

2 The Viennese symphony 1750 to 1827

JOHN IRVING

Mozart, recently dismissed from the service of the Archbishop of Salzburg, wrote optimistically to his father on 4 April 1781, claiming that Vienna was the best place in the world for someone of his profession.¹ It is understandable that he should have formed this impression of the Austrian capital. It had an abundant infrastructure for musical production and consumption. In the main, this was a result of both the Hapsburg dynasty, for whom Vienna already had been the principal residency for over a century, and of the Holy Roman Empire.² Together, the monarchy (Maria Theresa from 1740 to 1780; Joseph II from 1780 to 1790, Leopold II from 1790 to 1792 and Francis II from 1792 to 1835), and the Holy Roman Emperors (successively Francis I, Maria Theresa's husband until 1765, thereafter Joseph II, Leopold II and Francis II, until the Empire's abolition in 1806) brought in train a bureaucracy numbering, by Mozart's time, at least 10,000. Vienna was a hive of political and cultural activity and acted as a magnet for many thousands of affluent nobles resident in the city or else more-or-less loosely inhabiting its peripheries. One such was Prince Joseph Friedrich von Sachsen-Hildburghausen, whose musical establishment was among the finest in Vienna, in which the twelve-year-old Carl Ditters (later, 1773, von Dittersdorf) received his musical instruction and a first taste of orchestral playing. Diversity of opportunity acted as a powerful generator for the city's rich and varied musical life. It is against this background that the hundreds of musicians employed in court establishments such as the Hofkapelle worked. Successive Kapellmeisters Georg von Reutter (1751–72), Florian Leopold Gassmann (1772–4), Giuseppe Bonno (1774–88) and Antonio Salieri (1788–1825) were, in effect, civil servants whose positions were assured for life. Others enjoyed a more precarious living as singers, players and teachers.

While Vienna's public concert life does not look so active as, say, London's at the same time,³ that impression hides the fact that 'public' does not necessarily mean an event in a dedicated concert hall with tickets on sale to the 'public-at-large'. True, in Mozart's Vienna, there was a dearth of what might pass for 'concert halls', but he managed to give, as a soloist and part-promoter, over seventy concerts there in the first five years following his arrival in 1781. Concert series were supported by the

[15]

Vienna Tonkünstlersocietät from 1772, and subsequently by the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde (from 1814). Venues for concerts were diverse, and included theatres such as the Kärntnertortheater (originally built in 1709, burned down and rebuilt in 1761 from which point it was managed by the court as a centre for German-language comedies), and the Burgtheater (where Gluck's *Orfeo ed Euridice* had received its premiere in 1762 and later established as a National Theatre by the future Joseph II in 1776), the Augarten (a royal park, opened to the public by Joseph), the Mehlgrube dance hall, Jahn's restaurant, the Trattnerhof, masonic lodges (especially during the early 1780s), and in the palaces of the aristocracy (Prince Auersperg's, for instance) as well as in the homes of, for instance, Baron Gottfried van Swieten, Joseph II's education minister. Many concerts are known to have taken place in the homes of Vienna's nobility. Not all these locations supported symphonic repertoire, though Beethoven's *Eroica* Symphony received its first performance in the palace of Prince Lobkowitz in 1804 (it was rehearsed by the Prince's own orchestra).

Increasingly at the turn of the century the royal and imperial court was overtaken as a source of patronage by the nobility, most especially in the field of instrumental music. Beethoven, who made Vienna his home from 1792, was supported almost wholly by the aristocracy, to whom he dedicated many works and who seem to have perceived in his instrumental output an expressive voice whose originality and universality of appeal sat uncomfortably with past arenas of patronage in which a musician was a mere servant. To a degree his output, including his symphonic output, shaped the taste of the high aristocracy, rather than vice versa. Allied to the aristocratic engagement with a developing aesthetic of instrumental music and its possible meanings was an emerging civic musical scene in which a freshly liberated genre such as the symphony might find a stage for its representation to an inquisitive public. While it is undoubtedly true that the political repression of the Metternich era restricted the growth of public musical concerts in Vienna (from 1815 large public gatherings were systematically forbidden within what was effectively a police state), music itself was not a focus of censorship. Starting in 1819, Franz Xavier Gebauer and Eduard von Lannoy promoted the Viennese 'concerts spirituels' – public events given by an amateur orchestra, and featuring symphonies by Haydn (who, from 1790 until his death had been resident in Vienna, though his later symphonies were written for London's, not Vienna's concert life), Mozart and Beethoven. Professional performances of instrumental repertoire, however, tended on the whole to take place in aristocratic and affluent bourgeois homes in the Viennese suburbs, rather than in large public spaces. Nevertheless, these gatherings were a species of

