poland, where he enjoyed a successful concert career as, his contemporaries noted, "the representative of the Haydn school in his native country" (Landon 1976–80, 4:335).

Paul Struck was born in Stralsund and studied with Albrechtsberger in 1795, then with Haydn from 1796 to 1799.[11] On the advice and recommendation of Frederik Samuel Silverstolpe (chargé d'affaires to the imperial court), he traveled to Stockholm, where he eventually became a member of the Swedish Royal Academy of Music (taking part in the first Swedish performance of Haydn's *Creation* in 1801). While in Stockholm he composed a symphony and a cantata. After a year in Florence, Struck returned in 1802 to Vienna, where he was able to make a living as a piano teacher. In 1817 and newly married, he and his wife settled in Pressburg.

Janos (Johann) Spech was born in Hungary. Biographical sources on Spech slightly contradict one another. According to the *New Grove Dictionary,* which offers one item only in its bibliography, Spech studied law for a time before becoming one of Haydn's Viennese pupils. He subsequently returned to Hungary where he worked as a civil servant in Budapest from 1800 to 1812. In 1804 he became a theater conductor and in 1809 personal composer to Baron Podmaniczy. He lived in Paris during the 1820s and 1830s. His compositional output, produced between 1805 and 1825, consists for the most part of Hungarian songs, though he also wrote three operas, numerous cantatas, and an oratorio, as well as piano sonatas, string quartets, and miscellaneous other music for ensembles. Landon, who has interviewed Spech's great-grandson (and who also cites two additional biographical articles on Spech), presents a somewhat different biographical picture. He says that Spech went to Paris after leaving Haydn and that he studied at the conservatory for four years before returning to Hungary, where he devoted his life to the reform of church music and, on the advice of friend and patron Count Leopold Nadasdy, concentrated entirely on a musical career (Landon 1976–80, 3:556n.).

Peter Hänsel was born in Silesia the same year as Beethoven. He

learned violin from an uncle in Warsaw and played in Prince Potemkin's orchestra in Saint Petersburg in 1787. He studied composition with Haydn for several years, starting in 1792 (again, the same year as Beethoven),[12] and began to publish some of his work in 1798 (three years later than Beethoven). From 1802 to 1803 Hänsel lived in Paris. He then returned to Vienna and to a position—assumed in 1791—as kapellmeister to Princess Lubomirsky's orchestra. His published works consist of fifty-five string quartets, four string quintets, six string trios, and numerous other pieces for keyboard and strings (van der Straeten and Charlton 1980, 150).

Francesco (Frantisek) Tomich (Tomes), who dedicated three sonatas to Haydn in 1792, studied music at the Breslau foundation of the Barmherzige Brüder and later studied pharmacy in Vienna. While in Vienna he also studied music with Haydn, then emigrated in the early 1790s to London, where he pursued a musical career.

To be associated with Haydn was undoubtedly an asset for all of these composers, and in most cases, Haydn's pupils were eager to advertise their link to such a famous teacher. It was not uncommon for their earliest publications to be prefaced with the words "pupil of Haydn." Ostensibly, this practice provided a means of deferring to their "master"; it was a conventional way of demonstrating gratitude and respect. In addition, it endowed published works with allure and provided, in a promissory way, an insignia of quality that could preface the work. While basking in the reflected glory of the master, a "pupil of Haydn" could also export some of that glory to provincial regions, and association with Haydn could function as a means through which young and unknown composers gained exposure to aristocratic patrons, both in Vienna and abroad. Acting as Haydn's emissary, for example, Neukomm gained access to the empress dowager of Russia. She (Maria Feodorovna) in turn wrote to Haydn in 1804:

> The letter and composition which your pupil Neukomm brought me gave me much pleasure, and I remembered with joy that I had met you personally in Vienna. This, and the flattering description of me you gave to the bearer, moved me to have him play it for me at once; and I did not fail to recognize his teacher in him. I do thank you so much for the beautiful songs that you sent me . . . and I beg you to regard the enclosed remembrance [a ring] as a token of my sincere good wishes, with which I am, as always, Your ever well-disposed. (Landon 1959, 236)

Four years later, on the eve of his return to Vienna, Neukomm wrote to Haydn to describe how the Philharmonic Society in Saint Petersburg had

struck a medal in Haydn's honor, which they wanted Neukomm to deliver to Haydn (Neukomm refused because he thought it more fitting for the ambassador to present it personally to Haydn). In closing, Neukomm entreated Haydn to "preserve your affection for me, which is the only thing which renders my lot an enviable one, and makes me one of the happiest inhabitants on this earth" (ibid., 247).

Access to and inclusion in aristocratic patronage networks were essential for a musician to survive at a time when the Viennese music world was still controlled by Vienna's old aristocrats and musical life was conducted primarily in private. Occupational musicians took care not to alienate potential patrons, both at home and abroad. Haydn, writing a letter of reference for Peter Hänsel to Ignaz Pleyel (then in Paris),[13] notes that Hänsel is a "charming young man of the best character and also a good violin player. . . . You will see how talented he is by examining his three new quartets. He is in the service of the Polish Princess Lubomirsky, and for that reason I suggest that you treat him kindly" (ibid., 212). Similarly, Paul Struck's own success, on his return to Sweden as a "pupil of Haydn," was bolstered when (at Silverstolpe's instigation) Albrechtsberger, Salieri, and Haydn were made honorary members of the Swedish Royal Academy in 1799. Haydn's increasing profile in that country was further enhanced along with that of his pupils. Thus Haydn was something of a musical gatekeeper to career paths, to the extent that close association with him could provide access to the upper echelons of the high culture musical world and to the networks of aristocratic patrons. Contact with Haydn would have been especially important for those pupils who were otherwise denied access to elite patrons.

