

Reception Theories, Canonic Discourses, and Musical Value

Mark Everist

The study of music has always been rooted in the study of history, and music history balances precariously between an account of musical compositions and an account of musical cultures.¹ In the 1970s and 1980s, an enthusiasm for histories based on musical compositions, coupled with a leaning towards formalist analytical procedures, had the effect of dissolving the history of music into a series of more or less unrelated critical readings. Despite this popularity, the hegemony of text-based, formalist criticism is now as much under threat from a study of history as were such procedures in literary scholarship in the late 1970s.² An alternative to formalist criticism need not be an old-style literary or musical history that chronicles canonic genres and composers with household names. Nor need it trade in historiographical constructs and value-judgements based on criteria that are never made explicit. A return to history could be marked by a discourse in which canonic boundaries are transcended, in which musical cultures are seen as important as musical works, and in which the subjects of history could be allowed to speak a language that it is the historian's task to translate.³ A critical history such as this would address questions of canon, value, and reception. In this chapter I will argue that texts and docu-

¹ In literary studies these two tendencies are identified as intrinsic and extrinsic approaches to the writing of history. See Lee Patterson, 'Literary History', in Frank Lentriccia and Thomas McLaughlin (eds.), *Critical Terms in Literary Study* (Chicago, 1990), 250; and for a consideration of histories of music from a similar perspective, see Mark Everist, 'The Miller's Mule: Writing the History of Medieval Music', *Music & Letters*, 74 (1993), 44–53.

² Such challenges come from a variety of directions, and take various forms. The historicization of key themes has challenged the validity of certain analytical procedures as teaching tools for the twenty-first century. Awareness of the challenges to formalism in literature and a growing distrust in the value of scientific claims have led to a general dissatisfaction with the productivity of formalist procedures (see two of the three papers that constitute the round table 'Análisis musical: modelos sistemáticos versus modelos históricos' at the 1992 meeting of the International Musicological Society: Laurence Dreyfus, 'Musical Analysis and the Historical Imperative', and Nicholas Cook, 'Heinrich Schenker: Anti-Historicist', *Revista de Musicología*, 16 (1993), 11–23, 24–36 resp. The organicist (and historicized) background of many analytical procedures was identified nearly two decades ago; see Ruth Solomon, 'The Living Work: Organicism and Musical Analysis', *19th-Century Music*, 4 (1980), 147–56.

³ The clearest statement of such a procedure is Clifford Geertz, 'Art as Cultural System', *Modern Language Association*, 91 (1976), 1473–99. Margaret Bent specifically evokes the idea of translation as a way of engaging with the past in 'Editing Early Music: The Dilemma of Translation', *Early Music*, 22 (1994), 373–93.

ments which articulate the
 inal—to those that are res
 for its inclusion in, or excl
 orted by an examination o
 the identification of points

Theories of reception move
 tion and composition and to
 Carl Dahlhaus, following
 works.⁴ Reception history is
Receptionsgeschichte is frequ
 term, in music at least, signi
 usually means the study of
 to music. Such reception hi
 record; the idea of an accou
 many that describes the var
 is will be seen, however, su
 tal of the surviving docume

Theories of reception emb
 but also more traditional qu
 subdisciplines as reader-res
 utive more than just a chro
 value and evaluation. One i
 between 'effect' and 'recepti
 these two words, especially
 ion theory, *Wirkung* (effect)

⁴ Carl Dahlhaus, *Grundlagen der Musik*
 uthenson as *Foundations of Music Hist*
 erson to Benjamin is to 'The Task of th
 ury Rubin (New York, 1968), 71.

The literature on *Don Giovanni* and
 iese-Göhring, 'E. T. A. Hoffmann—"Ku
 ives "Don Juan" im Théâtre de l'Acadé
 ionalinstitut für Mozartforschung der
 erner-Jensen, *Studien zur 'Don Giovan
 Musikwissenschaft*, 8 (Tübingen, 1980); K
 ural Musical Association, 119 (1
 eption of Beethoven's *Eroica* Symp
 utherson: History, Aesthetics and Critic

Two useful overviews of the wide r
 eory" are Susan R. Sulciman, 'Intro
 e: Essays on Audience and Interpretati
 onal Introduction (London, 1984), 53–

ments which articulate the reception of a work are similar—in many cases identical—to those that are responsible for imparting value to the work, and hence for its inclusion in, or exclusion from, the canon. This argument will be supported by an examination of a theory of reception, considerations of canon, and the identification of points at which the two interact.

Theories of Reception

Theories of reception move historical enquiry away from questions of production and composition and towards issues related to response, audience, and what Carl Dahlhaus, following Walter Benjamin, called the 'after-life' of musical works.⁴ Reception history is often invoked in the study of music, and the German *Rezeptionsgeschichte* is frequently allowed to stand in its place. This much abused term, in music at least, signifies performance history, 'critical reception'—which usually means the study of journalism—and scholarly or theoretical responses to music. Such reception histories are concerned with the reconstruction of a record; the idea of an account of, for example, *Don Giovanni* or the 'Eroica' Symphony that describes the various stages of the work's reception is a familiar one. It will be seen, however, such a critical practice may not develop the full potential of the surviving documents.⁵

Theories of reception embrace not only what is familiar as reception history, but also more traditional questions of influence, and perhaps such better-known disciplines as reader-response criticism and affective stylistics.⁶ These include more than just a chronicle, and prompt the consideration of questions of genre and evaluation. One important preliminary distinction needs to be made: between 'effect' and 'reception'. It is impossible to avoid the German terms for these two words, especially given the inadequacy of their translations. In reception theory, *Wirkung* (effect) focuses on the textual and musical aspects of the

Carl Dahlhaus, *Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte*, Musikwissenschaftlichen Theoretica, 13 (Cologne, 1977), trans. J. Newman as *Foundations of Music History* (Cambridge, 1983), 155; page numbers refer to English trans. The reference to Benjamin is to 'The Task of the Translator', *Walter Benjamin: Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. E. T. A. Hoffmann, 'Kult' and 'Don Giovanni'-Rezeption im Paris des 19. Jahrhunderts; Castil-Lizasoain, 'The Literature on Don Giovanni and the 'Eroica' Symphony is vast. For recent work on the former see Sabine Gollmann, 'Studien zur 'Don Giovanni'-Rezeption im 19. Jahrhundert', *Frankfurter Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft*, 8 (Tübingen, 1980); Katharine Ellis, 'Rewriting Don Giovanni, or "The Thieving Magpies"', *Journal of Musicological Association*, 119 (1994), 212-50. For the latter see Scott Burnham, 'On the Programmatic Dimension of Beethoven's Eroica Symphony', *Beethoven Forum*, 1 (1992), 1-24; Thomas Sipe, 'Interpreting Beethoven: History, Aesthetics and Critical Reception' (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1992). The useful overviews of the wide range of activity that has been subsumed under the rubric of 'reception theory' are Susan R. Suleiman, 'Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism', in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (Princeton, 1980), 3-45, and Robert C. Holub, *Reception Theory: A New Paradigm* (London, 1984), 53-146.

onic Discourses, and Value

process, while *Rezeption* (reception) addresses the reader—in the broadest sense the recipient of the text.⁷

In literary criticism, distinctions between *Wirkung* and *Rezeption* are sometimes hard to make. However, the nature of the musical enterprise polarizes these differences in a way that clarifies them attractively. As part of a study of the history of *Don Giovanni* in the nineteenth century, we might consider within the domain of *Rezeption* the various records of the work left by E. T. A. Hoffmann, Berlioz, Beethoven, Chopin, Schumann, Kierkegaard, Gounod—and just about the rest of the musically literate world.⁸ If we were to consider questions of *Wirkung* or effect, on the other hand, we might be interested in the state of the work, the language of its libretto, its relationship to Mozart's Prague and Vienna versions of the opera, and how the narrative portions of the work were preserved—as seen recitative, accompanied recitative, spoken dialogue. We might also be interested in the ways in which other pieces of music and literature became associated with the composition, and the effect that such associations might have had on the dramatic structure of the opera. Not only can we begin to distinguish between *Wirkung* and *Rezeption*, but we may also start to see how the two ways of thinking might interact. The following questions could usefully be considered in this context: What exactly was the *Don Giovanni* known to Berlioz and Gounod when they wrote their accounts of the work? Was the Mozart that they knew the same as ours, or the same as Mozart's? How should this affect the way we evaluate their readings of the work? Analysis of the interrelation between *Wirkung* and *Rezeption* is a powerful tool when used to answer these questions, and in the presentation of a history of music that gives space to questions of reception.

Despite a highly respectable pedigree, reception theory seems to have little exposure in literary criticism as currently practised.⁹ In a gauge of literary criticism in 1988—McLaughlin and Lentriccia's *Critical Terms for Literary Study*—there is no entry for reception, and the word appears only once in the index.

⁷ The two terms are distinguished with great care by Holub, *Reception Theory*, pp. xi–xii. It is unfortunate that the two terms are left undistinguished in Robinson's translation of Dahlhaus, *Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte*: "The relatively new fields of *Rezeptionsgeschichte* and *Wirkungsgeschichte* have not yet found their way into Anglo-American academic parlance, but as it is merely a matter of time before they do I have avoided circumlocution and written simply "reception history" for both" (*Foundations*, p. x). It is unclear from the German edition of Dahlhaus's book whether or not he would have accepted the distinction between *Wirkung* and *Rezeption* outlined by Holub and adopted here.

⁸ Hans Engel, 'Mozart in der philosophischen und ästhetischen Literatur', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* (1953), 64–80; Erdmann Werner Böhm, 'Mozart in der schönen Literatur: Ergänzungen und Fortsetzung', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* (1958), 165–87; Karl Gustav Fellerer, 'Zur Mozart-Kritik im 18./19. Jahrhunderts', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* (1959), 80–94; idem, 'Zur Rezeption von Mozarts Oper um die Wende des 18./19. Jahrhunderts', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* (1965–6), 39–49; Herbert Schneider, 'Probleme der Mozart-Rezeption im Frankreich der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* (1980–3), 23–31; Erich Valentin, 'Mozart in der französischen Dichtung (zum 200. Geburtstag Stendhals)', *Acta Mozartiana*, 30 (1983), 71–4.

⁹ Such approaches to scholarship are dismissed by some, however, as 'fashionable terms such as "intertextuality", "reception-theory" and the rest' (David Fallows, 'Howard Mayer Brown (1930–1993)', *Early Music*, 21 (1993), 507; emphasis added). While the unfashionable nature of reception theories is clear from the present chapter, intertextuality was identified as a characteristic as early as Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton, 1957; repr. 1990) by Catherine Belsey, *Critical Practice* (London, 1980; repr. 1991), 26. What 'the rest' refers to is unclear.

... name appears just twice, once with
criticism and once paired with that of V
1970s and 1970s, reception theories in
literary history—were nearly eclipsed
studies of reception are popular. E
position in literature, writings about
were common. Investigations of perfor
especially where materials are extensive
century France, for example, newspaper
the information management of t
journalistic criticism has emerged as o
in the study of reception in music i
it is highly sophisticated, in its most e
publications that do little except docum
When we come to look more broadly at
we just how narrow this perspective rea

If investigations of reception are popo
the disinclination to consider the theo
disinclination can take the form sim
maintenance a theoretical framework,
that is the result of an inadequate or in
examinations of music journalism are
inclination verges on outright hostility
Musicological Society in Pittsburgh pro
to assess the nature of 'the discipline of r
speakers made plain his view that he (in
of reception, whether they came from
This is akin to a session on historiograph
on influence without Bloom, on tonal t
line without Riemann.

Despite the popularity of using docu
he said that there have been no theo

¹⁰ Lentriccia and McLaughlin (eds.), *Critical Terms*, 67.

¹¹ Some of the most sophisticated work in reception th
Robert Bledsoe, 'Henry Fothergill Chorley and the Rec
Temperley (ed.), *The Lost Chord: Essays on Victorian Mus
Illness and Power: Forces behind the Reception of Deb
the example of an attempt merely to reproduce newspa
Gaudry, *La Critique parisienne des 'grands opéras' de Meyer
études sur l'Opéra français du XIXe siècle*, 2 (Saarbrücken*

¹² *Abstracts of Papers Read at the Fifty-Eighth Annual M
1992, Pittsburgh Pennsylvania*, ed. Laurence Dreyfus (Ma

¹³ There is no entry for 'Reception' in *The New Grove Dic
London, 1980* or in *The New Grove Dictionary of Opera*, e
a succinct and useful entry by Patrick T. Will in *The
Cambridge, Mass., 1986*, 682. One awaits the arrival of
interest.

Jauss's name appears just twice, once wrongly in the context of reader-response criticism and once paired with that of Wolfgang Iser.¹⁰ Fashionable in the late 1960s and 1970s, reception theories in literature—so closely linked to the idea of literary history—were nearly eclipsed in the 1980s. In music, on the other hand, studies of reception are popular. Even before the emergence of a theoretical position in literature, writings about the performance and criticism of music were common. Investigations of performance and response are plentiful today, especially where materials are extensive. In the study of the music of nineteenth-century France, for example, newspaper reports from the 1820s onwards challenge the information management of the best-organized scholar. The study of journalistic criticism has emerged as one of the most popular research paradigms in the study of reception in music in the last twenty years. Although much of it is highly sophisticated, in its most extreme form, this tendency can produce publications that do little except document and reprint newspaper criticism.¹¹ When we come to look more broadly at the sites of musical reception, we will see just how narrow this perspective really is.