what we would call concerts and provided a space in which the symphony might enter into a dialogue with its listeners; this would affect its generic boundaries while simultaneously catalysing the musical appreciation of those listeners. Presentation of a symphony in the context of a concert affected the composer's organisation of his material. Since the audience was there on purpose, and actually *listening to the music*, it was essential that the musical material displayed some degree of logic in its construction; that it engaged the senses and perhaps also the minds of those listeners; that it emphasised points of departure and arrival, as well as contrasts of theme, key and texture; that it deployed the orchestral forces in an exciting way. In a direct sense the concert context dictated the manner in which the symphony proclaimed itself to the audience. That relationship between the symphony and the audience manifested itself in various ways, for instance in terms of continuity: a symphony was performed as a whole in such settings – albeit with applause, or even other compositions in other genres as quasi-entr'actes between movements – which inevitably focussed attention on the relative qualities, scorings, lengths, *affekt* or thematic interrelations between movements, including overtly cyclic ones as in Beethoven's Fifth Symphony. This situation defines the symphony generically as something existing in relation to a perceiver who is challenged in a particular representation to form an impression of it on, for example, an emotional level, or in constructional terms, and perhaps in relation to other, similar works. In other words, its generic identity emerges through its particular usage, and a concert representation was in contrast to the usage sometimes made of individual symphonic movements in the mid eighteenth century at the Gradual or Offertory in celebrations of Mass, either within large Viennese churches or in nearby monasteries. The diary of Beda Hübner, Librarian at St Peter's Benedictine Monastery in Salzburg, records that on 8 December in Salzburg Cathedral one of the infant Mozart's symphonies was performed at Mass to the great delight of all the assembled musicians. Likewise, some symphonies by Karl von Ordonez (1734–86) were evidently intended for such situations; manuscript copies are found in the monastery of Göttweig (copies of Haydn's symphonies are likewise preserved in monastery libraries).

Public representation of a symphony to a paying audience from different social classes, which has come together for a concert representation of orchestral music at a particular time and place, is a different matter to its representation by liveried musician-servants with polished shoe-buckles before an Empress and her retinue in between the courses of a banquet. Even when such performances were notionally 'concerts', they were

primarily social occasions at which there was also music (to judge from the diaries of aristocrats such as Count Karl Zinzendorf). The arena in which the symphonies of Beethoven were presented to the Viennese of the early nineteenth century and that in which the symphonies of Georg Christoph Wagenseil (1715–77; Wagenseil was Maria Theresa's music teacher) were produced are different creatures indeed, and mark out the approximate boundaries of the journey of the Viennese symphony to be explored below.

Beginnings

The influence of the Hapsburgs stretched far and wide, geographically as well as culturally. Vienna was a cultural crossroads and acted as a magnet for composers from parts of Germany, the Czech lands, present-day Slovenia and northern Italy. In the eighteenth century the region of Lombardy was a Hapsburg dominion and this goes some way towards explaining the early stylistic development of the symphony in Vienna, which owes much to the three-movement operatic overture of the type found in the work of Leo, Sammartini, Jommelli and Galuppi (this repertoire is considered in more detail in chapters 3 and 6). Their overtures during the 1740s and 1750s typically feature in their opening movements a clearly coordinated approach to thematic and tonal statement, contrast and return in which uniformity of baroque rhythmic patterning has been sacrificed for an overall symmetry of four- and eight-bar phrase and cadence schemes delineated by relatively slow and regular harmonic rhythms and an almost stereotypical functional hierarchy within the orchestration (leading melodies stated by the upper strings, perhaps reinforced by a pair of oboes, to which an energetic bass line of lower strings – perhaps with bassoon, though not necessarily a sixteen-foot string bass – acted as a counter-pole with a harmonic filler often supplied by long notes in the horns, doubled, with a dash of rhythmic activity, by the violas). While binary designs in the first movements of Italian opera overtures are still numerically in the minority (behind ritornello forms) by mid-century, such traits made no small impact on contemporary Viennese symphonists.