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF SKILL AND SKILL TRANSMISSION

I have so far left unexplored the issue of what Haydn's pupils may have learned from their teacher; instead, I have focused on the secondary benefits that association with a renowned teacher such as Haydn could confer. In this respect, my discussion runs counter to conventional musical historical and biographical treatments, which accent the ways that lessons with Haydn could enhance his pupils' musical skills. Such accounts correspondingly downplay the secondary benefits of the relationship between famous teacher and promising pupil, as if these were simply ancillary to the teaching process itself. Yet, over the past decade, a growing body of research on extraordinary achievement has specified

the crucial role a famous teacher plays in the production of a pupil's achievement. This research highlights how the teacher is important for reasons that extend beyond the issues of whether knowledge and skill are handed down as sets of explicit instructions, and whether it requires a "great" teacher to recognize and bring to fruition a "great" pupil's potential. Emphasis is placed on how, apart from crucial practical help (such as introductions and exposure), contact with a famous teacher exposes a pupil to the often tacit "culture of success"—how to "act the part" and how to mobilize various contacts (see, for example, Feldman 1979; Bourdieu and Passeron [1964] 1977; Lareau 1989). This approach is not meant to suggest that the "lesson content" and the quality of the interaction between pupil and teacher should be ignored. Rather, these scholars observe that what a pupil gains from lessons with a great teacher should not be conceptualized only to reinforce a preconceived view of how skill and the ability to become a "great" talent is "transmitted" from one "great" individual to another; that view tends to elide the way the description of skill and its successful transmission from teacher to student is, in several senses, a micropolitically charged issue.

Consider, for example, the following report from Silverstolpe, the Swedish diplomat, of an anonymous pupil's[14] lesson with Haydn in 1798. It suggests (if Silverstolpe was reasonably accurate in his report) that the type of criticism Haydn offered his pupil was, while clearly of a substantive nature, also rather vague:

> Once when I visited Haydn, he was just in the process of going through the work of a pupil. It was the first allegro of a symphony, in which form the young man was displaying his first essay. When Haydn cast his eye over the attempt, he found a long passage in which the wind instruments had rests, and he paid the pupil a compliment and said in a half-joking tone: "rests are the most difficult thing of all to write; you were right to remember what a big effect longer piano passages can have." The more he read, the darker became his mien. "I haven't anything to find wrong about the part writing [*Satz*]" he said; "it is correct. But the proportions are not as I would like them to be: look, here is a thought that is only half developed; it shouldn't be abandoned so quickly; and this phrase connects badly with the others. Try to give the whole a proper balance; that can't be so difficult because the main subject is good."—This was all spoken with charm, and the young man, hungry for knowledge, was—far from being hurt—full of thankful recognition. I never knew his name; perhaps he later became one of the well-known ones. (Landon 1976–80, 4:335)

One could of course question the value of this report as an ethnographic account; perhaps, for example, Silverstolpe was not sufficiently knowledgeable musically to follow and be able to recall Haydn's more technical instructions (though Silverstolpe, like most diplomats, was a keen amateur musician). Yet for anyone who has been a pupil of an established and therefore busy teacher in any field, the notion that advice is often conveyed in broad brushstrokes—and that it is often left up to the student to determine just what such terse advice is meant to index—is surely not foreign. The "how to" is often alluded to and left for the pupil to discover on his or her own, with the teacher sometimes returning to "take credit" retrospectively for the pupils' efforts (whether that appropriation is justified, of course, is a potential topic for negotiation).

To tell a student, for example, that a phrase "connects badly," is not to tell her or him how it "should" have sounded. Similarly, to ask that the whole composition be given "proper balance" is not, practically speaking, much help in teaching just what such a goal might entail. This is not to say that Haydn, with his far greater experience, was not capable of "improving" some of his pupil's early works—it is not, in other words, to assert cynically that Haydn did not, after all, have skills to convey. Rather shorthand instructions were naturally employed as a practical strategy in teaching, which suggests that the tacit content assumed to be present in the "gap" between the improvements that Haydn may have had in mind and the way he expressed himself would, of necessity, be filled in later by the student. Recognizing that such a gap between a teacher's instructions and a pupil's applications exists serves to highlight the possibility that these gaps may be filled in creative and unanticipated ways—at least some of which the teacher may not have intended.

How, for example, would we know whether "proper balance" has been achieved? The answer is inextricably linked to the quality of accounts that can be mobilized in favor of a pupil's work and to how that work is viewed in relation to a body of other works. In turn, these accounts are themselves linked to the relative authority ascribed to them as "legitimate"—that is, to the ways authority itself can be accounted for. Thus a creative attempt can be evaluated according to a variety of (potentially conflicting) grounds: Is the student's production "what Haydn would have done"? Has it exceeded Haydn or has it fallen short? Or was it oriented to an entirely different set of criteria? In other words, justifications and evaluative criteria have to be selected; only when the student's creative attempts are viewed against selected criteria do they become meaningful in evaluative terms—as good or poor, creative or plodding, far from the mark or perfectly in keeping with a given ideal.

Not surprisingly, therefore, any opportunity for criteria selection raises micropolitical issues. Depending on the nature of the criteria invoked, the distribution of various resources (in this case, honors and accolades) creates a variety of consequences. In this sense, then, the examination of how a teacher recognizes a pupil's work cannot be understood in isolation from the ways that recognition relates to numerous contextual features of the teacher-pupil relationship, features often considered as external and irrelevant to the teaching process. By no means is this argument meant to suggest, however, that musical factors (those intrinsic to musical practice itself) are reducible to external issues. Rather its purpose is to recognize that—because the perception and evaluation of compositions occur partly through reference to aesthetic ideas—"purely musical" factors alone cannot form the basis for an explanation of how works are assessed.

We need to distance ourselves from the conventional cultural notion of what study with a famous teacher provides. The major problem with that concept is that it idealizes the teacher's contribution and circumvents the ways both the pupil's and the teacher's abilities are constituted through the teacher-student relationship. Evaluation of what a pupil has "learned from" a teacher (and how talented that pupil is) has a social, interpretive dimension that cannot be accounted for through musical terms alone. Moreover, a student's ability to "profit" from the criticism of a teacher is often conceived in ways that undervalue the student's ability to "fill in" or second guess a teacher or, indeed, to impute a greater amount of intent to the teacher than the teacher's actual instruction may warrant. This discussion leads to the issue of how the teacher-pupil relationship was beneficial not only to Haydn's students but also to Haydn himself.

