

articles

Aesthetics and Ideology in the Fin-de-Siècle Mozart Revival*

By Leon Botstein

Back to Mozart? Why back? Why to Mozart? . . . If we observe the major works of music that have been written since the death of Wagner, we find that there is much to be praised, . . . but nevertheless one cannot suppress the feeling, however unclear, that in general terms, something is wrong and somewhere things are rotten in the development of music today. . . . None of the great masters is as far removed from us as Mozart. . . . The public . . . closes its eyes in wonderment when one speaks of him but remains distant when his works are played. It would behoove us first to find Mozart again before debating whether one can return to him. . . .

The deep satisfaction for which we yearn is denied us by the newest music of today. . . . We are aroused, not satisfied; fired up but not warmed; entranced but not elevated. . . . Music has become hysterical like an unhappy woman who has been wrongly imprisoned for a long time. Music must become healthy again. . . .

With our modern means of expression we must create once more in the spirit of Mozart: that would most likely be the right answer. If we truly look deeply into the wondrously translucent child-like eyes of Mozart's art, can we still speak of a "return?" I think the more truthful answer should be "Forward to Mozart!"¹

These words were written around 1910 by Felix Weingartner (1863–1942), the eminent Austrian conductor and composer. Though he began his career under the spell of Liszt and Wagner, by the time he was called to succeed Gustav Mahler at the Imperial Opera in Vienna in 1907 he had established a reputation as both a reformer and a reactionary. His seminal 1895 essay on the art of conducting attacked the Wagnerian performance tradition and advocated in its place a cleaner, more historically sensitive style of performance of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century orchestral repertoire. This challenge to the Wagnerian performance tradition, particularly of the works of Beethoven, was but one symptom of a deeper mistrust during the fin de siècle of the aesthetic direction being taken by living composers, above all those who continued to take their inspiration from Wagner.²

Weingartner was responding to a fin-de-siècle "back to Mozart" movement that was not only reflective of this mistrust but also the culmination of more than a century of struggle over the soul and meaning of Mozart. As Weingartner's argument made plain, German musicians (or those who held up German music as the essence of high art music) were using the battle cry "back to Mozart" to signal a deep dissatisfaction with the state of musical culture. For them a new model and source of inspiration was needed as an antidote to the musical aesthetics associated with Wagner and his followers—Max von Schillings, Engelbert Humperdinck, Friedrich Klose, Hans Pfitzner, and Richard Strauss among them.³ For all of its attractions, the verismo movement of the Italians Mascagni, Leoncavallo, and Puccini could not provide this remedy, since it was seen as a debasement of the "higher" qualities of musical culture.⁴ Furthermore, when Weingartner published his essay in 1912, a form of modernism even newer than neo-Wagnerism—one that cultivated the apparently banal, ugly, and arbitrary (i.e., the music of Gustav Mahler and Arnold Schoenberg)—had made an appearance during the first decade of this century.⁵

Neo-Wagnerism seemed to dominate not only composers but the tastes of the audience. The challenge seemed to be to find a way to render the classical tradition forward-looking and not merely retrospective. From the perspective of adherents to the idea of "absolute" music, the possibilities and limits of music *qua* music remained unheeded in a vulgar and philistine aesthetic environment.⁶ From the perspective of those calling for a Mozart revival, the writing of new music had become an undisciplined forum for the extravagant illustration of emotion and subjectivism. A composer himself, Weingartner believed that one could neither retreat by surrounding oneself with music from the past—even that of Mozart—nor utilize self-consciously a musical vocabulary rooted in the past. Although Mendelssohn had sparked the revival of interest in Bach in 1829 (which, in turn, nourished the development of historicist aesthetics), by the end of the nineteenth century Bach, despite a flourishing interest in his music, remained too austere a figure, too distant from modern life to be a standard-bearer of an alternative to neo-Wagnerism. Bach commanded awe but seemed excessively serious, religious, academic, and humorless. He had become an indispensable part of music education in the late nineteenth century, but the interest in him was as a historical figure, one who offered little potential as a real alternative to the seductive lure of Wagnerism. For Rudolf Louis, it was the spirit of Mozart that the new century required.⁷

Why did Mozart emerge as the ideal candidate for aesthetic renewal? Of the four canonic figures of Viennese musical classicism—Gluck, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven—Beethoven was easily the most significant figure

from the perspective of nineteenth-century composers and audiences. Although Beethoven dominated the classical repertoire in the concert hall and at home, among Wagnerian and anti-Wagnerian circles the image of Beethoven that had triumphed by 1900 was the one fashioned initially by Robert Schumann but augmented decisively by Wagner himself. Whereas Beethoven's music, particularly the chamber works, may have remained common ground for all camps, the reigning late-romantic image of the composer—one of an innovator, creator, and rebel, whose aesthetics, personality, and ambitions were readily perceptible in the orchestral music—dwarfed any conception of Beethoven as the symbol of musical classicism.⁸ The Beethoven of the late nineteenth century fit all too neatly into the Wagnerian claim that Wagner's music and its relation to drama had been the logical, progressive, and historically valid consequence of Beethoven's art.