Contrast between two principal themes is particularly common in the work of the Italian-trained Georg Christoph Wagenseil, whose early career in Vienna was substantially as an operatic composer.⁴ Almost all of Wagenseil's symphonies are in three movements, and the fact that many were published widely (both in France and England) shows that their appeal transcended the local circumstances

of their production for the court of Maria Theresa. Among such works are his *Six Symphonies a Quatre Parties Avec les Cors de Chasses Ad libitum . . . Oeuvre III . . .* (Paris, c. 1760). At the foot of the title page is the comment 'On vend les Cors de Chasses séparément' – a token of the relative hierarchy within the orchestral texture that was to remain fundamental to the conception of the Viennese symphony for some years to come. Perhaps their popularity rested partly on their relatively slight, yet convincingly proportioned dimensions, especially in respect of thematic recapitulation, partly on the catchy and unpretentious minuet finales with which many conclude.

Wagenseil, court composer from 1739 until his death, was a crucial figure in the development of the symphony.⁵ He composed over seventy such works, the majority of which are in three movements: fast–slow–fast (typically a 3/8 time or 3/4 time minuet). In terms of formal organisation, he favoured full, rather than curtailed, recapitulations, allowing space for thematic and tonal contrast sometimes featuring subdominant recapitulations and digressions to the minor mode. That suggests a forward-looking mindset (along with his adoption of a *galant* idiom, especially within the central slow movements), which had consigned the undifferentiated surface and harmonic rhythms of baroque ritornello practice to the past. Ultimately, Wagenseil achieved a convincing level of segmentation within his movement forms that was to bear further fruit in the symphonies of later Viennese generations.

Wagenseil's Viennese contemporary Georg Matthias Monn (1717–50) was perhaps less influential, both internationally and locally.⁶ None of his symphonies was published during his lifetime, though that is not a reflection of their general quality, which is comparable with Wagenseil, especially in the design of first movements, which frequently have two clearly defined and contrasting themes, a clear sense of periodic phrasing and tonal logic (including, as in Wagenseil, excursions to the minor mode) and full recapitulations. Monn's first-movement forms arguably feature a more strongly defined developmental purpose to the material immediately following the central dominant or equivalent cadence than those of his contemporary. Monn is credited with composing the earliest-known four-movement symphony (in which the minuet comes in third place). This work in D major, dating from 1740, is however the only four-movement symphony in Monn's surviving output of sixteen and although it survives in autograph, the designation 'sinfonia' is in a later hand. It must therefore be regarded as atypical, and while many of the emergent features of what may loosely be termed the 'Viennese classical style' are to be found in the symphonies of Monn and Wagenseil, the four-movement model apparently arose in Mannheim, where it was gradually established in the

symphonies of Johann Stamitz between 1740 and 1750,⁷ works widely circulated in print across musical Europe and ultimately influential on Viennese composers too.

Developments

So far the contribution of what may be termed the 'first-generation' Viennese symphonists has been investigated through an assessment of constructional features, especially first movements, the organisation of which may be read in part as a record of advancing coordination in the handling of internal elements, and in part as a record of transmission of material between different genres (opera overture, but equally church sonata and partita, to symphony). That complex generic trace reflects something of the relationship of the composer with his material, either on a point-to-point scale or on a broader sweep of (usually three) successive movements. But whether constructional features such as the separation of thematic presentation into two contrasting aspects, or the coordination of thematic return with tonal return were dictated in any sense by the circumstances of their presentation in court, chamber or church we may doubt. At this stage in its development, performance settings for the Viennese symphony did not determine it compositionally to a strong degree. That is to say, for the earliest Viennese symphonists, no stable tradition of listening determined in advance their manipulation of musical materials as a response. By contrast, effects such as Haydn's use of high horns in his Symphony No. 60, the shocking *fortissimo* chords in the Andante of the 'Surprise' Symphony, No. 94, Mozart's theatrical late recapitulation of the opening theme (*premier coup d'archet*) in the first movement of the 'Paris' Symphony, K 297, Beethoven's exhilarating recapitulation of the main theme over a dominant pedal in the first movement of the Symphony No. 7 – all of these are *rhetorical* elements of classical symphonic language and derive from usage in a concert situation in which rhetoric was expected by attentive listeners. In 1760 that was still not really the case. On the title page of Wagenseil's Op. 3 symphonies of c. 1760 referred to above, the four (string) parts are sufficient on their own without the two horns, whose parts could be purchased separately and therefore optionally. Clearly in such a context the contribution of the horns is not so essential to the effect as it was some forty years later in the first-movement recapitulation of Beethoven's *Eroica* Symphony. Wagenseil's musical materials do not exist in an essential relation with their *representation in sound*; in Beethoven's they most assuredly do. That observation is an interesting marker of generic difference (and distance travelled).