THE TEACHER'S GAIN FROM THE PUPIL

First, as I have already noted, underneath the cultural imagery of what a pupil gains from a master (primary skills rather than secondary benefits that help to assure success, such as contacts and prestige), a teacher can allow credit for that pupil's success to accrue back to him- or herself. A teacher can appropriate credit and do so legitimately where, according to the cultural imagery of the teacher-student relationship, "credit is due." Teaching becomes a resource for enhancing a teacher's standing as one who is able to foster talent. It is a resource because it provides a view of the pedagogic relationship that highlights the teacher as the imparter

of knowledge, while leaving in shadow the work of the pupil as "receiver" (and creative interpreter) of wisdom.[15]

Without the support of ethnographic access to Haydn's encounters with his pupils, this discussion must remain speculative. There were, however, concrete ways Haydn's pupils were useful to him. By the middle 1790s, Haydn was Vienna's most famous composer. He had begun to be recognized as one of Vienna's cultural treasures, an identity that was intensified after his two trips to London. After receiving an honorary doctorate in music from Oxford in 1791, Haydn was officially described as a composer of whom "his Fatherland can be proud . . . a great creative and ever productive genius."[16] As the cultural climate of aristocratic music patronage grew more receptive to the notion of musical "greatness," however, Haydn, rather than resting on the laurels of previous successes, actively engaged in expanding and to some extent redefining his reputation. For this project, his pupils were extremely useful as support personnel.

During the 1790s Haydn was increasingly recognized as not only a public and popular composer (he was involved in numerous charity concerts, for example) but also a great composer, foreshadowing the sort of reputation that Beethoven's success continued and expanded. Haydn's renown as a serious composer derived primarily from his work for the Gesellschaft der Associierten Cavaliere, the large-scale oratorios *The Creation* and *The Seasons*. During the last decade of the eighteenth century and the first decade of the nineteenth, Haydn was actively concertizing, composing prolifically (especially after 1792, in styles that were new for him), and making arrangements for travel and business. His students (particularly those who could not afford to pay the hundred-ducat fee) provided a variety of support services, which relieved him of many tedious but necessary chores—the sorts of chores through which international standing was maintained and through which it could be advanced.

Both Wranitzskys and Neukomm, for instance, acted as Haydn's assistants, arranging some of the master's larger works for smaller ensembles.[17] Neukomm helped Haydn in an even more substantial way by assisting with the arrangements of the national airs, nearly four hundred in all (written between sometime before 1792 and 1805), a lucrative commission for Haydn from the Scottish publisher George Thomson. Thomson advertised these airs as having been arranged "by Haydn"; yet, according to Silverstolpe, who became friendly with Neukomm between 1804 and 1808, Neukomm revealed that he had written accompani-

ments for seventy Scottish songs (Landon 1959, 216). In April 1803, Haydn wrote to Neukomm: "Dearest Friend, Your servant Jos. Haydn urgently requests you to do the enclosed two Songs as soon as possible, and to tell my servant on which day he may come and get them—I hope perhaps the day after tomorrow" (ibid.).

Like the Renaissance artists who painted only the most important sections of a work (such as the faces of figures) and left the completion of background sections to their assistants (Baxandall 1972, 20–23) (or like contemporary academics who lend their names to papers "coauthored" by research assistants), Haydn was able to spread the wealth that his name could generate by contracting out some of his commissions and other tasks.[18] A sense of the organization of such collaborations can be gleaned from a letter to Haydn's eventual biographer, Georg August Griesinger.[19] Haydn says: "As far as the arrangement of the *Seasons* for quartet or quintet is concerned, I think that Herr Wranizky, at Prince Lobkowitz, should receive the preference, not only because of his fine arrangement of the Creation, but also because I am sure that he will not make use of it to further his own ends" (see Landon 1959, 191). Neukomm and Paul Wranitzsky also served as conductors for performances of Haydn's works during the late 1790s and early 1800s, thereby allowing Haydn's music to be performed under conditions that would assure high quality without placing too many performance demands on the composer.

Thus it was important for Haydn to have pupils who could function as support personnel and who could also attest to (and advertise) the importance of their teacher, both at home and abroad. The relationship Haydn enjoyed with his various students during the 1790s was symbiotic. For the pupils, most of whom came to Haydn without strong preexisting aristocratic sponsorship, there was much to be gained from the appellation "pupil of Haydn"; for Haydn, pupils helped him maintain and expand a reputation by publicly acknowledging him as their "master," by acting as his emissary, by exporting his music and style to provincial areas, and by assisting him with some of the more mundane aspects of composition.

BEETHOVEN AND HAYDN

Although study with a famous teacher is capable of enhancing a pupil's chances of future success it may also, under some circumstances, limit how far a student can go. Being known as the pupil of a famous teacher

guarantees recognition, but it may also mean that the student's reputation will never equal or surpass the master's. Indeed, one reason Lessel, Neukomm, Hänsel, Struck, and Spech became recognized as "Beethoven's lesser contemporaries" may have been that they played the role of devoted pupil too well—they were drawn too far in to playing supporting roles in the larger project of expanding Haydn's own reputation. Beethoven managed to avoid precisely this predicament. In the remainder of the chapter, I consider how Beethoven's relationship with Haydn compared with that between Haydn and his other pupils.

In certain respects Beethoven's initial position as "pupil of Haydn" differed little from the experience of these contemporaries. In 1793 Beethoven was a young and, in Vienna, relatively unknown musician who had achieved some amount of distinction in a culturally important but distant north German town. As his Bonn teacher Neefe observed (quoted earlier), one way of looking at Beethoven's journey to Vienna was that Beethoven had been recommended to Haydn to gain further mastery in composition and, more important, the imprimatur of Vienna's most famous living composer.

Yet the nature of Beethoven's tie to Haydn was qualitatively different: Beethoven was the only Haydn pupil ever to be praised as "heir" to the Mozart-Haydn tradition and as Haydn's greatest prodigy.[20] In the Fischenich letter Haydn is said to endorse this view, and Haydn himself told the Bonn elector that he would be proud to be known as Beethoven's teacher. At the same time, the relationship between Beethoven and Haydn appears to have been more complicated and characterized by far more ambiguity than that between Haydn and any of his other pupils. Landon has described the relationship as "ambivalent and even morbid," as having begun under a shadow "as cloudy as was Haydn and Mozart's sunny" (1976–80, 3:204), and he has emphasized the "ambiguity with which their intercourse was clouded almost from the beginning" (ibid., 4:61).