If investigations of reception are popular in music, there may exist a correlation the disinclination to consider the theoretical dimension of the subject. Such disinclination can take the form simply of omission: not a reluctance to countenance a theoretical framework, but a clear one-sidedness of approach—that is the result of an inadequate or insufficiently reflective critical practice—examinations of music journalism are often cases in point. Occasionally, disinclination verges on outright hostility. The 1992 meeting of the American Musicological Society in Pittsburgh programmed a special session that claimed to assess the nature of 'the discipline of reception-history itself'.¹² The first of the speakers made plain his view that he (in fact he said we) had no need of theories of reception, whether they came from Hans Robert Jauss or from anyone else. This is akin to a session on historiography without mention of Hayden White, an influence without Bloom, on tonal theory without Schenker, or on *Formen-* *where without Riemann.*

Despite the popularity of using documents of reception in music, it cannot be said that there have been no theoretical engagements with the subject.¹³

¹⁰ Lentricchia and McLaughlin (eds.), *Critical Terms*, 67 and 220.

¹¹ Some of the most sophisticated work in reception that depends primarily on the press for its source material is Robert Bledsoe, Henry Foerthgill Chorley and the Reception of Verdi's Early Operas in England, in Nicholas Temperley (ed.), *The Last Chord: Essays on Victorian Music* (Bloomington, Ind., 1989), 119–42; and Jann Pastier, *Notes and Power: Forces behind the Reception of Debussy's Opera, 19th-Century Music*, 11 (1987–8), 147–77.

¹² An example of an attempt merely to reproduce newspaper criticism with minimal commentary is Marie-Hélène Gaudry, *La Critique parisienne des "grands opéras" de Meyerbeer: Robert le diable, Les Huguenots, Le Prophète, L'Africaine*, *Abstracts of Papers Read at the Fifty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Musicological Society* 4–8 November 1992, Pittsburgh Pennsylvania, ed. Laurence Dreyfus (Madison, 1992), 13.

¹³ There is no entry for 'reception' in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie (20 vols., London, 1980) or in *The New Grove Dictionary of Opera*, ed. Stanley Sadie (4 vols., London, 1992). There is, however, an entry and useful entry by Patrick T. Will in *The Harvard Dictionary of Music*, 2nd edn., ed. Don Randel (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), 682. One awaits the arrival of *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* at the letter 'R' with interest.

s the reader—in the broadest sense.

Wirkung and Rezeption are sometimes musical enterprise polarizes these differently. As part of a study of the history e might consider within the domain t left by E. T. A. Hoffmann, Berlio Gounod—and just about the rest of sider questions of *Wirkung* or effect. the state of the work, the language, rague and Vienna versions of the work were preserved—as seen dialogue. We might also be interested d literature became associated with ssociations might have had on the we begin to distinguish between to see how the two ways of think- could usefully be considered in the- known to Berlioz and Gounod when he Mozart that they knew the same id this affect the way we evaluate nterrelation between *Wirkung* and nswer these questions, and in the pace to questions of reception.

ception theory seems to have little ctised.⁹ In a gauge of literary cri- *Critical Terms for Literary Study*— d appears only once in the index.

caption Theory, pp. xi–xii. It is unfortunate that of Dahlhaus, *Grundlagen der Musikgeschich- icker have not yet found their way into Eng- before they do I have avoided circumlocution an- ncar from the German edition of Dahlhaus- en *Wirkung* and *Rezeption* outlined by Heide-*

hen Literatur', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* (1953), 64–64. gen und Forschung', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* (1959), 80–94. un- nder's', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* (1965–6), 35–40. nder's', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* (1965–6), 35–40. der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts', *Mozart- Dichtung (zum 200. Geburtstag Schopenhauer*, as 'fashionable terms such as 'intertextual- Brown (1930–1993), *Early Music*, 21 (1993), e: *Antology of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton, 1991), 26. What 'the rest' referred to

Dahlhaus devoted an entire chapter of his 1977 text *Fundamentals of Music History* to 'Problems in Reception History'; and an interesting debate sprang up c.1980 in the pages of the journal of the Berlin Institut für Musikforschung between Dahlhaus and Friedhelm Krummacker. (The principal point of disagreement between Krummacker and Dahlhaus is one to be developed at the end of this chapter.)¹⁴ These contributions were characterized by a focus on theory. There is, however, little consideration of the work of the scholars' literary colleagues. Although specific examples are mentioned in passing, one gets little sense of the beginnings of a new historiography of music that seems to be implied by much of the discussion. Some may view this as a rather unsatisfactory state of affairs: on the one hand, examinations of large amounts of material related to reception in music—which are generally unsullied by theory—and on the other, weighty theoretical discussions that rarely impinge on specific musical and cultural phenomena, let alone the day-to-day practice of musicology. This has only begun to change in the last few years, and it is in that light that this chapter is written.

A fundamental point of contact between music history and reception theory is the early theoretical orientation of Hans Robert Jauss. It is important to distinguish between Jauss's work in 1967 and, for example, that of 1973 and later. Jauss's 1967 essay 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory' should serve as the starting-point for an understanding of Jauss's work;¹⁵ and it is unfortunate that Dahlhaus, for example, should have started from the 1973 article on Racine and Goethe, in which we can already see the beginnings of Jauss's retreat from the central concept of the 1967 essay: the horizon of expectations (*Erwartungshorizont*).¹⁶ Dahlhaus, it should be said, is not the only one to essentialize in this way.¹⁷ The result is that it is quite possible for different readings of Jauss to yield conflicting or diametrically opposed opinions. For the purposes of this chapter, and in pursuit of an unshifting focus, it is Jauss's early work in reception theory that is under consideration.

¹⁴ Dahlhaus, *Foundations*, 150–65; Friedhelm Krummacker, 'Rezeptionsgeschichte als Problem der Musikwissenschaft', *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz* (1979/80), 154–70; Dahlhaus, 'Zwischen Relativismus und Dogmatismus: Anmerkungen zur Rezeptionsgeschichte', *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz* (1981/2), 139–42.

¹⁵ Hans Robert Jauss, 'Was heißt und zu welchem Ende studiert man Literaturgeschichte?', inaugural address at the celebration of the sixtieth birthday of Gerhard Hess (Rector of the University of Konstanz), University of Konstanz, 13 Apr. 1967; published as *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft*, *Konstanzer Universitätsreden*, 3 (Konstanz, 1967; 2nd edn. 1969); repr. in *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation* (Frankfurt am Main, 1970), 144–208, and in Rainer Warning (ed.), *Rezeptionsästhetik*, Uni-Taschenbücher, 303 (Munich, 1977; 2nd edn. 1979), 126–62; partially translated (chs. 5–12) as 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', *New Literary History*, 2 (1970–1), 7–37; retranslated in full under the same title by Timothy Bahti in *Theoretical Aesthetic of Reception*, *Theory and History of Literature*, 2 (Minneapolis, 1982), 3–45.

¹⁶ Jauss, 'Racines und Goethes Iphigenie—Mit einem Nachwort über die Partialität der Rezeptionsmethode', *Zeitschrift für Philosophie*, 4 (1973), 1–46; repr. in Warning (ed.), *Rezeptionsästhetik*, 353–400. Jauss's developing approach to the subject is outlined in Holub, *Reception Theory*, 53–81.

¹⁷ See e.g. Sipe's starting-point in 'Interpreting Beethoven', 6; Hans Robert Jauss, 'The Poetic Text within the Change of Horizons of Reading: The Example of Baudelaire's "Spleen II"', in *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, 139–85.

In the 1967 essay, Jauss adumbrates what should stand at the heart of literary theory: embodied as the horizon of expectations of literature; and (3) that the outcome of literary history.¹⁸ At this level, it is not difficult to identify 'literature', 'musical' for 'literary', and the starting-point has interesting analogies of the twentieth century. In his analysis, Jauss identifies two trends, which he characterizes as relativism and formalism. To reduce a variety of positions, and to terms that have a certain unity, Jauss identifies the two positions as, on the one hand, the West German Jauss saw as threatening, and on the other, an analytical or formalist perspective. Jauss's comments without being struck by the relativist–formalist division of the discipline, and analysis division of music that so often runs through Jauss's essay through to its conclusion, Jauss's significance, and many of its central concepts, become concepts without which the study of music becomes increasingly difficult.

The horizon of expectations is associated with the term 'recipient' attractively, and opens up other equally important locations. The coherence of literature as an event is perceived as the literary experience of contemporary readers. Whether it is possible to comprehend and reproduce this historicity depends on whether this horizon of expectations may be taken as an invitation to examine the electronic and a particular sort of diachronic relationship of equal epistemological importance.

Jauss embodies the relationship between the beginning of the Finale of Sibelius, for example. This passage has elicited two contrasting readings. Francis Tovey, writing in the second volume of his *Essays in Music*, published in 1935:

The bustling introduction provides a rushing introduction to his hammer. While he swings it there are other hammers. That's hammer swings us into C. . . .

¹⁸ Jauss, 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', 150–65. Although identifying both approaches as positivist, Jauss's analysis of the two approaches as separate (and treats them separately), in a manner that suggests that the two approaches, might be seen as positivist (*Musikologie*, 139–85).

In the 1967 essay, Jasss adumbrates three principal ideas: (1) that history should stand at the heart of literary study; (2) that a theory of reception—embodying as the horizon of expectations—is at the heart of any thinking about literature; and (3) that the outcome of such a procedure is a new sort of literary history.¹⁸ At this level, it is not difficult to see how one could substitute 'music' for 'literature', 'musical' for 'literary', and reach similar conclusions. Indeed, Jasss's starting-point has interesting analogies with the study of music in the last decade of the twentieth century. In his analysis of literary criticism in the late 1960s, he identifies two trends, which he characterizes—following convention—as Marxism and formalism. To reduce a very complex argument to manageable proportions, and to terms that have a certain musical resonance, we could identify the two positions as, on the one hand, a broadly historical approach that the West German Jasss saw as threatened by Marxist blandishments, and, on the other, an analytical or formalist perspective. It is difficult to read Jasss's introductory comments without being struck by the similarity between his image of a Marxist-formalist division of the discipline and the historical musicology-theory and analysis division of music that so many rightly find pernicious.¹⁹ Reading Jasss's essay through to its conclusion, the possibilities for music study grow in significance, and many of its central concerns, especially the horizon of expectations, become concepts without which sophisticated historical and cultural work in music becomes increasingly difficult.

The horizon of expectations is associated with the recipient of the cultural artifact. The term 'recipient' attractively avoids the specificity of 'audience', and opens up other equally important locations of reception, Jasss says:

The coherence of literature as an event is primarily mediated in the horizon of expectations of the literary experience of contemporary and later readers, critics, and authors. Whether it is possible to comprehend and represent the history of literature in its unique specificity depends on whether this horizon of expectations can be objectified.²⁰

This may be taken as an invitation to examine the points of intersection of synchronic and a particular sort of diachronic history, and to treat each juncture as of equal epistemological importance. In other words, the horizon of expectations embodies the relationship between *Wirkung* and *Rezeption* alluded to above. The beginning of the finale of Sibelius's Fifth Symphony may serve as an example. This passage has elicited two competing interpretations. First, Donald Francis Tovey, writing in the second volume of his *Essays in Musical Analysis*, published in 1935:

The bustling introduction provides a rushing wind, through which Thor can enjoy swinging his hammer. While he swings it there are sounds of a cantabile trying to take form. . . .

Jasss, 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', 18–19.

Although identifying both approaches as positivist, Joseph Kerman accepts without question that the two 'discourses' are separate (and treats them separately), in a manner that itself, in its acknowledgement of two separate 'horizons of activity, might be seen as positivist (*Musikologie*, Fontana Masterguides (London, 1985), 31–59).

Jasss, 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', 22; emphasis added.

his 1977 text *Fundamentals of Musicology*; and an interesting debate sprang up at the Berlin Institut für Musikforschung ummachter. (The principal point of de- were characterized by a focus on theory. of the work of the scholars' literary criticism mentioned in passing; one gets little re-ortography of music that seems to be he may view this as rather unsatisfactory examinations of large amounts of material are generally unsullied by theory—and positions that rarely impinge on specific one the day-to-day practice of musicology the last few years, and it is in that light the music history and reception theory and Robert Jasss. It is important to dis-nd, for example, that of 1973 and later. Challenge to Literary Theory' should anding of Jasss's work,¹⁵ and it is unfortunate have started from the 1973 article. I already see the beginnings of Jasss's return of expectations. The horizon of expectations should be said, is not the only one to exist. s quite possible for different readings of opposed opinions. For the purposes of writing focus, it is Jasss's early work in on.

Rezeptionsgeschichte als Problem der Musikwissenschaft, *Rezeptionsästhetik*, 154–155.

Frankfurt, University of Konstanz, University of Konstanz, *Rezeptionsästhetik*, 139–42.

Rezeptionsästhetik, *Rezeptionsästhetik*, 303 (Munich, 1982).

under the same title by Timothy Bahr in *Rezeptionsästhetik*, 1982), 3–45.

Rezeptionsästhetik, 353–400. Jasss's development of the Partialität der Rezeptionsmethode, *Rezeptionsästhetik*, 53–81.

Hans Robert Jasss, 'The Poetic Text within the Poetic Text', in *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, 1982).

In due course we reach the key of G flat. In this dark region the whole process . . . resumed, but pianissimo. And so we eventually come to E flat, where, without change of tempo, Thor swings his hammer in 3/2 time, the cantabile attains full form and glory, and the symphony ends with the finality of a work that knew from the outset exactly when its last note was due.²¹

This can be compared with an entry in Sibelius's diary for 21 April 1915, eight months before the work's première on the composer's fiftieth birthday, but more than six months after the original conception of the music:

Today at ten to eleven I saw 16 swans. One of my greatest experiences. . . . They circled over me for a long time. Disappeared into the solar haze like a gleaming silver ribbon. . . . Nature mysticism and life's *Angst!* The fifth symphony's finale-theme [which he quotes] . . . !²²

Three days later, Sibelius continued:

The swans are always in my thoughts and give splendour to my life. . . . Nothing in the whole world affects me—nothing in art, literature, or music—in the same way as do these swans and cranes and wild geese.²³

These two reactions to the same music evoke very different images. Tovey evokes the strength of Wodin's oldest son, the strongest of gods and men, in an interpretation characterized by myth, physical power, violence—even murder—triumph, and glory. He evokes figures from Norse mythology that are curiously at odds with those who populate the legends of the composer's own country, Finland. Sibelius, by contrast, calls forth nature, autobiography, and specific musical reference encased in a series of self-reflective observations.