What we may establish as generic *traits* of the symphony in Vienna by c. 1760 include:

1. A tendency to derive first-movement structures from binary form models, rather than ritornellos, usually involving at least two contrasting themes, both of which are recapitulated, and negligible 'development' of material immediately after the central double-bar.
2. An emerging recognition of the importance of key contrast and the vital role of cadential punctuation in achieving this; clear separation between different kinds of thematic functionality, contained within a steadily moving harmonic rhythm; symmetry and proportion as regulative elements of the structure, which operates in an interconnected way on the levels of local phrase, sentence and paragraph. Contrast, rather than uniformity, became a key element of coherence.
3. A succession of three (fast–slow–fast) rather than four movements, the third (final) movement often resembling a minuet: short, unpretentious and generally in binary form.
4. A presumed hierarchy of orchestral functions, in which winds are secondary to strings, and in which horn parts are often dispensable. At this stage, details that were soon to become relatively standard, such as the four-part string basis (the bass part comprising cello, string bass and potentially a bassoon), supplemented by a pair of oboes (or flutes), and a pair of horns, were still in flux; Wagenseil's published symphonies include his Op. 2 (1756) entitled 'trios en symphonie' (i.e. trio-symphonies for two violins and bass).

At this point in its development, the Viennese symphony as a genre exists somewhere between internally conceived constructional boundaries on the one hand and a plethora of contrasting performance contexts on the other. The former are emerging into quite clear patterns. By contrast, the latter must surely have detracted from the establishment of a clear generic focus. There was, as yet, no single institutional context for its presentation, and what we may call the 'practice of public reception' counts for a lot in this regard. While the expressive rhetoric of the later Viennese symphony was significantly shaped in the concert hall, presentations of the works of Monn or Wagenseil and their contemporaries within courtly, and primarily social, contexts tended to diminish recognition of an independent generic value. For instance, in a performance of a symphony as a kind of background music at a Viennese banquet, any guests who were paying careful attention, however fleetingly, to the symphony would probably have related what they heard to their existing social experience of music, and the likeliest connection would have been with the opera overture. Thus, their reception perspective is not likely to have exerted any strong generic impetus upon symphonic development. Likewise, the performance of symphonies – for example, the four extant *Sinfonie Pastorale*

of Leopold Hofmann (1738–93), or his small-scale B-flat symphony of c. 1763 (Badley Bb1)⁸ – within Catholic liturgical contexts (in which the focus is on the celebration of the Eucharist, to which, momentarily, the music is a background) will not have assisted the symphony's generic separation from the church sonata, from which, in formal terms, Viennese symphonies trace some of their material ingredients. Moreover, performance practice impinges strongly on reception: surviving (usually single) sets of manuscript playing parts, for instance in monastery libraries, repeatedly hint that the numbers of strings involved in performances of symphonies in such contexts were small (sometimes even one to a part), suggesting that there was no strong distinction to be made between a symphony and other genres of predominantly string chamber music. For example, when he first joined the musical establishment at Esterhaza (1761), Haydn's orchestral complement amounted to a total of thirteen to fifteen players: six violins, one viola, one cello, one bass, two oboes, two horns and a bassoon (some flexibility existed within this scheme, since most of the players could offer more than one instrument: a flute, for instance is employed in Symphony No. 6, *Le Matin*). Subsequently, during the 1770s, the size of the Esterhaza band increased, and there are documented performances of symphonies in Vienna by the Tonkünstlersocietät (founded 1771) with sizeable numbers of performers. But the link between the symphony genre and chamber music persisted remarkably long. At the end of the century, Haydn's 'London' symphonies were subsequently issued in various chamber-music arrangements by Johann Peter Salomon (most popularly for flute, string quartet and piano *ad libitum*). The difference between this situation (in which Haydn's symphonies could still be a chamber-music experience) and the looser generic situation of the 1750s was that these were clearly *adaptations for domestic purposes* of something originally experienced in a public concert setting and whose expressive parameters were decisively dictated by that original setting. In the case of the early Viennese symphony it is not so clear from the music that there was any or much difference between a domestic and any other imaginable forum of presentation in the first place.