The traditional version of the "Haydn's hands" story suggests, as the earlier quotations from Beethoven's contemporaries describe it, that Haydn took on Beethoven because of the younger composer's unusual promise as the Viennese musical heir, and that the younger was "initiated" into the "holy secrets" of music (to use Schönfeld's words) while the elder was a proud and admiring teacher. In at least one version of the story (the Fischenich letter), Haydn is depicted as a teacher who recognized the possibility that his pupil would eventually surpass him. In keeping with this narrative, Beethoven could be understood as paying

homage to Haydn by collaborating with him in public concerts (where he improvised on some of Haydn's themes [Solomon 1977a, 74]) and by dedicating his first published piano sonatas (op. 2) to his teacher, a conventional form of tribute. Considering the components of the story's "plot," we can outline the narrative as follows (1) Haydn was at the height of his fame, enjoying (via his international entrepreneurial ventures in London and engagements at Vienna salons) more attention than any of his contemporaries. (2) Haydn consented to take Beethoven as a pupil ("with whose care," as Haydn writes, he had been "graciously entrusted") because of Beethoven's extraordinary promise ("Beethoven will in time fill the position of one of Europe's greatest composers"); (3) in an environment of mutual respect (Beethoven "has put himself in the hands of our immortal Haydn," Schönfeld notes, and accordingly, Haydn says he will "be proud to be able to speak of myself as his teacher"), (4) the tradition was passed from an established to a budding genius ("to be initiated into the holy secrets of the art of music"). (5) As the pupil's experience increased, so did the master's conviction of the pupil's ability ("Haydn has . . . reported that he . . . would soon have to give up composing" [Fischenich]).

These components add up to an admirable and charming story, and for the most part this anecdote continues to be told by current Beethoven scholars, who accept it even in the face of contradictory evidence. As these elements are examined more closely, however, we find that not one of them can be accepted without qualification. There are numerous contradictions that have to be manipulated to present this story as a whole, and these contradictions suggest that the reality of the relationship is far less mythological, indeed, far less conventionally satisfying as a "good" (that is, dramatic and unambiguous) narrative.

According to Haydn's contemporary biographer Griesinger (1968, 63), Haydn "used to praise Pleyel, Neukomm and Lessel as his best and most grateful pupils." While there is no direct evidence to suggest that, during the early years of their relationship, Haydn's opinion of Beethoven was low (which seems unlikely), there is also not enough persuasive evidence to show that Haydn had clearly singled out Beethoven as the best or most talented pupil he had ever encountered. To the contrary, as Beethoven's reputation grew, Haydn seems to have grown increasingly *less* confident in the quality of his work. According to Giuseppe Carpani, Haydn's contemporary and biographer who was also acquainted with Beethoven, "Haydn was asked once by one of my friends what he thought of this young composer. The old man replied in all sincerity, 'his

first works pleased me quite a bit, but I confess that I do not understand the latest ones. It seems to me that he always writes fantasies.'" (that is, in free form, improvisational style).[21] To be sure, Carpani is not, as James Webster has observed (1984, 27), the most reliable of sources, but Solomon notes: "No single one of these reports can be confirmed by documentary evidence. But the sheer number of these recollections—and the total absence of reports of praise by Haydn for any of Beethoven's compositions following the Septet and The Creatures of Prometheus—makes it rather probable that Haydn was unable or unwilling to comprehend Beethoven's greater achievements" (1977a, 77).

One obstacle to a richer sociological understanding of what Haydn may have thought of Beethoven's work is the commonsense assumption that Haydn had some kind of clearly formulated and coherent opinion about how Beethoven compared with other musicians who were his pupils—that "opinion" has an existence independent of the changing circumstances under which it is elicited. This commonsense assumption, when it is conjoined to the strong pro-Beethoven bias of much of mainstream musicology, often results in the failure to consider the circumstances in which Haydn's accounts of Beethoven's talent were produced. We can, however, bracket belief in Beethoven's transcendent ability and recognize instead that Haydn's accounts of Beethoven's ability, like all accounts, must be understood in the context of how, when, where, and for whom they were produced. Then it is possible to recover a sense of the Haydn-Beethoven relationship outside of its conventional narrative frame and to see it as characterized by ambiguity, contradiction, and ambivalence, and as extremely difficult (if not impossible) to summarize definitely. Once we begin to consider such issues, the case for Beethoven as Haydn's favorite seems far less clear.

First, given Beethoven's origins in a major electoral kapelle, Haydn could have refused only with difficulty to take Beethoven on as a student. As the contemporary composer Johann Schenk observes in his memoirs, "In 1792, His Imperial Highness, Archduke Maximilian, Elector of Cologne was pleased to send his protegé Louis van Beethoven to Vienna in order that he might study musical composition with Joseph Haydn" (1951, 272). Similarly, the "mutual respect" between the two musicians was not always present in private, nor was "the tradition" always conceived as having been adequately transmitted. In 1795, for example, when Haydn wanted Beethoven to put "pupil of Haydn" at the top of his first publication (op. 1), Beethoven refused because, as he told his friend Ferdinand Ries, he had "never learned anything from [Haydn]" (Wegeler

and Ries 1987, 75). Certainly Beethoven was concerned with making a good impression on Haydn and depicting himself to his teacher as talented and industrious. One way Beethoven seems to have accomplished this was through covert help with his "homework" from the senior (but less celebrated) composer Johann Schenk:

> Towards the end of July [actually it was early in 1793—see Thayer and Forbes 1967, 1:142] the Abbé Gelinek informed me that he had made the acquaintance of a young man who displayed a rare virtuosity on the pianoforte, such as he had not heard since Mozart. At the same time he explained that Beethoven had begun to study counterpoint with Haydn more than six months before, but was still at work on the first exercise. He also said that His Excellency Baron von Swieten had warmly recommended the study of counterpoint to him and often inquired how far he had progressed in his studies. On Beethoven's writing desk I came across a few phrases of the first exercise in counterpoint. After a cursory examination it was clear to me that in every tonality (short as these were) there were several mistakes. This tended to bear out the truth of Gelinek's above-mentioned remarks. Since I was now convinced that my pupil was ignorant of the primary rules of counterpoint, I gave him the universally known text-book by Joseph Fux, *Gradus ad Parnassum,* so that he might obtain a summary of the subsequent exercises. Joseph Haydn, who had returned to Vienna from London towards the end of the previous year, was engaged in harnessing his Muse to the composition of great new masterpieces. Taken up with these important endeavors it was clear that Haydn could not easily occupy himself with teaching grammar. Now I was seriously anxious to be of assistance to one so eager to acquire knowledge. Before I began to teach him, however, I pointed out to him that our work together must forever remain a secret. In this regard, I ordered him to copy out once again every passage which I had corrected in my own hand, so that every time that Haydn examined it he would not notice the work of a strange hand. (Landon 1970a, 60–61)

Schenk may well have thought that this secret association would be of benefit to himself as well as to Beethoven, insofar as some of Beethoven's obvious and increasing cachet might rub off on him (Schenk was not nearly so close to the music aristocrats). But the association would clearly have been advantageous to Beethoven also, to the extent that it could enable him to demonstrate to Haydn a greater degree of competence.

In an essay that considers the Beethoven-Haydn relationship in detail and casts it in a favorable light (tending to discredit Schenk's account), Webster has suggested that Schenk's story was fabricated and that Schenk "doubtless saw no harm in puffing up his relationship with the great man into something more rewarding personally and, in its dupe-

like role for Haydn, more titillating" (1984, 12). At least some of the circumstantial evidence Webster presents does cast doubt on some of Schenk's statements (for example, that the manuscripts studied by Gustav Nottebohm [1873] reveal numerous errors in spite of this supposed help and that Schenk's claim that Beethoven was inexperienced at throughbass is contradicted both by Neefe's commendation of Beethoven's skills and by the fact that Beethoven held keyboard positions at the Bonn court). Moreover, as Webster observes, Schenk seems to have been an enemy of Haydn (though Webster also notes that the sources for this claim are as untrustworthy as Schenk's own account), which, "if it should be accurate . . . would go some distance toward explaining the animus that would have led Schenk to fabricate his story about Haydn and Beethoven"(14). But if Schenk felt animosity toward Haydn, could not this animosity have been served just as well by covert tutoring as through a fabricated account of tutoring?

It does seem plausible that Beethoven studied secretly with Schenk. We know, at any rate, that Beethoven attempted to mislead Haydn about his ability and productivity in at least one other way. He brought Haydn several examples of his "recent" compositions, including a quintet (lost), an eight-part *parthie* (later published as op. 103), an oboe concerto (lost), a fugue (WoO unknown), and some piano variations (unknown). All of these works (except perhaps the fugue) had been composed some years previously, while Beethoven was still in Bonn; unfortunately for Beethoven, these were the works that Haydn enclosed in his 23 November 1793 letter to Maximilian ("as evidence of his assiduity over and above his actual studies"). Maximilian's rather chilly reply bears quoting in brief:

> The music of young Beethoven which you sent me I received with your letter. Since, however, this music, with the exception of the fugue, was composed and performed here in Bonn before he departed on his second journey to Vienna, I cannot regard it as progress made in Vienna. . . . I am wondering therefore whether he had not better come back here in order to resume his work. For I very much doubt that he has made any important progress in composition and in the development of his musical taste during his present stay [in an earlier draft of this letter Maximilian says, more harshly, "for I very much doubt if he can have learnt anything from you"; see Landon 1959, 143 n.] and I hear that, as in the case of his first journey to Vienna he will bring back nothing but debts. (Thayer and Forbes 1967, 1:145)

This mishap benefited neither teacher nor student. Whether Haydn contemplated bringing Beethoven along with him on his second London trip

(some scholars, such as Landon [1976–80, vol. 3], have suggested that Haydn may have considered the possibility), he went without Beethoven and, in his absence, "turned him over to our great Albrechtsberger" (Schönfeld's *Jahrbuch*).

While Haydn was alive, the "mutual respect" depicted in the "Haydn's hands" story was often preempted by rivalry. Indeed, as we have seen, it seems that as Beethoven's career progressed, Haydn admired his former pupil's music less and less. We can periodize roughly the quality of their relationship as follows: (1) From 1793 to around 1796 they were involved in acting out various versions of the "Haydn's hands" account of their talents, with Haydn recognized as the "master" and Beethoven as the "disciple." (2) From about 1796 to around 1803 the two composers behaved openly like rivals, during which time their reputations were on a more equal footing, Beethoven coming into his own as a stylistically innovative composer. (3) After 1803, Beethoven and Haydn again colluded in promoting the story (at the 1809 performance of Haydn's *Creation,* Beethoven knelt down and kissed the hands of the master). As later reported in the *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung,* in 1803 Haydn reversed their roles, respectfully asking Beethoven for some artistic "advice." (4) After Haydn's death in 1809 (and when Haydn was thus no longer a rival), Beethoven publicly professed admiration for Haydn's genius and publicized his close ties to his former teacher.

The reality of the Beethoven-Haydn relationship is hard to summarize; it was characterized by contradictions that the clearer and more dramatic "Haydn's hands" narrative tends to elide. These contradictions have been explored by contemporary scholars, such as Solomon (1977a), who attempts to specify the diverse motives that informed Haydn's and Beethoven's interactions. He considers that Haydn may have been jealous of Beethoven's easier access to aristocrats but rejects this notion because Haydn was also helpful to Beethoven by introducing him to important aristocrats. Solomon also suggests that Beethoven was angry with Haydn for criticizing his compositions. So far, however, music scholars have not considered the Haydn-Beethoven relationship in the context of the changing occupational and cultural climate of musical life in late eighteenth-century Vienna. We can reach a deeper understanding of why Haydn colluded in the production of the "Haydn's hands" narrative by examining how, within this changing Viennese climate, the two musicians could be of help to each other—in ways that differed qualitatively from the mutual aid that characterized Haydn's relationship with his other pupils. This approach provides a way to accept the contradictions of the composers' relationship without having to resolve these contradictions in favor of one or the other of the alternatives that Haydn and Beethoven scholars have presented. It accounts for the production and dissemination of the "Haydn's hands" story without suppressing the numerous tensions with which it is riddled.