To interrogate the *Wirkung*, or effect, of this symphony is to observe that the composer's own response takes place within the context of compositional endeavour. By the middle of 1915, the Fifth Symphony, as Hepokoski points out, 'appears to have been little more than two or three scattered tables of potential themes that still needed weeding, developing, and binding together'.²⁴ Tovey, by contrast, responds to a work that has gone through three completed versions, publication, and a range of European premières; Tovey himself had conducted the Scottish première.²⁵ It could be said that Sibelius was responding to a highly unstable text, whereas Tovey could rely on a performed, published version. Although by the 1930s, the Fifth Symphony had achieved a certain international status, critics' wishing to comment more widely on Sibelius's music faced

²¹ Donald Francis Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis*, Vol. 2: *Symphonies (II), Variations and Orchestral Poliphony* (London, 1935), 128–9. A discussion of the organicist implications of the last sentence of this quotation is outside the scope of this chapter, but this is one respect in which Tovey could be admitted to the discussion of the organicism implicit in the work of Rétzi and Schenker (Solie, 'Living Work').

²² James Hepokoski, *Sibelius: Symphony No. 5*, Cambridge Music Handbooks (Cambridge, 1993), 36.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 41.

²⁵ Mary Grierson, *Donald Francis Tovey: A Biography Based on Letters* (London, 1952), 298.

technical problems in acquainting
had on critics' views of Sibelius
follows:

Not only are performances of Sibelius
miniature scores of them—up to the
date of 1931]—amount to no more
String Quartet (*Voces Intimae*), Op. 5
his other large works, or even the in-
at any musical circulating library
British Museum Reading-Room pos-
of miscellaneous works forming a se-
it is only charitable to suppose that

The condition and accessibility of
elements in its *Wirkung* or effect.

Issues of reception also pose w
anchor the Sibelius interpretatio
focus on the position of Sibelius
ing the importance of Sibelius, by
his series, Tovey was typical of his
a composer described by Gray as
Tovey in also observing that Sibe
on two works:

Finlandia is in the repertoire of every
heard in every picture-palace, restau-
world, from San Francisco to Cairo,
time . . . the great mass of his w
ignored . . . by every section of the mu
apart from Finland.²⁸

What we are witnessing in the
point in the reception of Sibelius,
significance from that of a merely
nature. It was Gray's stated task to
symphonic poems of Sibelius, whe
symphonies. Constant Lambert we
with Schoenberg's *Pierrot Lunaire*.²⁹
in *Music Ho!* is called 'Sibelius and
was not far away. As early as 1939

²⁶ Cecil Gray, *Sibelius* (London, 1939), 10.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 7.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Constant Lambert, *Music Ho!*

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 326–32.

technical problems in acquainting themselves with his scores. The effect that this had on critics' views of Sibelius's music is difficult to judge. Cecil Gray reports as follows:

Not only are performances of Sibelius' more important works exceedingly rare . . . but miniature scores of them—up to the time of writing [some time before Gray's publication date of 1931]—amount to no more than two in number, the Fifth Symphony and the String Quartet (*Voces Intimae*), Op. 56. It is, moreover, impossible to procure full scores of any musical circulating library or public institution. Even the music section of the British Museum Reading-Room possesses only the first three symphonies and a handful of miscellaneous works forming a selection so utterly unrepresentative and arbitrary that it is only charitable to suppose that they were chosen completely at random.²⁶

The condition and accessibility of the composition, then, are equally important elements in its *Wirkung* or effect. Issues of reception also pose wider questions. This example enables us both to anchor the Sibelius interpretation closely to the compositional process and to focus on the position of Sibelius in Great Britain in the 1930s. In acknowledged-focus on the importance of Sibelius, by including essays on two of the symphonies in this series. Tovey was typical of his time; he saw Sibelius as a popular composer—a composer described by Gray as a household name.²⁷ But Gray differed from Tovey in also observing that Sibelius's reputation depended almost exclusively on two works:

Finlandia is in the repertoire of every orchestra and brass band, and *Valse Triste* is to be heard in every picture-palace, restaurant, café, tea-shop, and cabaret in the civilised world, from San Francisco to Cairo, and from Stockholm to Cape Town. At the same time . . . the great mass of his work . . . has been . . . consistently and steadily ignored . . . by every section of the musical community . . . in every country in the world, apart from Finland.²⁸

What we are witnessing in the accounts by Gray and Tovey is an important point in the reception of Sibelius, an emphasis that attempted subtly to shift his significance from that of a merely popular composer to that of a composer of stature. It was Gray's stated task to introduce his readers to the symphonies and symphonic poems of Sibelius, whereas Tovey restricted his essays to two of the symphonies. Constant Lambert went as far as to compare the Fourth Symphony with Schoenberg's *Pierrot Lunaire*.²⁹ Indeed, the final section of his final chapter in *Music Ho!* is called 'Sibelius and the Music of the Future'.³⁰ But the backlash was not far away. As early as 1939, a report in the *Musical Times* suggested that

²⁶ Cecil Gray, *Sibelius* (London, 1931), 9–10.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 7.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Constant Lambert, *Music Ho! A Study of Music in Decline* (London, 1934), 323.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 326–32.

this dark region the whole process . . .
Y come to E flat, where, without change
cantabile attains full form and glory, and
k that knew from the outset exactly when

Sibelius's diary for 21 April 1915, eight
composer's fiftieth birthday, but more
tion of the music:

my greatest experiences. . . . They circled
the solar haze like a gleaming silver
The fifth symphony's finale-theme [which

splendour to my life. . . . Nothing in the
re, or music—in the same way as do these

very different images. Tovey evokes
ongest of gods and men, in an inter-
d power, violence—even murder—
Norse mythology that are curious

nds of the composer's own country,
nature, autobiography, and specific
-reflective observations.

this symphony is to observe that the
within the context of compositional
Symphony, as Hepokoski points out,
or three scattered tables of potential
g, and binding together'.²⁴ Tovey, in
through three completed versions,
nieres; Tovey himself had conducted

Sibelius was responding to a higher
on a performed, published version,
ny had achieved a certain interme-

ore widely on Sibelius's music face-

ic Handbooks (Cambridge, 1993), 36.

Letters (London, 1952), 298.

'a scholarly counterblast [against uncritical views of the composer] is badly needed in the case of Sibelius.³¹

Canonic Discourses

The comparison of these two responses to an identical passage suggests a distinction between *Wirkung* and *Rezeption*. It also shows how, as the discussion of reception opened up and began effectively to 'objectify the Horizon of Expectations', questions arose of the composer's standing—in short, of Sibelius's position in the canon. In contrast to theories of reception, issues relating to canon have been at the centre of literary scholarship for at least twenty years. Questions of canon have stood behind some of the most public literary disagreements in the United States; the so-called Great Books debate³² and the reform of the Stanford curriculum are just two well-known examples.³³ Even in Britain, issues surrounding the teaching of English literature in the National Curriculum have their basis in a critique of the canon.³⁴ Music study, however, has been less than willing to engage with some of these important questions; indeed, it is easy to detect a clear resistance even to acknowledging the term 'canon' itself. In a review recently published in a musicological journal is a disapproving statement to the effect that the 'modish' term 'canon' is a poor alternative to 'classic'.³⁵ While such a view might have been congenial to Sainte-Beuve or T. S.

³¹ Robert Lorenz, 'Afterthoughts on the Sibelius Festival', *Musical Times*, 79 (1939), 13–14; cited in Hamish Johnson, *Sibelius* (London, 1959), 181.

³² This debate has kept recurring during the twentieth century. The most recent catalyst has been Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education has Failed Democracy and Imperiled the Souls of Today's Students* (New York, 1987). For a useful, although poorly documented, history of the debate, see William Casement, 'Some Myths about the Great Books', *Midwest Quarterly: A Journal of Contemporary Thought*, 36 (1995), 203–24. For two liberal critiques of the issue, from different perspectives, see Dinesh d'Souza, 'Multiculturalism 101: Great Books of the Nonwestern World', *Policy Review*, 56 (1991), 22–30, and Eugene Garfield, 'A Different Sort of Great Books List: The 50 20th-Century Works most Cited in the Arts-and-Humanities-Citation-Index, 1976–1983', *Current Contents*, 16 (1987), 3–7. Liberal and feminist critics do not all advocate a critique of the Great Books; see Elizabeth Genovese, 'The Claims of a Common Culture: Gender, Race, Class and the Canon', *Salmagundi*, 72 (1986), 133–40; Richard Rorty, 'That Old-Time Philosophy', *New Republic*, 198 (4 Apr. 1988), 28–33.

³³ Stanford University's reform of its Western culture course in 1988 and 1989 attempted an opening of this particular canonic discourse. Responses from various members of the university were strikingly public. See Mary Louise Pratt, 'Humanities for the Future: Reflections on the Western Culture Debate', *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 89 (1989), 7–25; Sidney Hook, 'Is Teaching Western Culture Racist or Sexist?: Letter from Stanford', *Encounter*, 73 (1989), 14–19. Documents relating to the affair by Sidney Hook and Bill King (chair, Black Students' Union, Stanford University) were published in *Partisan Review*, 55 (1988), 653–74. Writers on music also contributed to the debate: Herbert Lindenberger, 'On the Sacrality of Reading Lists: The Western Culture Debate at Stanford University', *Comparative Criticism*, 11 (Summer 1989), 4–11; William Mahrt, 'Course Focus on Classical Antiquity is Key to Intellectual Heritage', *Campus Report* (Stanford University), 24 Feb. 1988, 13–14. Responses from Europe are Christopher Hitchens, 'Whose Culture, Whose Civilisation?', *Times Literary Supplement*, 4431 (1988), 246, and Pierre Bourdieu, 'Tempête sur un campus', *Esprit*, 2 (1989), 130–2.

³⁴ The literature on the place of English in the National Curriculum is extensive. For two contrasting views see Martin Dodsworth, 'The Undermining of English: How the National Curriculum Threatens Literature Teaching', *Times Literary Supplement*, 4586 (1991), 11; Argi Bhattacharyya, 'Cultural Education in Britain: From the National Report to the National Curriculum', *Oxford Literary Review*, 13 (1991), 4–19.

³⁵ Nicholas Temperley, review of Samuel Sebastian Wesley, *Anthems I*, ed. Peter Horton, *Musica Britannica*, 57 (London, 1990) and Maurice Greene, *Ode on St Cecilia's Day and Anthem: Harken unto me, ye holy children*, ed.

...it hardly does justice to the wide
...ature in English and other modern
...cularly minds in the Northern Hem

The only definitions of 'canon' give
...itions concern contrapuntal tech
...ere.³⁷ Two other definitions take us
...ed in the last five years to describe
...this is the sense in which it is used in
...aining Music.³⁸ The conference sessi
...articulated was called 'Musicology as
...methodology and ideological orientat
...different understanding of canon: th
...articulated by Joseph Kerman when
...enduring exemplary collection of bo
...same way for contemplation, admira
...mise'.⁴⁰

Although there are points with wh
...tion of canon in the other arts, as
...number of key concepts—value, exer
...neral continuity—it would be very u
...German immediately goes on to say th
...of repertory; and much of what he
...developing the distinction between
...Canon is an idea; a repertory is a p
...that 'Repertoires are determined b
...rious formulation assigns a more
...tant role to the performer than ex
...vey and Sibelius shows how perform
...same individual, and a move back a

...Black Johnstone, *Musica Britannica*, 58 (London,
...1984). The comment comes in the context of approval
...not ceased to regard music as a realm of concrete e
...y', *Musica Britannica*, 5 (London, 1981), 483–502'. Temperley con
...standing (*ibidem*).

³⁷ Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve, 'Qu'est-ce qu'un
...10–55; T. S. Eliot, 'What is a Classic?', Presidential
...Frank Kermode (ed.), *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot* (Lon
...1961).

³⁸ Alfred Mann and J. Kenneth Wilson, 'Canon (I)
...and Stanley Sadie, 'Canon', in *New Grove Dictionary of*

³⁹ Katherine Bergeron and Philip V. Bohlman (e
...1992).

⁴⁰ *AMS/CBMR/CMS, New Orleans, October 15–18*

⁴¹ Joseph Kerman, 'A Few Canonic Variations', *Criti
...1984); page numbers refer to the 1'*

⁴² *Ibid.*

that, it hardly does justice to the wide range of commentary on the canon of literature in English and other modern languages that occupies some of sharpest scholarly minds in the Northern Hemisphere.³⁶

The only definitions of 'canon' given in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* concern contrapuntal techniques, which are not what is at issue here.³⁷ Two other definitions take us in different directions. The term has been used in the last five years to describe the paradigms of musicological study, and this is the sense in which it is used in the recent collection of essays entitled *Disrupting Music*.³⁸ The conference session in which the idea behind that book was formulated was called 'Musicology and its Canons'.³⁹ Despite this emphasis on methodology and ideological orientation, many of the contributions drift into a different understanding of canon: the one at issue here. This was thoughtfully articulated by Joseph Kernan when he called the canon 'in other arts . . . an enduring exemplary collection of books, buildings, and paintings authorised in some way for contemplation, admiration, interpretation, and determination of

Although there are points with which one could take issue in Kernan's definition of canon in the other arts, as a working description which embodies a number of key concepts—value, exemplification, authority, and a sense of temporal continuity—it would be very useful. One has to say 'would be' because Kernan immediately goes on to say that in music we do not speak of canon but of repertoire; and much of what he has to say in the same article consists of developing the distinction between canon and repertoire.⁴¹ He asserts that a canon is an idea; a repertoire is a program of action, and goes on to suggest that 'Repertoires are determined by performers, canons, by critics'.⁴² This curious formulation assigns a more important role to the critic and a less important role to the performer than each seems to deserve. Even the example of Sibelius shows how performance and criticism can be embodied in the same individual, and a move back a further century to consider the careers of

Black Johnstone, *Musica Britannica*, 58 (London, 1991), *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 117 (1992), 13–14. The comment comes in the context of approval of a comment by Vincent Buckles that '[Englishmen] have never ceased to regard music as a realm of concrete experience, not a field for philosophical speculation' (*Musical Studies in Britain: The Romantic Age 1800–1914*, ed. Nicholas Temperley, *The Athlone History of Music in Britain*, 5 (London, 1981), 483–502), *Temperley continues*: 'May it long remain so. Schenker and Barthes notwithstanding (*ibidem*).'

Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve, 'Qu'est-ce qu'un classique', in *Causettes de Lami* (6 vols., Paris, 1849–60), 2: 38–55; T. S. Eliot, 'What is a Classic?', Presidential address to the Virgil Society, 1944 (London, 1945); repr. in *Frank Kermode* (ed.), *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot* (London, 1975; repr. 1987), 115–31 (page numbers refer to 1987 edition).

Alfred Mann and Kenneth Wilson, 'Canon (I)', in *New Grove*, iii, 689–93. The same is true of Julian Budden and Stanley Sadie, 'Canon', in *New Grove Dictionary of Opera*, I, 715.

Katherine Bergeron and Philip V. Bohlman (eds.), *Disciplining Music: Musicology and its Canons* (Chicago, 1992).
AMS/CBMR/CMS, *New Orleans, October 15–18 1987: Abstracts* (1987), 17–20.
Joseph Kernan, 'A Few Canon Variations', *Critical Inquiry*, 10 (1983), 107; repr. in Robert van Hallberg (ed.), *Canon and Anthem: Hewken unto me, ye holy children*, etc.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 114.

critical views of the composer] is badly

to an identical passage suggests a de-
It also shows how, as the discussion
ly to 'objectify the Horizon of Expect-
standing—in short, of Sibelius's pos-
s of reception, issues relating to canon
partnership for at least twenty years. Que-
the most public literary disagreement
Books debate³² and the reform of the
-known examples.³³ Even in Britain,
ish literature in the National Curricu-
anon.³⁴ Music study, however, has been
these important questions; indeed, it
acknowledging the term 'canon itself'.
ological journal is a disapproving sta-
term 'canon' is a poor alternative to
been congenial to Sainte-Beuve or T.S.

Musical Times, 79 (1939), 13–14; cited in
century. The most recent catalyst has been Allan Bloom.
Failed Democracy and Improved the Souls of Man
commented, history of the debate, see William Cassin,
Journal of Contemporary Thought, 36 (1995), 203–18.
see Dinesh d'Souza, 'Multiculturalism 101: Great Books
Humanities-Citation-Index, 1976–1983', *Cultural
Scists: Letter from Stanford*, *Encounter*, 73 (1991),
74. Writers on music also contributed to the debate.
Western Culture Debate at Stanford University', *Com-
1988, 13–14. Responses from Europe are *Christoph
Supplement*, 4431 (1988), 246, and Pierre Bourdieu,
curriculum is extensive. For two contrasting views on
National Curriculum Theatens Literature Teaching
3 (1991), 4–19.*

ing and Anthem: Hewken unto me, ye holy children, etc.

Schumann and Berlioz suggests even more strongly that Kerman's distinction is open to challenge.⁴³ By contrast, his description of canon in what he calls 'the other arts' has much to recommend it. Both performative and critical impulses play a role in determining the canon in drama, art history (exhibitions), and literature (reading lists), as well as in music. Claiming that one discipline or field is in some way above the canonic restraints of its fellows is disingenuous, and may be seen as an attempt to fend off what might evolve into attacks on canonic works.

In this, Kerman has much in common with his slightly younger German contemporary, Dahlhaus, who also makes a bipartite distinction within the canon. But the latter distinguishes between a canon that is *chosen* and a canon that is *chosen from*. His claim is that 'It is this primary, pre-existent canon rather than the secondary, subjective one that represents a premise of music historiography'.⁴⁴ We might want to replace 'music historiography' with 'musical scholarship', since it is not just the writing of music history but any musicological endeavour that must take the canon as its premiss. Dahlhaus's distinction remains misleading, however. There can be no objection to the idea that individuals or institutions develop canons that are subsets of a larger one. However, Dahlhaus's intention is to make a much more significant—and doubtful—claim: that there is a difference between aesthetic standing and historical significance in the canon that is *chosen from*, and that this difference may be an indication of the value of individual works.⁴⁵ Coming to terms with Dahlhaus's approach to the canon is difficult. The sections on canon in his *Foundations of Music History* are shot through with contradictions, which suggests that parts were written at different times and for different purposes. More important, however, is that Dahlhaus never abandons the objectivist premiss that a musical work can have aesthetic standing that is independent of its historical circumstances.⁴⁶ It could convincingly be argued that this is related to Dahlhaus's defence of the Austro-German canon: a narrow segment of musical culture from Schütz to Schoenberg that not only conditions Dahlhaus's view of canon, but lies behind much of his resistance to reception theory.⁴⁷

Both Kerman's and Dahlhaus's models of the canon are problematic; but both acknowledge, as least in passing, the existence of several interrelated canons: for Kerman, the idea of 'canon' and 'repertory', for Dahlhaus 'the canon *chosen*' and 'the canon *chosen from*'. Modern critical practice is to speak of a multiplicity of 'canonic discourses' that allow us to consider the interrelation of a number of

⁴³ See Leon Plantinga, *Schumann as Critic*, Yale Studies in the History of Music, 4 (New Haven, 1967; repr. New York, 1976); Kerry Murphy, *Hector Berlioz and the Development of French Music Criticism*, Studies in Musicology, 57 (Ann Arbor, 1988).

⁴⁴ Dahlhaus, *Foundations*, 93.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 95.

⁴⁶ Dahlhaus's objectivist stance is discussed further below, 405–6.

⁴⁷ This point is made conclusively in James Hepokoski, 'The Dahlhaus Project and its Extra-Musicological Sources', *19th-Century Music*, 14 (1991), 221–46.

canons that may stand in a variety of interest, and so on.⁴⁸ This concept of many of the repressive properties to 'Canonbusters' so strongly object.⁴⁹ A constructive critique of canonic discourse used in this chapter for the purpose of this multivalent sense of canonic discourse neutralizes many of the objections to both by Kerman and by Dahlhaus.

There are two principal critiques of the canon. A conservative critic contemplates works that shape our culture, that have an appeal that transcends historical time might happily speak of the *Kleinmeister* popular in their time, but now—with the historical awareness—can be judged as being liberal. A liberal critique accuses the canon of being status, and 'Canonbusters' advocate material, in the process known as 'Opening of alternative canons'.⁵¹ In Western Europe today most clearly associated with work Citron's *Gender and the Musical Canon* in this perceived hegemony is also challenged.

Both critiques of the canon are severe. It is the easier of the two to deal, with a fundamental claim—that canonic works are and objectively demonstrable—is open to Beethoven's symphonies, for example, and Schumann in the C minor symphony and the at opposite ends of the nineteenth century canon works.⁵⁴ Even the history of two enough to suggest that a symphony by

⁴⁸ Jan Gorak, *The Making of the Modern Canon: Genesis*.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁵⁰ John Guillory, 'Canon', in Lentricchia and McLaughlin.

⁵¹ See the essays in Leslie A. Fiedler and Houston A. Baker.

⁵² Marcia J. Citron, *Gender and the Musical Canon* (Cambridge, 1995–99) is marred, however, by an over-reliance on (and theory, and some curious emphases. Claiming that Hans-George in the extreme, and the chapter retreats from a serious composition of reception theory I have ever read' (review of

⁵³ Guillory, 'Canon', 237.

⁵⁴ Hans von Bülow is reported as having said, on 28 October 'Interpreting' would have been dedicated to him (Sipe, 'Interpreting

canons that may stand in a variety of relationships to each other: set-subset, set-intersect, and so on.⁴⁸ This concept of canonic discourse immediately removes many of the repressive properties to which those whom Gerald Graff called 'Canonbusters' so strongly object.⁴⁹ In turn, this frees up the opportunities for constructive critique of canonic discourses: and if the term 'canon' is occasionally used in this chapter for the purpose of comprehensibility, it is always with this multivalent sense of canonic discourse in mind. Such a concept immediately neutralizes many of the objections to a critique of canonic discourses raised both by Kernan and by Dahlhaus.

There are two principal critiques of canonic discourse: conservative and liberal. A conservative critic contemplates the canon, and views its contents as works that shape our culture, that have endured throughout history, and that have an appeal that transcends historical circumstances.⁵⁰ The conservative might happily speak of the *Kleinmeister*, and identify works that might have been popular in their time, but now—with the aid of our greater sensibilities and critical awareness—can be judged as being of less value than canonical works. A liberal critique accuses the canon of having an authoritarian and even coercive status, and 'Canonbusters' advocate either the inclusion of a wider range of material, in the process known as 'Opening up the Canon', or the establishment of alternative canons.⁵¹ In Western European serious music and opera, this is today most clearly associated with works by women composers, and Marcia Citron's *Gender and the Musical Canon* is a recent case in point; but in literature this perceived hegemony is also challenged by both race and class.⁵²

Both critiques of the canon are severely problematic. The conservative critique is the easier of the two to deal with, and possibly the less contentious. Its fundamental claim—that canonic works exhibit values that are transcendental and objectively demonstrable—is open to challenge.⁵³ The recent literature on Beethoven's symphonies, for example, shows that the values identified by Hoffmann in the C minor symphony and those imputed by von Bülow to the 'Eroica' at opposite ends of the nineteenth century promote very different views of these canonic works.⁵⁴ Even the history of twentieth-century performance practice is enough to suggest that a symphony by Beethoven under the baton of Richard

Jan Gorak, *The Making of the Modern Canon: Genesis and Crisis of a Literary Idea* (London, 1991), p. x.
 Ibid. 6.
 John Guillory, 'Canon', in Lentricchia and McLaughlin (eds.), *Critical Terms*, 236–7.
 See the essays in Leslie A. Fiedler and Houston A. Baker (eds.), *English Literature: Opening Up the Canon—Selected Papers from the English Institute, 1979* (Baltimore, 1981).
 Marcia J. Citron, *Gender and the Musical Canon* (Cambridge, 1993). The welcome discussion of reception theory (85–89) is marred, however, by an over-reliance on (and in some cases a lack of sympathy with) Holub, *Reception in the Extreme*, and the chapter retreats from a serious engagement with questions of reception theory after the first two pages. It is difficult to understand how Patricia Howard can describe this as 'containing the clearest exposition of reception theory I have ever read' (review of Citron, *Gender, Musical Times*, 150 (1994), 36).
 Guillory, 'Canon', 237.
 Hans von Bülow is reported as having said, on 28 May 1892, that if Beethoven had known Bismarck, the 'Eroica' would have been dedicated to him (Sipe, 'Interpreting Beethoven', 232 n. 54).

Strauss develops a rather different meaning from one under the direction of Roger Norrington.⁵⁵ If we could agree on what qualities we value in a symphony by Beethoven today, we would have to give our consent to the view that these qualities are different from those we perceive in earlier authors and performers. These are difficult points to refute, although the stranglehold that the conservative critique of the canon has on all aspects of our musical culture results in a reluctance to acknowledge the fact.

The liberal critique of the canon is an attractive development within an academic or pedagogical context, and one that has resulted in the teaching of courses on women in music; a heightened awareness of the possibility of gender criticism has perhaps been an even more important consequence.⁵⁶ The great problem with the liberal critique of the canon is that it suffers, ironically, from the same pitfalls as the conservative critique that it seeks to supplant. If one asks that certain works should now be admitted to the canon on the basis that they are as good as those already included, and have only been excluded because they are by women, Caribbean authors, or for indeed any other reason, this is as much as to say that objective value may be identified not only in the works for which admission to the canon is sought, but also in its existing members. And this objective value is exactly what is so problematic with the conservative critique of the canon.

Literary critics who have addressed questions of canon reach the conclusion that neither the liberal nor the conservative critiques of the canon are satisfactory. Both John Guillory and Jan Gorak also agree that, although the canon has the effect of freezing responses to texts inside it, it is essential for the reproduction of culture from generation to generation.⁵⁷ The consequences of such a view are interesting, and bring us back to questions of reception. Guillory writes:

An individual's judgment that a work is great does nothing in itself to preserve that work, unless that judgment is made in a certain institutional context, a setting in which it is possible to insure the *reproduction* of the work, its continual reintroduction to generations of readers. The work of preservation has other more complex social contexts than the immediate responses of readers to texts.⁵⁸

We might just pause for a moment on Guillory's use of the term 'institution'. In literary studies, it is assumed that the academy is the location of canon formation and preservation. In music, as has already been suggested, this is

⁵⁵ The two performances have been recorded: Richard Strauss, Berlin State Opera Orchestra (Koch 37115-2, 1928); Roger Norrington, London Classical Players (EMI CDC7 49656-2, 1989).

⁵⁶ One further development in the criticism of music in the last thirty years has had a limited impact on the opening-up of the canon: the historically informed performance of music. With regard to music before 1750 or perhaps 1750, the performance of 'early music' has automatically involved the representation of music previously outside the canon. But in those performances of music after 1750 that use period instruments and playing techniques, the approach to canon is no less narrow than that of traditional approaches to performance.

⁵⁷ Guillory, 'Canon', 237; Gorak, *Making of the Modern Canon*, 8.