All of this prompts the realisation that we must look elsewhere for reception stimuli impinging upon the development of the Viennese symphonic genre. Arguably, this is to be found in an examination of influence. The institutional framework for musical instruction in eighteenth-century Vienna revolved around the choir schools (for instance, at St Stephen's Cathedral, or the Michaelerkirche) and, ultimately, it was centred on the personnel of the Hofkapelle. Among the more important connections are these: Fux (1660–1741) was Wagenseil's teacher; in turn Wagenseil taught

at least one member of a later generation of Viennese symphonists, Leopold Hofmann; Dittersdorf's (1739–99) teacher was the Imperial Kapellmeister, Giuseppe Bonno (1711–88); Dittersdorf is said to have contributed to Johann Vaňhal's (1739–1813) musical training after the latter had moved to Vienna in 1760–1; Josef Leopold Eybler (1765–1846) trained initially at St Stephen's, and subsequently with Johann Georg Albrechtsberger (1736–1809), who had received his training in the choir school of the Augustinian monastery at Klosterneuburg and subsequently as a pupil of Monn; Albrechtsberger (revered by Mozart as an organist) became a colleague of Hofmann, succeeding him as Kapellmeister at St Stephen's in 1793; his most famous pupil was Beethoven (from 1794, his previous teacher, Haydn, having left Vienna temporarily for his second London visit). In such a close-knit environment, it is understandable that the generic hallmarks of the Viennese symphony might to a large extent have been determined internally, in a progressive, influential dialogue between professionals working with the materials of their symphonic craft and defining the genre constructionally from within. That ongoing dialogue bore fruit in the increasing sophistication with which segmented formal functions within movements (especially first movements) are handled in the work of, for instance, Hofmann, Ordonez, Vaňhal and Dittersdorf. This ultimately led to a less casual relation between the different movements, in particular to a balanced conception in which the finale was regarded as providing a firm sense of closure to the three- (or four-) movement work, a kind of counterpole to the opening movement. As a result, the finale was now far less frequently in binary form, longer, and tending towards rondo structure, or, from the 1770s, sonata-rondo (in which sonata form maps onto the tonal logic of the refrains and episodes), and occasionally fugal types or even themes and variations.

Understanding this journey is not without its frustrations, principally because the surviving sources do not allow us to piece together a reliable chronology. Almost half of Leopold Hofmann's fifty symphonies – a significant number of which may have been primarily intended for liturgical use, to judge from the quantity of sources surviving in monasteries such as Göttweig – have four (not three) movements; he was among the earliest of Viennese composers to adopt this expanded outline (though we should remember that some of these are in a slow–fast–slow–fast sequence and that others are effectively three-movement works with slow introductions).⁹ More contemporary sources survive for Hofmann's symphonies than for any other composer of the era save Haydn and Pleyel (like those of his teacher, Wagenseil, Hofmann's symphonies appeared in print in Paris; four were published there by Sieber in 1760, for example). But a chronology for his symphonies is not easy to establish with certainty, and it is not

safe to assume that, for instance, his three-movement works were superseded by four-movement ones. Perhaps the innovatory aspect of a four-movement plan contributed to their popularity, but it is perhaps their sure command of texture and form that guaranteed their wide appeal. Concertante elements are occasionally found, for example in the F major symphony of c. 1760 (Badley F2), a three-movement work whose second-placed minuet features a central trio specifically for solo viola, cello and bass, contrasting with surrounding *tuttis* (strings and oboes). Similar concertante elements are found elsewhere within the emergent Viennese symphonic tradition, notably in Haydn's slightly later programmatic set, *Le Matin, Le Midi* and *Le Soir* (c. 1761–2) and subsequently in such works as the *Larghetto* of Dittersdorf's four-movement A minor Symphony (Grave a1, c. 1770–5),¹⁰ which features prominent cello solos along with punctuating interjections for a pair of horns, and the *Adagio molto* of Vaňhal's D major Symphony (Bryan D17)¹¹ of 1779 (in three, not four, movements), which may as well be the slow movement of an oboe concerto. Hofmann also preceded Haydn in the employment of a slow introduction to first movements, for example in the D major symphony of c. 1762 (Badley D4), in which the relatively lightweight and pithy character of the extremely economical *Allegro molto* is contextualised by a preceding *Adagio* of considerable *gravitas*. The main *Allegro molto* discriminates effectively between its primary, secondary, connective and cadential materials. Interestingly, there are quite clear resemblances between the second-movement *Andante* and the opening *Adagio* introduction. Interrelations between thematic elements is likewise a characteristic of the symphonies of Florian Leopold Gassmann (whose position as Imperial Kapellmeister Hofmann failed to secure on Gassmann's death in 1774),¹² though here the references are typically between the successive themes within an exposition in a quasi-organic succession as the tonal narrative away from the opening tonic unfolds.