Beethoven, unlike other Haydn pupils, did not arrange or conduct his teacher's music. Although he did improvise on a theme by Haydn when he was a featured artist in Haydn's 1795 benefit concert (allowing him to demonstrate his improvisatory skill, for which he was rapidly becoming renowned), the remainder of his contribution to that concert consisted of performing his own works. Nor did he help Haydn with the numerous Scottish airs (indeed, Beethoven was subsequently invited by George Thomson to write accompaniments under his own name, a lucrative project during the 1810s). Moreover, as observed earlier, Beethoven refused to attach the phrase "pupil of Haydn" to his earliest publications (though he did dedicate his first published piano sonatas, op. 2, to his teacher—a less deferential gesture). One might wonder, therefore, what Beethoven could "do" for Haydn: if Beethoven avoided many of the more conventional forms of service a pupil could provide to a teacher, what practical benefit could Haydn derive from teaching Beethoven? One might suggest that Haydn agreed to tutor Beethoven simply because he had a genuine belief in Beethoven's talent, but this explanation bypasses too much material that is of interest.

An association with Beethoven could, in fact, benefit Haydn, and to understand the reasons requires looking once again into Haydn's own status and aspirations during the 1790s and into Beethoven's social background. I have already discussed the ways Haydn was actively engaged in furthering and redefining the quality of his reputation. Even so, though the status of the Viennese musician was changing during these years, it was still held in check by the aristocratic practice of treating musicians as domestic servants. This practice had an effect on the social innovations Haydn was able to accomplish.

Ideological conceptions of the musician's role changed as the notion of "great" music was elaborated and disseminated during the late 1790s and early 1800s. A major catalyst for this change was Beethoven himself and the quality of his reception. It is important to recognize that although Haydn was, in comparison to his fellow musicians, quite comfortably situated between the old (patronal) and new (quasi-freelance) forms of music sponsorship, in Vienna he was still closer to the old than the new. The Viennese did not begin to honor Haydn as a national celeb-

rity until after he was awarded the doctorate of music at Oxford in 1791. Karl Geringer has suggested that, to many Viennese during the 1790s, Haydn was still known primarily as the musical servant of Prince Esterhazy rather than a figure in his own right (1946, 85–86).

While this view tends to overstate the case, it seems clear that, especially as Beethoven's own star ascended, Haydn risked being conceived (by strong Beethoven supporters, at least) as a musical exponent of the old regime, of music "in service to" aristocratic festivities and ceremonies. This notion colored Haydn's reception up until the twentieth century: his work—including the highly innovative, dark, and emotive works of the 1770s—became decontextualized and perceived (unfairly) as benign and anachronistic. To suggest, however, that all of Vienna came to perceive Haydn as old-fashioned and Beethoven as the "wave of the future" would be far too simplistic. Haydn was, after all, an established international figure, whereas Beethoven was a young upstart and a *pianist*-composer at the beginning of his career. Yet, unlike Beethoven, Haydn had spent nearly a lifetime under the older system of patronage, and, in addition, the Esterhazy family maintained a conservative approach to both musical-occupational issues and stylistic changes. Even as late as 1802, according to Landon, Haydn was treated openly as a servant, as extant communications from Prince Nikolaus II to Haydn suggest. In 1801, for example, Esterhazy wrote: "To Herr Kapellmeister Haydn: I urge you to bear in mind that the members of the band must appear at all times with their uniforms clean and neat, and with powdered wigs. Disobedience will result in the offender being dismissed from the band. Eisenstadt, 26th September 1801" (Landon 1959, 191). And in 1802:

> To Kapellmeister Haydn: [speaking of Fuchs, a new assistant kapellmeister] . . . Just as the said Assistant Kapellmeister is now entrusted with the direction of the orchestra and church music in your absence, so the leader Luigi Tomasini is to assume the direction of the chamber music. Together with you, both of them, according to these circumstances, are to ensure that all the individual members of the band show the proper obedience; whereby I insist that there will be no case of insubordination, and that the various duties be performed in an exemplary manner; this includes personal appearance, care of uniforms, and other tokens of good behavior. . . . I have observed, not without displeasure, obvious proof of negligence of duty among certain members of the band: in future, a monetary punishment will be levied on any member of the band who absents himself from the [church] service. (ibid., 207)

Landon has commented on how "the difference between [Haydn's] position in London and that in Vienna and Eisenstadt will have been forcibly made clear to him almost every day" (1976–80, 3:195). Thus, despite Haydn's celebrity late in his career, even then this fame was qualified by his former position as musical "servant."

Haydn was on the verge of a new kind of celebrity during the 1790s, and this potential dictated a partial transformation of his previous reputation. Beethoven, on the other hand, was distinctly poised for this new kind of fame from the start of his career, at a time when the possibility of the older type of success (as a kapellmeister/servant) became increasingly unlikely. In contrast to Haydn, whose repute accumulated gradually over a long and increasingly international career, Beethoven's success had a prospective dimension: Beethoven was primed for success even before the start of his Viennese career. Moreover, unlike Haydn, Beethoven could follow a career path that ran closer to the perimeter of (and in some respects entered) the circle of aristocratic patrons. As I discuss in the following chapter, even at the outset of his career, Beethoven was much closer to his aristocratic backers than Haydn ever was, including during the final years of his career. Nevertheless, Haydn could also be of help to Beethoven. While Beethoven's familiarity with aristocrats during his first two years was probably deeper than Haydn's, it was also narrower; Beethoven needed to widen the extent of his support. So Haydn was helpful to Beethoven in the concrete sense of being able to broaden the base of aristocratic contacts. Beethoven spent the summer of 1793 at Eisenstadt with Haydn, and, according to Landon (1976–80, 3:219), Prince Esterhazy was later an early subscriber to Beethoven's Piano Trios op. 1. It was also through Haydn that Beethoven was introduced to Countess Thun and the Erdödy family. Finally, the association with Haydn provided a pretext for discussion of Beethoven's special talent—the "Haydn's hands" story.