⁵⁸ Guillory, 'Canon', 237; emphasis original.

much less so, and it may not be the of the academy would like to think to concert-giving organizations, or producers gives Guillory's statement ignore.

If these comments are given any so we invoke a theory of reception to p canon-forming institutions. Indeed, when he says:

Let us try . . . to reconstruct a *historical* seminated, reproduced, reread, and retained order to understand the historical circumrary canon, then, we must see its historreception of texts. We must understandtion of *what* we read but of *who* reads aanswer all of these questions in order tostitution of the canon.⁵⁹

These comments echo those made byical response to the implications of thquoted with approval by Krummacherelationship between reception and c

Reception Theories, C

In one of the more liberal moments judgement, Dahlhaus admits the analstudy—although he immediately reinot affect the validity of what he calwardly alongside Jauss's view as preser in the 1967 paper.

The merit of a literary history based on anentent to which it can take an active part i

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 238; emphasis original. Both Kerman and Dahlhaus (with regard to the reception of nineteenth-century music is to be approached on the same basis as that of Frankish culture), that is, in terms of its own culture and its reception, are recognised and so must the practice of analysis which is involved in the reception of texts'. 117; 'For a historian to "receive" a predetermined canon—means first of all that he reconstructs the canon as it was in its own imaginary museum' (Dahlhaus, *Foundations*, 97; emphasis original).

⁶⁰ Klaus Kropffinger, 'Probleme der musikalischen Rezeptionsgeschichte', 159.

⁶¹ 'Yet music historians must make aesthetic distinctions between the canon and the history in the strong sense' (Dahlhaus, *Foundations*, 97).

much less so, and it may not be the case in literature as much as the denizens of the academy would like to think. Broadening the concept of institution to concert-giving organizations, opera-houses, journals, critics, and record-producers gives Gullory's statement a resonance that, for music, is very hard to ignore. If these comments are given any sort of historical dimension, they suggest that we invoke a theory of reception to play an important part in the analysis of these canon-forming institutions. Indeed, Gullory calls for something very similar when he says:

Let us try . . . to reconstruct a *historical* picture of how literary works are produced, disseminated, reproduced, reread, and retiaught over successive generations and eras. . . . In order to understand the historical circumstances determining the constitution of the literary canon, then, we must see its history as the history of both the production and the reception of texts. We must understand that the history of literature is not only a question of *what* we read but of *who* reads and *who* writes. . . . We must be able to ask and answer all of these questions in order to arrive at a historical understanding of the constitution of the canon.⁵⁹

These comments echo those made by Klaus Kropfingger in 1973 in a musicological response to the implications of the early work of Jass, and they are in turn quoted with approval by Krümmacher, although—as he has already said—the relationship between reception and canon is too often unacknowledged.⁶⁰

Reception Theories, Canons, and Musical Value

In one of the more liberal moments of his discussion of canon and value-judgement, Dahlhaus admits the analysis of the nature of the canon as a viable study—although he immediately reinforces his objectivist claim that this would not affect the validity of what he calls the 'aesthetic' canon.⁶¹ This sits awkwardly alongside Jass's view as presented just before the first of his seven theses in the 1967 paper.

The merit of a literary history based on an aesthetics of reception will depend upon the extent to which it can take an active part in the ongoing totalization of the past through

⁵⁹ Ibid. 238; emphasis original. Both Kerman and Dahlhaus reluctantly approach Gullory's position. But, if nineteenth-century music is to be approached on the same basis [as an interpretation of Gregorian chant in the context of Frankish culture], that is, in terms of its own culture and ideology, the force exerted by the idea of the canon must be recognised and so must the practice of analysis which was developed to validate it (Kerman, 'A Few Canonic Variations', 117). For a historian to 'receive' a predetermined canon—which in no way excludes the possibility of his including that canon—means first of all that he reconstruct 'value-relations' which have qualified works for inclusion in our imaginary museum' (Dahlhaus, *Foundations*, 97; emphasis added).
⁶⁰ Klaus Kropfingger, 'Probleme der musikalischen Rezeptionsforschung', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 135 (1974).
⁶¹ Yet music historians must make aesthetic distinctions in order to determine just what does or does not belong to history in the strong sense' (Dahlhaus, *Foundations*, 97).

aning from one under the direction of what qualities we value in a symphony give our consent to the view that these receive in earlier authors and performers. Though the stranglehold that the conservatories of our musical culture results in a attractive development within an academic that has resulted in the teaching of gender awareness of the possibility of gender are important consequence.⁵⁶ The great canon is that it suffers, ironically, from a unique that it seeks to supplant. If one adhered to the canon on the basis that they had have only been excluded because they indeed any other reason, this is as much as to be included not only in the works for which also in its existing members. And the problematic with the conservative critique questions of canon reach the conclusion that also agree that, although the canon texts inside it, it is essential for the generation.⁵⁷ The consequence of us back to questions of reception. does nothing in itself to preserve that work. institutional context, a setting in which its continual re-introduction to generations her more complex social contexts than the Gullory's use of the term 'institution' the academy is the location of canon has already been suggested, this is Strauss, Berlin State Opera Orchestra (Koch 371152-DC7 49656-2, 1989). the last thirty years has had a limited impact on the practice of music. With regard to music before 1750 that use period instruments and playing with traditional approaches to performance.

aesthetic experience. This demands on the one hand—in opposition to the objectivism of positivist literary history—a conscious attempt at the formation of a canon, which, on the other hand—in opposition to the classicism of the study of traditions—presupposes a critical revision if not destruction of the received literary canon. The criterion for the formation of such a canon and the ever necessary retelling of literary history is clearly set out by the aesthetics of reception. The step from the history of the reception of the individual work to the history of literature has to lead to seeing and representing the historical sequence of works as they determine and clarify the coherence of literature, to the extent that it is meaningful for us, as the prehistory of its present experience.⁶²

Kerman also approaches the relationship between reception and canon. At the end of his 1983 essay he apologizes, saying that his comments are 'coming to an end at a point where many readers . . . would like to see them begin: *How are canons determined, why and on what authority?*'⁶³ Kerman's concluding remarks are a claim that we can only answer these questions when we have built up a serious criticism of music, of the sort advocated in his *Musicology*.⁶⁴ Few would want to agree with this, probably none of the other contributors to the special issue of *Critical Inquiry* devoted to canons in which Kerman's essay was published. In considering specific ways in which theories of reception and the canonic discourses in music interact, Kerman's questions, and his refusal to answer, are a valuable point of departure.

Guillory, Kropfing, Dahlhaus, and Kerman state or imply that a theory of reception could play an important part in addressing questions of canon, but do not suggest how this might happen. The hints they give may be developed by uniting agencies of reception (Guillory's 'historical circumstances') with what Barbara Herrnstein Smith has called 'contingencies of value'.⁶⁵ That is to say, characteristics of a work's reception overlap substantially those characteristics that may impart value to the work. In response to a hypothetical conservative critique of canon, she writes:

What is commonly referred to as 'the test of time' . . . is not, as the figure implies, an impersonal and impartial mechanism; for the cultural institutions through which it operates (schools, libraries, theaters, museums, publishing and printing houses, editorial boards, prize-awarding commissions, state censors, and so forth) are, of course, all managed by *persons* (who, by definition, are those with cultural power and commonly other forms of power as well); and, since the texts that are selected and preserved by 'time' will always tend to be those which 'fit' . . . *their* characteristic needs, interests, resources,

⁶² Jauss, 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', 20. There are points in Jauss's formation of this view that the present chapter does not encompass: the idea of the *destruction* of the canon and the concept of a *serial* history of literature or music.

⁶³ Kerman, 'A Few Canonic Variations', 124; emphasis original.

⁶⁴ Kerman, *Musicology*, 113–54.

⁶⁵ The title of an article, 'Contingencies of Value', *Critical Inquiry*, 10 (1983–4), 1–35; and a book, *Contingencies of Value: Alternative Perspectives for Critical Theory* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988), in which the article is reprinted, 17–53.

and purposes, that testing mechanism has thus intensified by time.⁶⁶

This list of cultural institutions is not those that might affect the value of a list, similar in scope to that offered by critics, concert series, foundations promoting novels with narratives centred on music to attract others. An example taken merely from societies, illustrates how the relative value might work.

Societies exist today to promote the types of musical activity. Two may be mentioned: the Britten-Pears Foundation at Aldeburgh is an important financial element in the constitution of the promotion of the cause of a single composer's position in the canon. This may be contrasted with the promotion of such more routine bibliographic activities as the publication of a composer's working papers for the Paul Banks Stiftung in Basle goes one step further in promoting composers; Stockhausen, Berio, Carter. This philanthropic exercise has the same function as the Britten-Pears Foundation, except that canonic pressure is exerted on living composers.

If this understanding of reception is straightforward, the relationship has a straightforwardness. Reception have exhibited a narrow view of canon. It has been subject to this sort of enquiry—Wagner—are already assured of canon.

⁶⁶ Ibid. 51; emphasis original. Although she does not make a critique of the essentially objective standpoint in *Aesthetics* (Oxford, 1982). She does, however, cite Leonard B. Meyer's *Essays on Music and Music Theory* (Chicago, 1967), 22–41 ('Some Ambitious and Ambiguous Claims for Empirical Aesthetics'). It will become clear that her book is a significant source-text for this chapter. In the usual manner, her thinking informs large parts of this book.

⁶⁷ The Britten-Pears Foundation acts as an umbrella for the foundation, the Aldeburgh Festival, various competitions and the Britten-Pears Library, and provides various subsidies. Many of these activities do far more than promote the activity of the Foundation. I am grateful to Paul Banks for his activities of the Britten-Pears Foundation.

⁶⁸ Boulez and Berio gave their names to individual collections (1986), 23 and 25). The most recent acquisitions of the *Journal of Music and Epiphanies* and documentary material relating to Boulez. I am grateful to Drue Ferguson for discussing the foundation's relevant literature to my attention. See also Lewis Foreman (1980), 27. I am grateful to Stephen Banfield for drawing

and purposes, that testing mechanism has its own built-in partialities accumulated in and was intensified by time.⁶⁶

This list of cultural institutions is necessarily incomplete, and an inventory of those that might affect the value of a musical work would be very different. A list similar in scope to that offered by Herrnstein Smith for literature, might add novels with narratives centred on musical works or performers, and might sub- tract others. An example taken merely at random, that of musical foundations and societies, illustrates how the relationship between reception, canon, and value might work.

Societies exist today to promote the work of a single composer or particular types of musical activity. Two may be considered here. The Britten-Pears Foundation at Aldeburgh is an important factor in the reception of Britten's works, a crucial element in the constitution of the canon and Britten's place within it. Promotion of the cause of a single composer is an attempt to enlarge the composer's position in the canon. This may be by means of performance or recording, or of such more routine bibliographical functions as the collection of a composer's working papers for the purposes of scholarship.⁶⁷ The Paul Sacher Stiftung in Basle goes one step further in acquiring the working papers of active composers; Stockhausen, Berio, Carter, Birtwistle, and Boulez are examples.⁶⁸ This philanthropic exercise has the same effect as that of the Britten-Pears Foundation, except that canonic pressures are enhanced by promoting the works of living composers.

If this understanding of reception theory and canonic discourses seems straightforward, the relationship has a darker side. Previous accounts of musical reception have exhibited a narrow view of canon. Composers whose works have been subject to this sort of enquiry—Beethoven, Mozart, Handel, Bach, and Wagner—are already assured of canonic status. In the light of the claims made

ibid. 51: emphasis original. Although she does not cite the work, in this passage Herrnstein-Smith is offering a critique of the essentially objective standpoint in Anthony Savile, *The Test of Time: An Essay in Philosophical Aesthetics* (Oxford, 1982). She does, however, cite Leonard B. Meyer, *Music, the Arts and Ideas: Patterns and Predictions in Twentieth-Century Culture* (Chicago, 1967), 22-41 ('Some Remarks on Value and Creativity in Music') as a naive and ambitious claim for empirical aesthetics'. It will become clear to anyone familiar with Herrnstein Smith's work that her book is a significant source-text for this chapter, and that, although direct quotations are acknowledged in the usual manner, her thinking informs large parts of the ideological structure of this study.

The Britten-Pears Foundation acts as an umbrella organization for Britten Estate Ltd., the commercial arm of the foundation, the Aldeburgh Festival, various competitions, the Britten-Pears School for Advanced Musical Study, and the Britten-Pears Library, and provides various subventions and grants for contemporary music and music education. Many of these activities do far more than promote the music of Britten, but such promotion is central to the activity of the Foundation. I am grateful to Paul Banks (Britten-Pears Library) for a very useful discussion of the activities of the Britten-Pears Foundation.

Boulez and Berio gave their names to individual collections in the mid-1980s (*The Paul Sacher Foundation* (Basle, 1986), 23 and 25). The most recent acquisitions of the two composers are Berio's *Brno, Canticum novum testamenti* and *Epiphany* and documentary material relating to Boulez's career (*Mitteilungen der Paul Sacher Stiftung*, 7 (1994), 49). I am grateful to Bruce Ferguson for discussing the function of the Sacher Foundation with me, and drawing the relevant literature to my attention. See also Lewis Foreman, 'Reputations . . . Bought or Made', *Musical Times*, 121 (1980), 27. I am grateful to Stephen Banfield for drawing this article to my attention.

in this chapter about the value of a theory of reception to the understanding of canonic discourse, such a state of affairs is a paradox. This relationship is subject, as are all that involve canonic discourses, to the strictures of the conservative and liberal critiques of the canon. To date, the conservative critique of the relationship between reception and canonic discourse has had the upper hand (as the list of subjects given above demonstrates). One awaits explanations of the reception of the music of Vanhal, Auber, and Malipiero.