For the Viennese symphony emergent between c. 1760 and 1780 (the period spanned by the production of symphonies by Dittersdorf and his contemporary, Vaňhal), growing confidence in the coordination and proportioning of theme, rhythm, harmony, tonality and texture contributes substantially to the impression of an overall trend towards a narrative whose unfolding features emerge as a logical succession of elements specifically designed to be noticed by listeners: Vaňhal's C major *Sinfonia Comista* (Bryan C11, c. 1775–8) affords a clear example. In the concertante *Larghetto* of Dittersdorf's A minor Symphony, mentioned above, repeating cadential refrains supplied by the two horns are not simply an attractive colouristic device, contrasting with the solo cello's episodes, but are precisely coordinated with the arrival of moments of tonal articulation

upon which the overall form depends. Both sound and structure are surely meant to be recognised by a listener; an element of meaning derives from dialogue between the abstract musical conception and a listener paying attention to it in real time. That listener would also have noted the currency of Dittersdorf's opening *Vivace* (which employs three horns), which is firmly in the tempestuous *Sturm-und-Drang* idiom that was sweeping Viennese music in the early 1770s. *Sturm und Drang* is a feature too of some symphonies by Vaňhal from this period. His G minor Symphony (Bryan g1), published in Paris in 1773–4, but perhaps dating from the late 1760s, is a case in point. It makes prominent use of tone colour (notably two pairs of horns tuned in G and high B flat, and concertante parts for violin and viola in the second of its four movements, *Andante cantabile*) in addition to the expressive harmonic colours obtainable from the minor mode, its driving syncopations and sudden dramatic contrasts of dynamic, register, texture and accentuation, reminiscent in character of more famous symphonies in G minor by Haydn (Hob. I:39) and Mozart (K 183). Moreover, Vaňhal's orchestration is pioneering. In a D minor Symphony (Bryan d2), one of five symphonies of his advertised for sale by Breitkopf in Supplement XII (1778) of their Thematic Catalogue, he uses no fewer than five horns (in two pairs, crooked in F and D, with an additional one in A), giving him a wide range of notes and once again allowing the horns' full participation in the exploitation of expressive harmonic potential. And several symphonies (among them Bryan D17 and C11, mentioned above, and C3, D2 and A9) use pairs of clarino trumpets.

Conclusions

Vaňhal's output marks an important point of arrival in the development of the Viennese symphony. His are works of considerable individuality, technically assured, inventive, substantial in length and also in intellectual concentration, requiring, indeed, a certain degree of concentration on the part of the listener if they are to be satisfactorily realised. His symphony Bryan D2 (c. 1763–5) has, in its first movement, a genuine development section, which introduces a new theme during its course. Symphony A9, of uncertain date, is a single-movement symphony in three sections (fast–slow–fast), though its dimensions and expressive range far exceed those of the Italian opera overtures that were once a prototype for the earlier Viennese symphony; its opening and closing sections include unmistakable cross-references, the Finale's closing material returning to the opening bars of the work. The majority are in four movements, a scheme within

which there is purposeful regard for the overall proportions, the finales sometimes being considerably extended and typically in rondo, sonata-rondo or sonata form. They may well have been known to Haydn (ten of Vaňhal's symphonies are preserved in the Esterházy archives) and also to Mozart (who played chamber music with Vaňhal); certainly the 62-bar slow introduction (in the minor mode) to Vaňhal's D major symphony (Bryan D17) has strong similarities both to the introduction of the 'Linz' Symphony, K 425 and to that of the 'Prague' Symphony, K 504.