Beethoven's social connections to aristocratic patronage, unlike those of Neukomm, Lessel, Struck, and Spech (Hänsel had connections to Prince Potemkin's kapelle in Saint Petersburg)—none of whom were from backgrounds that gave them proximity to important aristocrats (including Haydn himself, the son of a wheelwright)—were established long before he arrived in Vienna to study with Haydn. Whereas most of Haydn's other pupils were entirely dependent on their teacher for introductions and recommendations, Beethoven was already backed by key aristocrats. In comparison with Haydn's other pupils, therefore, Beetho-

ven was less reliant on Haydn for making his way in the world of aristocratic musical life. Beethoven's aspirations were, however, qualitatively different from those of Haydn's other pupils; Beethoven was far more ambitious. To be viewed as Mozart's legitimate heir, Beethoven needed Haydn's help, and in ways that extended beyond compositional training.

Solomon (1977a) has observed in passing that perhaps Beethoven did not recognize Haydn's assistance because he did not want to remain known as a "pupil of Haydn" all his life. It does seem the case that Beethoven was strategically conscious of how he could enhance his status as an "important" musician; his letters and conversation books suggest a meticulous attention to self-portrayal as an autonomous, ideologically committed artist, as do his activities in the concert world (see the following chapters). Beethoven was in a position that allowed him to take some initiative in his self-presentation and in his relationship with his teacher. Unlike Haydn's other pupils, he had the social capital that made creative independence possible, permitting him to purchase some independence from Haydn. From the start of his career, there was a group of elite aristocrats—some of whom were Vienna's music controllers—interested in observing and underwriting Beethoven's progress. The Beethoven-Haydn relationship had, from its inception, a high degree of visibility. It provided a public arena, a means for both musicians to enhance their profiles. This context reveals what Haydn had to gain from a connection with Beethoven.

Association with the "rising" Beethoven—that is, with a young musician whose success was expected, at least by an initial cluster of prominent aristocrats—provided Haydn the means for a new kind of success. This connection with Beethoven, especially as he was so swiftly taken up by some of Vienna's musical princes, was an opportunity for Haydn to come closer to or gain more status in relation to these music aristocrats. Collaborating or playing along with the "Haydn's hands" story, as this story became increasingly public, could be useful to both musicians even if the private reality of their relationship was more complex. This is by no means to suggest that Haydn and/or Beethoven were acting in a calculating and conscious manner—for instance, that Haydn was privately hostile to Beethoven and his music, but that he praised it in public for purely instrumental reasons. Rather, it is to call for a more naturalistic imagery of how decisions are made and stances taken toward individuals and works, one which recognizes individuals as often indecisive and ambivalent, and where ideals and practical circumstances are inextricably and interactively related.[22] Thus whatever Haydn may have thought of

Beethoven, he could hardly contradict any imagery of Beethoven as his prodigy that was projected onto their relationship by such august patrons as van Swieten, Waldstein, Lichnowsky, and Lobkowitz.

NARRATIVE AND ITS USES

Rather than attempting to determine Haydn's and Beethoven's opinions of each other, I look instead at how the two participants entered or were drawn into a cultural structure, a narrative historical account of people and events, and consider this account's effects—its impact on the organization of Vienna's music world. The "Haydn's hands" story helped to create certain entitlements and had implications for the allocation of resources, such as attention, time, and space in publications. Like a turn in conversation that establishes a concrete platform for initiating or shaping certain courses of action, a story provides a platform for depictive, representational work.[23]

Analysts of conversation describe how a story provides a way of organizing the statuses and relations between teller(s), addressed recipient(s), principle character(s), and nonaddressed recipient(s) by aligning them and clarifying their identities both substantively and in relation to each other. As a prerequisite to the work that telling accomplishes, however, it is necessary to "get the floor," that is, to mobilize the attention of addressed and nonaddressed recipients. Getting the floor is achieved through the pretext of providing something of value, something worth listening to, such as news, drama, comedy, and so on. The promise of a story worth telling is thus a pretext for the opportunity to advance a claim or series of claims about the way(s) reality is to be represented. To be able to tell a story or write a history, and to have established an entitlement to a venue, to listeners, and ideally to some means of reproducing that story over time, is to possess a resource for the classification and framing of what comes to pass as the "real" or "correct" version of events.[24]

"Stories" should be understood as providing resources for organizing the perception of an ongoing, often ambiguous present that lends itself to a plethora of interpretations. "Good" stories provide their recipients with what Melvin Pollner (1987) and Hugh Mehan (Grimshaw 1990, 160–77) have referred to as "incorrigible propositions"—sacred principles to which further ad hoc, practical sense-making processes ("documentary practices") become subservient. In Beethoven's case, once a valid claim was established for the "Haydn's hands" version of Beetho-

ven's talent, the chances increased that perception of Beethoven would occur in ways that helped to substantiate, flatter, and elaborate that claim.[25] The issue of who can mobilize resources necessary to empower and privilege particular accounts (and in which contexts) is crucial. Pretexts for gaining access to a story-telling venue (a floor) are key, and these pretexts will themselves be perceived to have greater and lesser degrees of value, which will in turn have an impact on the quality of the venue and thus on the conditions under which reception occurs.

Telling the "Haydn's hands" story was useful in a number of respects. First, it established a high-profile platform—a legitimate pretext for attention—on which entitlements to future claims about Beethoven could be dramatized. In addition, because this story contained prophetic dimensions, it helped to organize perception and expectations about the musical future. The association with Haydn was a resource in two senses: it established a venue and it inaugurated a clarification of Beethoven as someone special, as someone of whom "great things" were expected. Second, the "Haydn hands" story was a vehicle for the creation of a qualitatively different type of publicity. The narrative organized the music field (tellers, principle characters, addressed and nonaddressed recipients) according to new and more hierarchical lines. It highlighted the notion of a definitive and self-conscious tradition of "greatness": Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven could be opposed in this discourse to the more workaday, ordinary musicians who came to be constituted as their lesser contemporaries. Although the narrative cleverly described the value of Mozart as if it had remained constant over time, we have seen (in chapter 2) that the notion of Mozart's "greatness" (as opposed to his popularity) was an emerging and evolving phenomenon during the 1790s. The conceptual resource of Mozart's spirit—awaiting an heir—was constructed and mobilized in the service of this larger story line. The "Haydn's hands" narrative helped to transform Mozart's reputation, it also affected Haydn's status, and, most important for the purposes of this study, it helped to structure the ways Beethoven was perceived.