The relationship between canonic discourses and reception may be refined further by trying to protect the distinction between *Wirkung* and *Rezeption*, because this can be of theoretical value here. *Wirkung* focuses on the textual and musical aspects of the process, whereas *Rezeption* addresses the recipient of the text. The link between agencies of reception and contingencies of value can be enlarged by arguing for a tripartite link between agencies of reception, contingencies of value, and locations of effect (*Wirkung*). These three elements often share the same site; similarly, that site invites excavation in three ways. With reception, effect, and value combined as the basis for a consideration of canon, a second example will be considered.

On 10 April 1784, Mozart wrote to his father, giving a report of a concert that had taken place on 1 April that year.⁶⁹ He said:

I composed two grand concertos and then a quintet, which called forth the greatest applause: I myself consider it the best work I have ever composed.⁷⁰ It is written for one oboe, one clarinet, one horn, one bassoon and the pianoforte. How I wish you could have heard it! And how beautifully it was performed! Well, to tell the truth I was really worn out in the end after playing so much—and it is greatly to my credit that my listeners never got tired.⁷¹

We could try to neutralize the importance we attach to this very interesting assessment by saying that Mozart would continue to compose for seven and half years, and he might not have thought quite so highly of the Quintet for Piano and Wind, K.452, in, say, 1788. Nevertheless, such statements as these are sufficiently rare for us to probe just a little further. When Mozart gave this assessment to his father, he was setting the quintet alongside, but presumably above, the two piano concertos that he played in the same concert, K.450 and K.451, and also at least the first three of the quartets that would be dedicated to Haydn the following year, those in G major, D minor and E flat major.⁷²

This letter from Mozart to his father embodies a value-judgement about the work. That judgement has not been shared by all those who have considered this

⁶⁹ The concert had originally been programmed for 21 Mar. 1784, and the work was entered into Mozart's *Verzeichnis* on 30 Mar.

⁷⁰ The original German is: 'Ich selbst halte es für das beste was ich noch in meinem Leben geschrieben habe' (Wilhelm Bauer and Otto Erich Deutsch (eds.), *Mozart: Briefe und Aufzeichnungen: Gesamtausgabe* (7 vols., Kassel, 1962–75), iii, 309).

⁷¹ Emily Anderson (ed. and trans.), *The Letters of Mozart and his Family* (London, 1985), 873.

⁷² Of the six quartets dedicated to Haydn that were published by Artaria as Op. 10 on 1 Sept. 1785, K.387, K.421, and K.428 were complete by summer 1783.

piece between 1784 and the present. It has fared rather badly. In Hans Keller's *Mozart Companion*, the work is not mentioned elsewhere only as a footnote to Donald Tovey's account of the works for wind instruments in such more restricted treatments as the *Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Keller does mention (albeit in a footnote) the Quintet in other standard texts treat the work similarly.

The reception of the Quintet for Piano and Wind, K.452, in terms of considerations of genre. This clearly relegates it with a piano concerto, we are competing for a place in the same professional performance context. The status is being enlarged all the time by a number of recordings and institutions. This point was made as long ago as 1935 in Bloom's *Master Musicians* volume on Mozart. In the critical literature: the generic organ is being enlarged. Keller's judgement that such works are sidelined. Keller's judgement is extraordinary: in a chapter entitled 'The Chamber Music', one page only is devoted to wind instruments, and it does not include the Quintet for Wind at all. Mozart's judgements of value are marred by organicist myopia.

The fate of K.452 in criticism and performance has been in a favourable position in terms of recordings. The Quintet and three string quartets mentioned in the current *Gramophone* as K.451 in the current *Gramophone* again of K.428, and twice as many of K.451.

For a wide range of reasons (only some of which are mentioned in the work viewed by Mozart in 1784 as his father's judgement) the stature in musical criticism of the Quintet has not been enriched by considering the position of the Quintet in the repertoire.

⁷³ Hans Keller, 'The Chamber Music', in H. C. Robbins Landon (ed.), *Mozart: The Serenades for Wind Band* (London, 1965; repr. 1977), 90–137 (*The Mozart Companion*), 76 n.1.

⁷⁴ Stanley Sadie, 'Mozart, (3) (Johann Chrysostom) V. 1785–6. The references are unchanged in Stanley Sadie, *The Mozart Companion* (London, 1973), 76 n.1.

⁷⁵ For a recent example, see Volkmar Braunbehrens, *Mozart in Vienna* (Oxford, 1991), 198 (page numbers refer to English edition).

⁷⁶ 'Another endearing composition of the serenade type for oboe and piano (K.452), which suffers from neglect for the public: the regrettably few opportunities wind players have in the repertoire' (*Master Musicians* (London, 1935), 252). See also *ibid.* 122.

⁷⁷ The figures are as follows: K.451: 18; K.452: 19; K.450: 18 (1994), 462, 486, and 500).

here between 1784 and the present. In twentieth-century criticism, the quintet has fared rather badly. In Hans Keller's notorious contribution to the influential *Mozart Companion*, the work is not mentioned at all, and it appears in the book somewhere only as a footnote to Donald Mitchell's discussion of the C minor Serenade in his account of the works for wind ensemble.⁷³ The work receives two mentions in such more restricted treatments as Stanley Sadie's essay in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*;⁷⁴ these refer to the problematic nature of the genre, and mention (albeit in a low-key way) Mozart's view of the work. Other standard texts treat the work similarly.⁷⁵

The reception of the Quintet for Piano and Wind since 1945 is dominated by considerations of genre. This clearly related to performance; when we compare it with a piano concerto, we are comparing a work that survives today with no easy professional performance context (the quintet) with one whose generic focus is being enlarged all the time by audiences, performers, and concert-giving institutions. This point was made as long ago as 1935 in the first edition of Eric Blom's *Master Musicians* volume on Mozart.⁷⁶ Considerations of genre also affect the critical literature: the generic organization of many scholarly texts means that such works are sidelined. Keller's contribution is therefore all the more extraordinary: in a chapter entitled 'The Chamber Music' that runs to forty-seven pages, one page only is devoted to the chamber music with wind instruments, and it does not include mention of the Quintet for Piano and Wind at all. Mozart's judgements of value on his work are sacrificed to Keller's organicist myopia.

The fate of K.452 in criticism and performance is counterbalanced by its favourable position in terms of recording. When set against the two piano concertos and three string quartets mentioned above, there are as many recordings of K.452 as K.451 in the current *Grove Online Classical Catalogue*, half as many again of K.428, and twice as many of K.453.⁷⁷ For a wide range of reasons (only some of which have been discussed here), a work viewed by Mozart in 1784 as his finest is reduced to a mere also-ran in nature in musical criticism of the last fifty years. This conclusion may be criticized by considering the position faced by those who seek to interpret

⁷³ Hans Keller, 'The Chamber Music', in H. C. Robbins Landon and Donald Mitchell (eds.), *The Mozart Companion* (London, 1965; repr. 1977), 90–137 (*The Mozart Companion* was originally published in 1956); Donald Mitchell, 'The Serenades for Wind Band', *ibid.*, 76 n.1.
⁷⁴ Stanley Sadie, 'Mozart, (3) (Johann Chrysostom) Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart', in *New Grove Mozart*, 1982), 86 and 97–8.
⁷⁵ For a recent example, see Volkmar Braunbehrens, *Mozart in Wien* (Munich, 1986), trans. Timothy Bell as *Mozart: A Biography* (Oxford, 1991), 198 (page numbers refer to English trans.).
⁷⁶ Another enduring composition of the serenade type in [sic] the Quintet in B flat major for oboe, clarinet, horn, bassoon and piano (K.452), which suffers from neglect for the only reason that keeps the wind octet serenades from the public: the regrettably few opportunities wind players have to appear as chamber performers' (Eric Blom, *Mozart: Master Musicians* (London, 1935), 252). See also *ibid.*, 129.
⁷⁷ The figures are as follows: K.451: 18; K.452: 19; K.453: 36; K.428: 27 (*The Grove Online Classical Catalogue* (1994), 462, 486, and 500).

of reception to the understanding of a paradox. This relationship is subject to the strictures of the conservative discourse; the conservative critique of the discourse has had the upper hand (as it were). One awaits explanations of the (Wirkung). These three elements often invite excavation in three ways. With the basis for a consideration of canon, father, giving a report of a concert that he said: a quintet, which called forth the greatest have ever composed.⁷⁸ It is written for one of the pianoforte. How I wish you could have red Well, to tell the truth I was really very greatly to my credit that my listeners never

... we attach to this very interesting continue to compose for seven and half quite so highly of the Quintet for Piano. Nevertheless, such statements as these are sufficient. When Mozart gave this assessment along side, but presumably above, in the same concert, K.450 and K.451. Critics that would be dedicated to Haydn and B flat major.⁷²

... embodies a value-judgement about the ... by all those who have considered this ... 1784, and the work was entered into Mozart's ... was ich noch in meinem Leben geschrieben habe ... und Aufzeichnungen: Gesamtausgabe (7 vols., Kassel ... and his Family (London, 1985), 873.

Beethoven's Quintet for Piano and Wind Op. 16, composed in 1796, two years after the posthumous publication of Mozart's work. For Alfred Einstein, the relationship between Mozart's K.452 and Beethoven's Op. 16 was 'universally known'.⁷⁸ To question the Mozart that Beethoven knew is again to interrogate the issue of *Wirkung*, and is here a very productive enquiry. True, K.452 was published by Artaria as Op. 29 in February 1794; the edition ran to several issues; and André, Schott, and Götz all produced editions before 1800. But all these editions were of an arrangement for piano quartet (piano and strings). The first edition of the version for piano and wind instruments was not published until September 1800—by Gombert in Augsburg—four years after the composition of Beethoven's quintet.⁷⁹ Unless Beethoven had a manuscript copy of the original version, which is unlikely, why did he write his Op. 16? What is Op. 16 a reception of, if it is not of Mozart's piece? A piano quartet that he knew had originally been a quintet for piano and wind? The fact that was 'universally known' in 1945 appears much less clear in the wake of Gertraut Haberkamp's recent work on Mozart first editions.⁸⁰

This example points up a variety of things. First, that among Mozart's works, the position the quintet holds has changed radically between 1784 and the present. However complex the position was in 1784—and the evidence comes from Mozart's pen only, not from the more widely articulated description of the culture of Francis II's Vienna—its critical position today is precarious in comparison with that of the piano concertos. Second, although critical writing on the work sets it to one side, recorded performances of the work seem to suggest that it is a work that might take a more central role in a canonic discourse associated with recorded rather than live performance. Finally, and perhaps most important, the example shows how views of canonic status are contingent on historical circumstance, which in turn demands systematic analysis. The value attached to a given work changes with time, and accounts for the position at the margins of certain canonic discourses of such a work as Mozart's Quintet for Piano and Wind. Reconstructing the horizon of expectations for the work and its recipients—even as sketchily as has been done here, with publication and

⁷⁸ Alfred Einstein, *Mozart: His Character, His Work*, trans. Arthur Mendel and Nathan Broder (London, 1945), 122.

⁷⁹ Gertraut Haberkamp, *Die Erstdrucke der Werke von Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart*, Musikbibliographisches Arbeitsheft 10 (2 vols., Tützing, 1986), i, 219–22.

⁸⁰ Informal discussion of this matter with Mozart and Beethoven scholars leads to two conclusions: (1) that Einstein's view of the relationship between the two works is still widely held (although Haberkamp's work is almost a decade old); and (2) the important—even burning—question seems to be which of the works is better. In at least one instance this preoccupation has found its way into print: 'Although it [Beethoven's Quintet Op. 16] is scored for the same forces as Mozart's K.452, a work which Beethoven must surely have known, a comparison between the first movements of the two pieces serves mainly to highlight Mozart's extreme economy of material as opposed to Beethoven's over-extravagance [*sic*] (Nicholas Marston, 'Chamber Music with Wind', in Barry Cooper (ed.), *The Beethoven Compendium: A Guide to Beethoven's Life and Music* (London, 1991), 226; emphasis added). 'Economy' is one of Janet Levy's covert and casual values in writing about music (Janet M. Levy, 'Covert and Casual Values in Recent Writing about Music', *Journal of Musicology*, 5 (1987), 7–13. Her comments about the relationship of 'economy' to chamber music are important in the context of a critique of this quotation.

influence in the 1790s, recorded sound in the 1930s to the 1950s—demonstrate analysis of canon formation. The work's subsequent canonic position is creation and arise out of subsequent d

Changes in the canonic status of a work in a repertoire can be associated very closely with groups. We will consider two examples. Until the late 1960s, two Rossini works were previously called 'the repertoire':⁸¹ *Il barbiere di Siviglia* and *La cenerentola*. Rossini's profile as a subject for scholarship has changed radically, largely through Philip Gossett. Not only was a complete scholarly edition planned, with Gossett as editor in chief, but in North America were given as the result of the marketing of singers. This continues to be an endeavour: most recently, at the time of the production of *Cenerentola* in Bologna. This aspect of Rossini needs to be stressed, because much of the project's success, it is often said, is due to the complete edition of the complete performative elements of the tradition, which is something like canonic status.⁸⁴

Such examples are rare; one is tempted to add up the canon to Rossini and T. S. Eliot, and metaphysical poets to the canon of the 19th century.⁸⁵ More often, such openings—of events that may or may not be recorded and 1980s were important points in the history of important contingencies of value—such as the music of Berlioz.

Throughout the first half of the 20th century, a trickle of scholarly work on Berlioz, s

⁸¹ See Kerman's evasive comments about canon and Philip Gossett, 'History and Works that have no history', in Philip Gossett and Richard Bohlman (eds.), *Disciplining Music*, 97.

⁸² Citron, *Gender*, 27.

⁸³ Perhaps because the recording of opera is so often a compromise between recorded and live performance in the promotion of the work.