While the symphonies of Vaňhal may, in sum, be claimed to represent a maturity in the development of the Viennese classical symphony that served as a platform from which were launched the final achievements of the genre's four greatest exponents, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert, that claim requires substantial qualification. First, Vaňhal's symphonies are exemplary of an achievement stemming from an environment of fairly loose, intertextual progress among Viennese composers generally towards mastery of technique allied to form, rather than the product of a single, paradigm-shifting individual. Secondly, an agenda of progress towards Haydn and Mozart, followed by Beethoven and Schubert and their lesser adjuncts, Czerny, Ries, Spohr, Cherubini, Gyrowetz, et al., is one whose motives (originating perhaps in a conflation of nineteenth-century political, aesthetic and especially nationalist debates) are highly questionable. Such debates redefined the symphonic genre in an act of retrospective *Rezeptionsgeschichte* that was bound up with the invention of a Viennese classical canon supported by institutions such as the professional concert, the complete edition, the founding of conservatoires, the discipline of musical *Formenlehre* and the rapid rise of serious musical criticism. As a consequence, the Viennese symphony at the turn of the nineteenth century assumed what would remain its destiny as the most prestigious among instrumental genres. Within this species of *Rezeptionsgeschichte*, the symphony was expected to be individual, to possess inherently dramatic qualities, to encapsulate in addition to mere technical control of its materials an aesthetic of progress beyond 'absolute music'. In Beethoven's symphonies, which played a pivotal role in launching the Viennese symphony into this exciting uncharted territory, the genre is once more redefined as a public demonstration – celebration, even – of topics such as the sublime (for example, the first movement of the *Eroica*, which at nearly 700 bars, is the longest symphonic movement Beethoven ever composed); of overarching unity in diversity, expressed cyclically in the Fifth Symphony through thematic transformation of theme, through the linking of different movements and, indeed, through the dissolution of boundaries separating movements, as the Scherzo gives way to the culminating finale; of 'fate' and 'strife-to-victory' (exemplified

in some readings of the same symphony); of the naturalistic as a retreat from the dehumanising perspectives of war and industrialisation in the 'Pastoral' Symphony; and, in the Ninth's Finale, the transformation of the genre through the medium of the human voice singing of an imagined redemption attainable only beyond the material realm.¹³ Poetic ideas, to be sure; and such was now expected of the symphony. Crucially, the baritone addresses the audience as 'Friends', directly inviting their involvement, for it is within that shared framework of endeavour that Beethoven's Ninth Symphony must have its meaning if all men are to be brothers, rejecting past agendas (as Beethoven, metaphorically, has just rejected his previous themes in turn) and striding confidently forth into joy. This moment is a turning point in the symphonic genre; the symphony as civic agency has remained a powerful reception metaphor ever since (this event is considered below in chapters 8 and 9).

One casualty of this historiographical agenda was Schubert, whose symphonies were eclipsed throughout the nineteenth century and beyond by the mighty achievement of his idol, Beethoven. Like Beethoven's nine symphonies, Schubert's eight travel a path away from late eighteenth-century classical purity, symmetry and elegance towards the frontier of transcendence articulated in the writings of the German Romantics, Wackenroder, Tieck, E. T. A. Hoffmann and the Schlegels. But Schubert's 'Beyond' arguably lay deep within himself. His 'Unfinished' and 'Great' C major symphonies conform uneasily to early nineteenth-century expectations of the symphonic genre, and this may be a contributory cause to their painfully slow acceptance into the canon (they were only even premiered in 1839 and 1865 respectively), for they trace a path not towards the attainment of a public and civic spiritual brotherhood of all mankind, but a private and interior world of half-lights and self-doubts whose technical musical language is often not far removed from the lied. While there are no voices in Schubert's symphonies, the vocality of his personal symphonic genre is unmistakable. In his hands, as in Beethoven's, the Viennese symphony had travelled far.

Notes

1 For Mozart's letter, see Emily Anderson, ed., *The Letters of Mozart and His Family*, 3rd rev. edn, ed. Stanley Sadie and Fiona Smart (London and Basingstoke, 1985), no. 396. See also Otto Eric Deutsch, *Mozart: A Documentary Biography*, trans. Eric Blom, Peter Branscombe and Jeremy Noble (London, 1990), H. C. Robbins Landon, *Mozart: the Golden Years* (London, 1989) and Elaine Sisman, *Mozart: The 'Jupiter' Symphony* (Cambridge, 1993).

2 For an overview of life and society in Hapsburg Vienna, seen against the backdrop of the Enlightenment, see Derek Beales, *Enlightenment and Reform in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (London and New York, 2005). The musical picture is painted in Daniel Heartz, *Haydn, Mozart and the Viennese School 1740–1780* (New York and London, 1995).