Thus the "Haydn's hands" narrative provided a means to dramatize the worth of both composers. It could enhance their reputations and distance them from the older, more traditional image of musician-as-servant; it could also more closely align them with the newer image of musician-as-celebrity. It is important to emphasize that Viennese-based musicians did not have at their disposal as many ways of dramatizing themselves as independent or as celebrities as did their English counterparts (or even as did Haydn when he performed in London). Within the

scope of aristocratic receptivity, this drama of "Mozart's spirit from Haydn's hands" was one route to enhanced reputation that was not impeded by Vienna's more traditional organizational structure. Playing such parts worked to the composers' mutual advantage in that it let them appropriate more attention, repertory, and repute for themselves as independent musicians. The ideas of "master" and "heir" tended, in theory at least, to contribute to the further inflation of the musical enterprise by dramatizing it as a serious undertaking.

Certainly, the association with Haydn enhanced the description of Beethoven in Schönfeld's *Jahrbuch* because it was a medium through which discussions of his special qualities could be broadcast. Simultaneously, it resulted in the allocation of even more space in that publication to Haydn because, within the entry for Beethoven, Schönfeld discusses the link between teacher and pupil (the entry for "Josef Haiden" was already two-and-a-third pages long, as compared to Beethoven's single page and the more typical fifth or less of a page accorded to most others). Both musicians benefited from the interaction between the categories of Haydn's greatness and Beethoven's promise. At the same time, they were also, within the scene's various performances, involved in negotiating their respective roles, and it is here that the breaches in their performances often occurred.

My intention is not to debunk Beethoven and Haydn by suggesting that their actions were instrumentally careerist. On the contrary, I am attempting to describe how actors trying to accomplish constructive work of any kind are caught in a web of circumstances, including their own understandings of these circumstances. In Vienna, the idea of the canonic tradition (Bach, Handel, Mozart, Haydn), and with it the notion of the extraordinary composer and the new practices of concert behavior, comprised an available route away from the framework of servant-composers; it was useful as a response against the more traditional conception of the musician's role. It was a vehicle with which musicians such as Haydn and Beethoven could negotiate identities different from those linked to musician-as-lackey. I am not, in other words, suggesting that Beethoven pursued the new line of conduct for purely egotistical reasons—for recognition in and of itself. What I am suggesting is that, given Beethoven's position in Vienna and the circumstances surrounding his arrival there, this was one way of making the most of a quasi-freelance, quasi-private musical organizational setting, of creating a "space" in which to work. In a sense, Beethoven was "pulled" by available cultural and structural resources as much as he "pushed" with them.

Haydn's association with Beethoven was an opportunity to "tell about" musical events in ways that highlighted Haydn's distinctive role as greatest living exponent and bearer of the newly constructed tradition. In the short term, this was good for Haydn's reputation; by lending his existing clout to the prefiguration of Beethoven's greatness in terms of his promise, Haydn could enhance his own greatness. In the long term, however, once Beethoven's reputation began to grow (and Beethoven's antagonism toward Haydn with it), Haydn risked being constructed in the role of father to a younger and more advanced version of the "great" tradition. The nickname "Papa," which began as an endearment, began to highlight how Haydn, though venerable, was past his prime. Although this line of thinking was not fully elaborated until later in the nineteenth century, these 1790s stories about Beethoven and Haydn were seminal for this later development.

The "Haydn's hands" story had short- and long-term benefits for Beethoven, as well. It was initially useful because it aligned him with Haydn and established his entitlement to publicity: Beethoven became "the man to watch" (what Mozart reportedly said after Beethoven reportedly played for him, an entirely fabricated story about Beethoven that circulated later in Beethoven's career). In the long run the anecdote contributed to the restructuring of the musical field. It fostered modern conceptions of musical hierarchy and serious musical "stars" or "geniuses." The "Haydn's hands" story can be understood as providing a "pre-text" for action or a guide for how to regard Beethoven in relation to other musicians. In sum, it provided Beethoven with a resource—being aligned with the unimpeachable Haydn—and, equally important, it created a space for talk about Beethoven and, implicitly, for talk about others who did not have access to that resource—those who were not recognized as Haydn's "heir." At the same time, the story of "Haydn's hands" transformed that space; it helped to create new and more imposing hierarchies in the field within which artistic reception occurred.

CHAPTER 6

Beethoven in the Salons

The "Haydn's hands" story provided a pretext for considerations of Beethoven as a musician of exceptional promise. The next issues are how this "promise" was converted into evidence of Beethoven's worth and what Beethoven was able to achieve during his first decade in Vienna; to what extent Beethoven's achievements were collaboratively produced; and how Beethoven's increasing legitimacy was linked to, as Landon puts it, his ability to become "a force in music" (1977, 71).

BEETHOVEN AND PRINCE LICHNOWSKY

According to Carl Czerny (1791–1857),[1] one of Beethoven's few pupils: "It has repeatedly been said in foreign lands that Beethoven was not respected in Vienna and was suppressed. The truth is that already as a youth he received all manner of support from our high aristocracy and enjoyed as much care and respect as ever fell to the lot of a young artist" (Thayer and Forbes 1967, 1:444). During the early years of his Viennese career, Beethoven's most significant patrons were Prince Karl Lichnowsky (1756–1814) and Lichnowsky's wife, Princess Christiane (née Thun). The Lichnowskys were old nobility, positioned near the top of the multitiered, rigid structure of the Viennese aristocracy (Landon 1988, 24). In the music world they were also recognized as one of Vienna's foremost patronal families. Both Lichnowsky and his mother-in-law, Countess von Thun, had been important patrons of Mozart during the composer's later (and less economically secure) years. When Lich-