⁸⁴ This example is often quoted in the literature on the canon. It was 'the most ambitious feat of cultural imperialism in the American Use of Symbolism', in Graham Martin (ed.), *The Influence of Eliot on F. R. Leavis and Scrutiny* (1983), 38–43.

influence in the 1790s, recorded sound in the 1990s, and critical attitudes from the 1930s to the 1950s—demonstrates the merit of a theory of reception for the analysis of canon formation. The generic qualities that have determined this work's subsequent canonic position were both inscribed in the work at its creation and arise out of subsequent developments in musical culture.

Changes in the canonic status of a work, of a composer's output, or of a complete repertoire can be associated very clearly with particular individuals or small groups. We will consider two examples. The first concerns the operas of Rossini. Until the late 1960s, two Rossini works formed part of what was—and still is—devotedly called 'the repertoire':⁸¹ *Il barbiere di Siviglia* and *Guillaume Tell*.⁸²

Rossini's profile as a subject for scholarly enquiry was at that time negligible. This picture has changed radically, largely as a result of the intervention of Philip Gossett. Not only was a complete scholarly edition of the works of the composer planned, with Gossett as editor in chief, but performances all over Europe and North America were given as the result of both his entrepreneurial skills and his coaching of singers. This continues today, twenty-five years after his earliest endeavours: most recently, at the time of preparation of this chapter, a production of *Cenerentola* in Bologna. This aspect of the revival of interest in the works of Rossini needs to be stressed, because although Gossett is often credited with much of the project's success, it is often only on the grounds of his involvement with the complete edition of the composer's works.⁸³ But interventions in the performative elements of the tradition have been important in returning Rossini to something like canonic status.⁸⁴

Such examples are rare; one is tempted to draw an analogy between opening up the canon to Rossini and T. S. Eliot's almost single-handed admission of the metaphysical poets to the canon of English literature in the middle of the century.⁸⁵ More often, such openings-up of the canon are the result of a series of events that may or may not be related. In the same way that the 1970s and 1980s were important points in the reception of Rossini's operas—and important contingencies of value—so too were the 1950s and 1960s for the music of Berlioz.

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, there had been only a trickle of scholarly work on Berlioz, sparked off by the 1903 centenary that in

See Kernan's evasive comments about canon and repertory quoted above (391–2).
81 Philip Gossett, 'History and Works that have no History: Reviving Rossini's Neapolitan Operas', in Bergeron and Bohman (eds.), *Disciplining Music*, 97.
82 Citron, *Gender*, 27.
83 Perhaps because the recording of opera is so often associated with performance, there is not the disparity between recorded and live performance in the promotion of Rossini's works as in, e.g., Mozart's Quintet for Piano and Wind.
84 This example is often quoted in the literature on canon-formation in English literature. For the view that this was 'the most ambitious feat of cultural imperialism the century seems likely to produce' see Cabrel Pearson, 'Eliot: An American Use of Symbolism', in Graham Martin (ed.), *Eliot in Perspective: A Symposium* (London, 1970), 97–100. For the influence of Eliot on R. Leavis and Scrutiny, see Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford, 1983), 38–43.

nd Op. 16, composed in 1796, two year
Mozart's work. For Alfred Einstein, the
and Beethoven's Op. 16 was 'universally
productive enquiry. True, K. 452 was pub-
1794; the edition ran to several issues.
ed editions before 1800. But all these edi-
no quarter (piano and strings). The first
and instruments was not published until
bourg—four years after the composition
even had a manuscript copy of the origi-
he write his Op. 16? What is Op. 16 a
A piano quarter that he knew had origi-
The fact that was 'universally known'
wake of Gerratut Haberkamp's recent
ings. First, that among Mozart's works
ged radically between 1784 and the
was in 1784—and the evidence contin-
re widely articulated description of the
al position today is precarious in com-
Second, although critical writing on
ormances of the work seem to suggest
entral role in a canonic discourse ass-
ormance. Finally, and perhaps most
s of canonic status are contingent on
mands systematic analysis. The value
e, and accounts for the position at the
such a work as Mozart's Quintet for
zon of expectations for the work and
een done here, with publication and

turn had set in motion the Breitkopf and Härtel collected works. It was the 1950s that saw Jacques Barzun's book *Berlioz and the Romantic Century*, the foundation of a Berlioz Society and its *Bulletin* in 1952, and the influential 1957 production of *Les Troyens* at Covent Garden.⁸⁶ Two powerful forces were at work in the admission of Berlioz into both scholarly and performing canonic discourses in the subsequent decade: the foundation of the *New Berlioz Edition* in 1965 and the beginning of Colin Davis's persuasive series of recordings of the composer's works.⁸⁷ Between 1960 and 1969, Davis recorded all the major works of the composer including *Béatrice et Benedict* and *Les Troyens*;⁸⁸ only *Benvenuto Cellini* was omitted. What is so striking about these endeavours is that they nearly all took place in the British Isles—which is even now a source of rancour in the Francophone world. A comparison between the status of Berlioz's music in 1945 and 1995 reveals a striking growth in many fields of musical activity: performance, recording, and scholarly action.⁸⁹

There is an interesting, and less attractive, by-product of both the Rossini and the Berlioz projects that deserves attention. Put simply, many of those who promote a composer so avidly for inclusion in the canon are just as quick to decry those whose works have been left outside. It is rare to find documentary evidence of this, but such derision of those left outside often finds its way into less formal contexts. The author of the *Master Musicians* volume on Rossini, while a less significant player in the inclusion of the composer's works in the canon, is quick to point to the shortcomings of Rossini's contemporaries. Much of Richard Osborne's discussion of *L'italiana in Algeri* is built around an unfavourable comparison with Luigi Mosca's setting of the same libretto.⁹⁰ In an address to the Royal Musical Association in London in 1992, the same author offered an unscripted distinction between Rossini's *Il barbiere di Siviglia* and Morlacchi's work of the same name. The latter, he said, sounded like 'so much knitting'.⁹¹ These are not straightforward, uncritical restatements of history: the versions by Mosca and Morlacchi were ultimately eclipsed by those of Rossini, but a dash to assign judgements of value is dangerous in an environment in which pro-

⁸⁶ Jacques Barzun, *Berlioz and the Romantic Century* (Boston, 1950); *The Berlioz Society Bulletin* was first published as a quarterly in 1952, and subsequently yearly from 1975; the significance of the 1957 *Les Troyens* production for scholarship in the 1960s is acknowledged in D. Kern Holoman, 'Troyens, Les', in *New Grove Dictionary of Opera*, iv, 828.

⁸⁷ Hugh MacDonald, 'The New Berlioz Edition', *Musical Times*, 106 (1965), 518.

⁸⁸ Colin Davis's Berlioz recordings from the 1960s include the following: *L'Enfance du Christ* (Oct. 1960); *Béatrice et Benedict* (Apr. 1962); *Harold en Italie* (Oct. 1962); *Symphonie fantastique* (May 1963); *Concert Overtures* (Oct. 1965); *Roméo et Juliette* (Feb.–Mar. 1968); *Te Deum* (Jan. 1969); *Les Troyens* (Sept.–Oct. 1969); *Grande Messe des Morts* (Nov. 1969). For a complete list of the recordings of this period see Malcolm Walker, 'Discography', in Alan Blyth, *Colin Davis* (Shepperton, 1972), 61–3.

⁸⁹ Kerman ('A Few Canonic Variations', 115) lists Berlioz alongside Mussorgsky, Verdi, Rachmaninoff, and Sibelius as composers whose inclusion has changed the 'standard canon' between 1928 (the date of his example taken from Aldous Huxley's *Point Counter Point*) and 1983 (the date of Kerman's article).

⁹⁰ Richard Osborne, *Rossini, Master Musicians* (London, 1986), 159–61. The unfavourable comparison is based on the *duetto* 'Ai capricci della sorte' from Act I of both works.

⁹¹ Osborne, 'Rossini and his Librettists', paper read at Royal Musical Association meeting, London, 15 Feb. 1992.

ductions and recordings, let alone the background of the works, do not extend to the exclusion of Morlacchi and that extend from the beginning of the twentieth—need serious consideration and condemnation.

Composers whose names begin those eager to protect recent recruits victim is Meyerbeer. A surreptitious bear from members of the editorial interesting results. Whereas Osborne's attempt to demonstrate value—or visceral. One informant (an important 1960s to the 1980s) declared that had only heard one unrepresentative owned a recording of *Le Prophète*, h

What is so interesting in these v individuals who seek to admit comp to a liberal critique of the canon— subtly to the conservative: to close and Morlacchi.⁹⁴ Why one might fee value are offered as scholarly comm affect the ways in which historical Does it matter, for example, that Ros public Teatro Argentino, whereas embattled Italian court opera in D was setting a new libretto by Ste rossellini's libretto written for Pais Rossini was writing for an Italian working in an environment much league at Dresden being Weber?⁹⁵ ges, and it is worrisome that, althou

⁹² Osborne's comments were based on a comp Rossini work and the corresponding passage in Mor same libretto. Although both libretti at this point de are quite different; this makes a meaningful comp ment of value—impossible.

⁹³ However interesting a historical account of th appropriate here to discuss this subject.

⁹⁴ Such a procedure gives a focus to the essential cussed above.

⁹⁵ The history of the relations between Weber an the subject. In January 1817, Weber and German Italian opera; but, with hindsight of the most prim in decline, in the face of works with German libretto

ductions and recordings, let alone accounts of the institutional and aesthetic background of the works, do not exist.⁹² The historical circumstances that led to the exclusion of Morlacchi and Mosca from the canon—circumstances that extend from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the end of the twentieth—need serious consideration; their works do not deserve automatic condemnation.

Composers whose names begin with M seem to suffer badly at the hands of those eager to protect recent recruits to the canon. In the case of Berlioz, the victim is Meyerbeer. A surreptitious campaign to extract judgements on Meyerbeer from members of the editorial board of the *New Berlioz Edition* yielded interesting results. Whereas Osborne's views on Rossini are at least based on an attempt to demonstrate value—or the lack of it—views on Meyerbeer tend to be visceral. One informant (an important figure in English musical circles from the 1960s to the 1980s) declared that he could not stand Meyerbeer, although he had only heard one unrepresentative work, and admitted that, although he owned a recording of *Le Prophète*, he had yet to listen to it.⁹³

What is so interesting in these verbal documents of reception is that when individuals who seek to admit composers to the canon—and therefore subscribe to a liberal critique of the canon—have been successful, their critique moves subtly to the conservative: to close off canon discourses to Meyerbeer, Mosca, and Morlacchi.⁹⁴ Why one might feel uneasy is that these adverse judgements of value are offered as scholarly comments, whether implicitly or explicitly, and so affect the ways in which historical research might subsequently be conducted. Does it matter, for example, that Rossini's *Il barbiere di Siviglia* was written for the public Teatro Argentino, whereas Morlacchi's work was written for the much embattled Italian court opera in Dresden? Does it matter, further, that Rossini was setting a new libretto by Sterbini, whereas Morlacchi was setting Petrosellini's libretto written for Paisiello in 1782? Does it matter, finally, that Rossini was writing for an Italian operatic culture, whereas Morlacchi was working in an environment much under threat from indigenous opera, his colleague at Dresden being Weber?⁹⁵ Answers to all three questions are of course yes, and it is worrisome that, although the now canonized Rossini and Berlioz are

⁹² Osborne's comments were based on a comparison between the quintet 'Don Basilio! Cosa veggo!' from the Russian work and the corresponding passage in Morlacchi, and treated the two passages as if they were based on the same libretto. Although both libretti at this point depend on Beaumarchais (*Le Barbier de Séville*, Act III, sc. xi), they are quite different; this makes a meaningful comparison—even in terms of style and technique, let alone a judgement of value—impossible.

⁹³ However interesting a historical account of the declining fortunes of Meyerbeer's works since c.1870, it is not appropriate here to discuss this subject.

⁹⁴ Such a procedure gives a focus to the essential conservative background to the liberal critique of the canon discussed above.

⁹⁵ The history of the relations between Weber and Morlacchi is a further illustration of differing perspectives on the subject. In January 1817, Weber and German opera must have felt quite clearly subordinate to Morlacchi and Italian opera; but, with hindsight of the most primitive sort, it is not difficult to see Morlacchi and Italian opera as declining, in the face of works with German libretti and in a radically different style.

Hartel collected works. It was the 1950s and the *Romantic Century*, the foundation of powerful forces were at work in the and performing canon discourses in of the *New Berlioz Edition* in 1965 and a series of recordings of the composers is recorded all the major works of the and *Les Troyens*.⁸⁸ only *Benvenuto Cellini* these endeavours is that they nearly all is even now a source of rancour between the status of Berlioz's music in with in many fields of musical activity.

tion.⁸⁹

ive, by-product of both the Rossini and tion. Put simply, many of those who in the canon are just as quick to decry It is rare to find documentary evidence side often finds its way into less formal ans volume on Rossini, while a less sposer's works in the canon, is quick's contemporaries. Much of Richard is built around an unfavourable com- same libretto.⁹⁰ In an address to the 1992, the same author offered an *Il barbiere di Siviglia* and Morlacchi's id, sounded like 'so much knitting' restatements of history: the versions clipped by those of Rossini, but a dash us in an environment in which pro- 1950); *The Berlioz Society Bulletin* was first published the significance of the 1957 *Les Troyens* production in an. *Troyens, Les*, in *New Grove Dictionary of Opera*, 106 (1965), 518.

the following: *L'Enfance du Christ* (Oct. 1960); *Balthazar* (May 1963); *Concert Overtures* (Oct. 1969); *Les Troyens* (Sept.–Oct. 1969); *Grande Messe de Requiem* (Oct. 1969); *Le Carnaval* (Oct. 1969); *Le Barbier de Séville* (Oct. 1969); *Le Barbier de Séville*, Act III, sc. xi), they this period see Malcolm Walker, 'Discography', in *Alan* (1965), 518.

side Musorsky, Verdi, Rachmaninoff, and Stravinsky (between 1928 (the date of his example taken from German's article).