3 See, for instance, Susan Wollenberg and Simon McVeigh, eds., *Concert Life in Eighteenth-Century*

Britain (Aldershot, 2004) and Mary Sue Morrow, *Concert Life in Haydn's Vienna: Aspects of a Developing Musical and Social Tradition* (Stuyvesant, 1989).

4 Eighteenth-century sources of Wagenseil's symphonies survive in numerous locations, among them the Bibliothèque du Conservatoire, Brussels, the Národní Muzeum, Prague, the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde and Nationalbibliothek, Vienna and the Library of Congress, Washington DC.

5 See John Kucaba, 'The Symphonies of Georg Christoph Wagenseil' (Ph.D. diss., University of Boston, 1967). Subsequent references to Wagenseil's symphonies draw on the editions ed. John Kucaba in Barry S. Brook, gen. ed., *The Symphony, 1720–1840*, Series B, vol. III: *Georg Christoph Wagenseil: Fifteen Symphonies, D1, D9, C8, C3, C4, G1, Eb2, C7, F1, Bb2, D2, G2, G3, E3, Bb4* (New York and London, 1981).

6 See Kenneth E. Rudolf, 'The Symphonies of Georg Mathias Monn (1715–1750)' (Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, 1982). Works consulted can be found in Barry S. Brook, gen. ed., *The Symphony, 1720–1840*, Series B, vol. I: *Georg Matthias Monn: Five Symphonies, Thematic Index D-5, Eb-1, A-2, Bb-1, Bb-2* (New York and London, 1985).

7 Eugene K. Wolf, *The Symphonies of Johann Stamitz: A Study in the Formation of the Classic Style* (Utrecht, 1981).

8 Numbers for Hofmann's symphonies throughout refer to Artaria Editions AE022, 24 and 26, ed. Alan Badley (Wellington, 1995). On Hofmann's symphonies, see G. C. Kimball, 'The Symphonies of Leopold Hofmann (1738–1793)' (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1985).

9 A handful of the seventy symphonies of Karl von Ordonez (1734–86) are in four movements, and very occasionally there are slow introductions; see D. Young, 'The Symphonies of Karl von Ordonez (1734–1786)' (Ph.D. diss., University of Liverpool, 1980). For editions of Ordonez's

symphonies, see Barry S. Brook, gen. ed., *The Symphony, 1720–1840*, Series B, vol. IV: *Carlos d'Ordoñez: Seven Symphonies, C1, F11, A8, C9, C14 minor, G1, Bb 4*, ed. A. Peter Brown with the assistance of Peter M. Alexander (New York and London, 1979).

10 Editions of Dittersdorf's symphonies consulted are Dittersdorf a1 (k95), ed. V. Luitlhlen, *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich*, lxxxii, Jg.xliiii/2 (Vienna, 1936) and also Barry S. Brook, gen. ed., *The Symphony, 1720–1840*, Series B, vol. I: *Carl Ditters von Dittersdorf: Six Symphonies, Thematic Index e1, Eb3, E2, A10, D9, C14*, ed. Eva Badura-Skoda, thematic index by Margaret H. Grave (New York and London, 1985). On Dittersdorf's symphonies, see also Margaret H. Grave, 'Dittersdorf's First-Movement Form as a Measure of his Symphonic Development' (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1977).

11 Editions of Vaňhal's symphonies consulted are: Vaňhal g1, ed. H. C. Robbins Landon, *Diletto musicale* 38 (Vienna and Munich, 1965); Vaňhal C11, ed. Alan Badley (Wellington, 1996); Vaňhal d2, ed. Alan Badley (Wellington, 1996); Vaňhal C3, ed. Alan Badley (Wellington, 1997); Vaňhal A9, ed. Alan Badley (Wellington, 1997); Vaňhal D2, ed. Alan Badley (Wellington, 1998). On Vaňhal's symphonies, see Paul R. Bryan, *Johann Wanhal, Viennese Symphonist: His Life, and His Musical Environment* (Stuyvesant, 1997).

12 See George R. Hill, 'The Concert Symphonies of Florian Leopold Gassmann (1729–1774)' (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1975). Editions of Gassmann's symphonies can be found in Brook, gen. ed., *The Symphony, 1720–1840*, Series B, vol. X: *Florian Leopold Gassmann: Seven Symphonies: 23, 26, 62, 64, 85, 86, 120*, ed. George R. Hill (New York and London, 1981).

13 See, in this respect, Nicholas Cook, *Beethoven: Symphony No. 9* (Cambridge, 1993).