196), 159–61. The unfavourable comparison is based on the Musical Association meeting, London, 15 Feb.

bona fide subjects for scholarly enquiry, those who work on Morlacchi and Meyerbeer may have to contend with hostile judgements of value from those who would have been in an identical position only thirty years ago.

Implicit in the foregoing discussion of liberal critics becoming conservative is the question of relativism. This was the point of disagreement, referred to earlier, between Krummacker and Dahlhaus in the early 1980s. The point at issue was that a theory of reception produces a wide range of documents that bear witness to the echo of a work across history, and therefore to a series of competing interpretations that affect our current view of their value and their place in a canonic discourse.⁹⁶ How are we to judge the value of one interpretation over that of another? If we consider again the example of Sibelius's Fifth Symphony, and arbitrate definitively between the composer and Tovey about the meaning of the Finale's second theme, many might agree that we should prefer the composer's view to that of Tovey. But why? In the English-speaking world at least, Sibelius's comments were not made known until 1993, and even in Finnish were not generally known before 1965. For nearly sixty years, English musicians familiar with Tovey have had his image of Thor swinging his hammer at the back of their minds, and this clearly had value for conductors of the work, its audiences, critics, and scholars. Claiming that Sibelius's interpretation automatically has more value than Tovey's—just because it comes from the composer—is to privilege our *current* reception of the work over that of the period 1935–93. It is not merely to replace an 'incorrect' account by a critic by the composer's 'correct' interpretation.⁹⁷

If there are problems with these sorts of evaluations, how have others attempted to come to terms with this question of relativism? Dahlhaus offered the idea of the *kairos* or *point de la perfection*: a time in a composition's history when its reception was more accurate, more sensitive, to the artistic nature of the work. His example, which he had been developing since the early 1970s, was the reception of Bruckner's symphonies in the 1920s.⁹⁸ Krummacker was rightly unhappy with this idea. His critique of Dahlhaus is well put:

But the suggestion does not only presuppose that it is known from the start where such a *Kairos* is to be found. It also presupposes trust in a hierarchy of values: one has to

⁹⁶ See the references provided in n. 14 above.

⁹⁷ It is striking that no reference to Tovey is made in Hepokoski, *Sibelius: Symphony No. 5*, not even in the index (107). The author declares that references to Tovey were omitted deliberately: 'Actually, I left out Tovey from my Sibelius 5th book on purpose. It was one of the early decisions. Basically, I was so tired of that old quotation that I didn't want to recycle it, even in refuting it. The idea was to eclipse it totally, to render it irrelevant. But it probably didn't work. It's too firmly ingrained into the reception tradition . . . the error, in all likelihood, will continue to persist' (electronic communication to the author, 24 May 1995). This is an extreme position to take in terms of the evaluation of competing interpretations, and could be seen as a once-removed example of privileging the composer over the context—preferring a just-recovered composer's view of a work to a critic's view of a work well embedded in a musical culture. It should be stressed, however, that the above comments represent no critique of the volume under discussion, but only of a general tendency of which the book is just one part.

⁹⁸ Dahlhaus, *Foundations*, 157; *idem*, 'Zur Wirkungsgeschichte musikalischer Werke', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 134 (1973), 215–16.

know right away which qualities of a
time. Only then would one not have
reception.⁹⁹

Krummacker's point of departure
competing receptions of the work w
assumes the objective status of a m
accept at present. Both Krummacker
to the question of relativism. Altho
this chapter, it may be said that Vod
tially, and that a consideration of f
retization (borrowed from Ingarde
Krummacker.¹⁰⁰

The question of how to deal with
Dahlhaus may be answered by view
more recent thought on the subject.
Herrnstein Smith, and especially Pa
this is enough to show how they dif
a distinction between relativism and
must distinguish between competin
not share the need to arbitrate.¹⁰² I
have to be argued *except* in the teeth
an ideological agenda as does a relat
do we need to arbitrate between Tow
has been put excellently by Herrnste

⁹⁹ The German reads: 'Indes setzt der Vorschlag
Kairos liege. Er bedingt auch das Zutrauen in eine
täten eines Werks in welcher Zeit am angemessenen
übergierende Rezeptionszeugnisse nicht irritierten

¹⁰⁰ The two texts cited by both Dahlhaus and Krum
Herrnstein del: Problematika ohlasu Nerudova díla
Konkretisation des literarischen Werks—Zur Problem
ästhetik, 84–112; English trans. by John Burbank
Reception of Neruda's Works', in Peter Steiner (ed.),
Texas Slavic Series, 6 (Austin, Tex., 1982), 103–34; a
and Jan Mukarovsky (eds.), *Čtení o jazyce a poezii
geschichte literarischer Werks', in Warning (ed.), Res
History of the Echo of Literary Works', in A Prague
ington, DC, 1964), 71–81. Neither author does just
which reception is viewed as a quality inherent in h
lation of essays, *Rezeptionsästhetik*, ed. Rainer War
German as well as translations from Czech lured both
work of Jauss (see above, n. 14).*

¹⁰¹ For Herrnstein Smith see above, n. 65. Influenc
Nelson Goodman, *Ways of Worldmaking* (Hassocks, 19
Aesthetic Theory of Knowledge (London, 1975); *idem*, 'Th
1978), 79–86; *idem*, 'Notes on Relativism', in *Farewell*

¹⁰² Herrnstein Smith's preference is to describe
Wahr, 167).

now right away which qualities of a work were received most appropriately at which time. Only then would one not have to be disadvantaged by divergent documents of reception.⁹⁹

Krummacher's point of departure for this problem is to invite comparison of competing receptions of the work with analysis of the work itself, a position that assumes the objective status of a musical analysis, a position that it is difficult to accept at present. Both Krummacher and Dahlhaus cite Felix Vodicka's response to the question of relativism. Although such discussion is beyond the limits of this chapter, it may be said that Vodicka's views have been represented only partially, and that a consideration of his distinction between reception and con-¹⁰⁰tradiction (borrowed from Ingarden) has been blurred by both Dahlhaus and

The question of how to deal with competing interpretations that so troubled Dahlhaus may be answered by viewing the problem of relativism in the light of more recent thought on the subject, particularly the work of Nelson Goodman, Herrnstein Smith, and especially Paul Feyerabend.¹⁰¹ Their starting-point—and this is enough to show how they differ from Dahlhaus in particular—is to draw a distinction between relativism and objectivism, and to show how an objectivist must distinguish between competing interpretations, whereas a relativist does not share the need to arbitrate.¹⁰² In other words, why *should* a relativist case have to be argued *except* in the teeth of an objectivist onslaught that has as clear an ideological agenda as does a relativist defence? Or, to return to Sibelius, why do we need to arbitrate between Tovey's and Sibelius's interpretations? The case has been put excellently by Herrnstein Smith in her book *Contingencies of Value*

⁹⁹ The German reads: 'Indes setz der Vorschlag nicht nur voraus, dass man von vornherein wisse, wo sich ein gutes liegt, für bedingt auch das Zuträuen in eine Hierarchie von Werken: man muss vorab wissen, welche Qualität eines Werkes in welcher Zeit am angemessensten rezipiert wurden. Nur dann müsste man sich auch durch unangenehme Rezeptionszeugnisse nicht irritieren lassen' (Krummacher, 'Rezeptionsgeschichte', 162). The two texts cited by both Dahlhaus and Krummacher are Felix Vodicka, 'Literarne historické studium ohlasu k operám Nerudovy díla', *Slova a slovensko*, 7 (1941), 113–32; German trans. as 'Die Interpretation des hierarchischen Werkes—zur Problematik der Rezeption von Nerudas Werk', in Warning (ed.), *Rezeptionsästhetik*, 8–112; English trans. by John Burbank as 'The Concretization of the Literary Work: Problems in the Reception of Neruda's Works', in Peter Steiner (ed.), *The Prague School: Selected Writings, 1929–1946*, University of Texas Slavie Series, 6 (Austin, Tex., 1982), 103–34; and *idem*, 'Dejiny ohlasu hierarchického literárního díla', in Bohuslav Havranek and Jan Mukarovsky (eds.), *Čtení o jazyce a poezii* (Prague, 1942), 371–84; German trans. as 'Die Rezeptionsästhetik der Echo of Literary Works', in *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style* (Washington, DC, 1964), 71–81. Neither author does justice to Vodicka's appeal to literary history in these articles, in which reception is viewed as a quality inherent in history. Significantly, both articles appear in the influential collection of essays, *Rezeptionsästhetik*, ed. Rainer Warning; the popularity of this collection for works originally in German as well as translations from Czech blurred both Krummacher and Dahlhaus into a mistaken view of the early work of Jauss (see above, n. 14).

¹⁰⁰ For Herrnstein Smith see above, n. 65. Influential on Herrnstein Smith, and therefore on this chapter, are Nelson Goodman, *Ways of Worldmaking* (Hassocks, 1978), and Paul Feyerabend, *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge* (London, 1975); *idem*, 'The Spectre of Relativism', in *Science in a Free Society* (London, 1978), 79–86; *idem*, 'Notes on Relativism', in *Farewell to Reason* (London, 1987), 19–89.

¹⁰¹ Herrnstein Smith's preference is to describe relativism and objectivism as 'cognitive tastes' (*Contingencies of Value*, 167).

those who work on Morlacchi and Meyer-... Judgements of value from those who... only thirty years ago.

liberal critics becoming conservative... point of disagreement, referred to earlier... the early 1980s. The point at issue was... a range of documents that bear witness... therefore to a series of competing inter... their value and their place in a canon... value of one interpretation over that of... of Sibelius's Fifth Symphony, and... and Tovey about the meaning of the... that we should prefer the composer's... English-speaking world at least, Sibelius... 993, and even in Finnish were not gen... years, English musicians familiar... unring his hammer at the back of their... conductors of the work, its audience... Sibelius's interpretation automatically be... comes from the composer—is to pre... er that of the period 1935–93. It is no... by a critic by the composer's 'correct... ts of evaluations, how have other... tion of relativism? Dahlhaus offers... tion: a time in a composition's history... ore sensitive, to the artistic nature of... developing since the early 1970s, was... s in the 1920s.⁹⁸ Krummacher was... e of Dahlhaus is well put:

... that it is known from the start when... trust in a hierarchy of values: one has...

... Sibelius: Sinfphony No. 5, not even in the... method deliberately: Actually, I left out Tovey from my... Basically: I was so tired of that old quotation that... it totally, to render it irrelevant. But it probably... the error, in all likelihood, will continue... This is an extreme position to take in terms of the... of a once-removed example of privileging the composer... of a work to a critic's view of a work well established... above comments represent no critique of the volume... book is just one part.

... musikalischer Werke, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*...

and by Feyerabend in his critique of Popper and Putnam.¹⁰³ If one is wedded to an idea of a reception history of music that simply tracks the 'after-life' of musical works, there is contestable ground between a relativist and an objectivist. If, conversely, reception theory is taken as one of the premisses of a sophisticated history of music that takes its synchronic dimension seriously, it is difficult to identify any complaint that an objectivist might make.

The central claim of this chapter has been that locations of reception overlap substantially with contingencies of value, and therefore that a theory of reception is fundamental to a diagnosis of canonic discourse. This is a basis for a theory of history that assimilates both synchronic and diachronic trajectories, and that fuses a traditional history of works, composers, and institutions with a fully worked-out history of music based on a theory of reception. The result would be a significant contribution to a history of music conditioned by, for example, cultural anthropology or *annaliste* thought.¹⁰⁴ This is a very different prospect from the arid concept of separate spheres of historical endeavour—one music history, one reception history—envisioned by Dahlhaus. Whatever type of historical narrative one is trying to write, whatever philosophy of history one adopts—and in this sense it does not matter whether the perspective is Whig, *annaliste*, or New Historicist—reception theory, and a critical account of canonic discourse, deserve a place centre stage in the theatre of music history.

¹⁰³ Feyerabend, 'Notes on Relativism', 79–83.

¹⁰⁴ Both these historiographical tendencies are the victims of a reluctance to engage with the practical implications they embody. For the cultural-anthropological view of history see Gary Tomlinson, 'The Web of Culture: Context for Musicology', *19th-Century Music*, 7 (1984), 350–62, and the trenchant comments about its neglect by Philip V. Bohlman, 'On the Unremarkable in Music', *19th-Century Music*, 16 (1992), 207 n. 17. The *annaliste* school of historical thought has an even more tenuous grip on musicology: see Jane Fulcher, 'Current Perspectives on Culture and the Meaning of Cultural History in France Today', *Stanford French Review*, 9 (1985), 91–104, and William Weber, 'Mentalité, tradition et origines du canon musical en France et en Angleterre au xviii^e siècle', *Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations*, 44 (1989), 849–72. Although Fulcher's conclusion may not be entirely convincing, her explanation of *annalisme* is of great value, but should be read in conjunction with more sceptical views of the *troisième niveau* from the Anglo-American world (such as Robert Darnton's introduction to *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York, 1984)). The publication of Weber's article in the journal *Annales: ESC* speaks for itself.

The principal subject of this chapter is written or printed, whether or not a number of developments during whether a musical text need be written a text, and indeed whether a performer a musical text. I shall return to this to begin with a tacit assumption that paper.

The written or printed musical text elicits blind trust exactly when being questioned at many points where simple examples will illustrate this a

The first is a case of opposites: music widely in the manner in which the editions such as those of Artur Schnabel music, slurs, fingerings, added dynamics, tempi, and advice on how to articulate the original melodic material. Such musical understanding of (sometimes) beginner and advanced musician alike. Scholars, and many performers, know validity as stemming from Beethoven traceable back to the composer: the performing view exemplified by the exactly which annotations might have as far as that could imply specific application editor.

In selecting Schnabel's edition for comment, I am aware of the product of a fine musical mind. I wish that available editions.

There is a brief but fundamental discussion of editions, *All Souls' Studies*, 1 (London, 1963), 28–