Gluck, meanwhile, seemed too much identified with the issues of opera, and Haydn, too removed from any impulse associated with nineteenth-century romanticism. Furthermore, unlike Bach, Mozart had not ever been forgotten. Although only a fraction of Mozart's non-operatic repertoire was in active use, all musicians, Wagnerian and non-Wagnerian alike, paid ritual homage to his greatness.⁹ To all, including the general public, Mozart was a name to be revered, on a par with Shakespeare, Goethe, and, as Otto Jahn suggested in 1858, even Sophocles. *Don Giovanni*, *Figaro*, and *The Magic Flute* were standard repertory items, and excerpts from them were widely known. Therefore, if within contemporary music a true revival of classical aesthetics—defined as the logical alternative to Wagnerian ideas—could be achieved, by invoking Mozart the conceits of Wagner and his followers would not remain undisturbed. Such were the hopes of the advocates of a "back to Mozart" movement.

* * *

From the standpoint of the composers, critics, performers, and teachers at the end of the nineteenth century who sought to encourage a rediscovery and reappraisal of Mozart, the elevation of public taste was at stake; the defeat of a superficial and decadent modernism in new music would be a natural byproduct of the revival of the refined "classicism" that Mozart embodied. The problem was that, as Max Bruch put it in 1891, "in these days there are many who cherish Mozart in speech, but in their hearts remain completely distant from him and have lost all understanding for true musical beauty and organic form."¹⁰

Even among the neo-Wagnerians the revival of Mozart was not necessarily unwelcome. Wagner's warm praise of Mozart in his polemical writings countered any fin-de-siècle use of Mozart as a defense for a reactionary

historicist canon of classicism. As with Beethoven, Wagner himself had provided an alternate historical interpretation of Mozart consistent with the aesthetics of neo-Wagnerism. Further complicating the fin-de-siècle Mozart debate into which Weingartner entered in 1910 was the explicit if infuriating embrace of Mozart by avowed modernist composers such as Max Reger, Arnold Schoenberg, and Ferruccio Busoni. "I pray every day: God almighty, grant us a Mozart; we have such need of him," wrote Max Reger to Karl Straube in 1904.¹¹ Composers were turning to Mozart to find ways to free themselves from the restrictive terms of a late-nineteenth-century, neoromantic aesthetic debate that had pitted the innovations of Wagner and his followers against the so-called traditionalism of Brahms and other conservative nineteenth-century opponents of Wagner.¹²

Much like the role that the rediscovery of Biedermeier aesthetics played in the evolution of Viennese modernism in design and architecture at the beginning of the twentieth century, the re-evaluation of Mozart that began at the end of the nineteenth century was to be crucial to the "new" musical modernism of Reger, Busoni, and Schoenberg (especially after Schoenberg's expressionist period came to a close after 1913). The return to Mozart became the musical analogue of a fin-de-siècle credo of stylistic integrity that favored visual simplicity, directness, and a respect for ideas of structure and function, rather than the late-nineteenth-century penchant for decoration and aesthetic camouflage (i.e., the visual analogue of Wagnerism).¹³ Adolf Loos's 1908 critique of ornament and decoration in modern life as corrupt and, in relation to aesthetic and ethical truths, analogous to crime (*vis-à-vis* ethics and law), can be compared to Reger's and Busoni's turn to Mozart and other pre-nineteenth-century models of classicism. Predictably, the example of Mozart continued to exert a powerful influence on the direction taken by twentieth-century musical neoclassicism in the 1920s in France and Germany, during the era of the Bauhaus and "Neue Sachlichkeit."

An example of Mozart's centrality in the aesthetic debates of the early twentieth century can be found in a leading Viennese textbook on music history. In the last edition (1915) of his widely used "compendium" of music history, Adolf Prosniz (who had taught elementary piano and obligatory courses in music history at the conservatory in Vienna from 1869–1900) wrote:

There came an era of musical romanticism when Mozart's art was in retreat. His music was considered harmless and old fashioned against romanticism's raving, subjective musical language and its passionate life of sentiment. In our day, in which a tumultuous movement rages through our musical world—one of the poeticizing and the painterly

push towards the superficial and the perverse (even including the celebration of real bacchanalias)—owing to the fatigue of nervous overstimulation, there is now a counter movement among circles of music lovers. It reflects the longing for the ennobling and pleasure-giving enjoyment of pure and beautiful music; for the classical calm of the true work of art. Therefore many voices have let themselves be heard with the slogan: Back to Mozart!¹⁴

At the other end of the aesthetic divide from this reactionary characterization of Mozart stood two types of modern romanticism, that of Strauss, Mahler, Debussy, and that of a younger and less established generation, including Schoenberg and Franz Schreker.¹⁵ Ironically, by 1915 both Strauss and Schoenberg were breaking new ground in their music, drawing considerable, although contrasting, inspiration from Mozart. For Schoenberg, Mozart's formal procedures in the chamber music and symphonies (later expanded by Brahms)—the use of variation and the techniques of transformation of melodic material—were exemplary for his own effort to design a contemporary grammar of music that could empower new music to communicate sensibilities and experiences that were uniquely and purely musical. Despite the decisive differences between Schoenberg's cultural politics and those of Prosniz, the redemption of the aesthetic power of purely musical means was at the core of their divergent critiques of contemporary musical life.¹⁶

In the case of Richard Strauss, Germany's most celebrated composer at the fin de siècle, the operatic Mozart became crucial as a model. As he prepared for a new production of *Così fan tutte* in Munich in 1910, Strauss encountered the comic subtlety, the humor, and the lightness of Mozart—in other words, an alternative to the Wagnerian definition of the dramatic. As Strauss later recalled in 1944, for him Mozart had "solved all problems before they were even raised; . . . in his work all phases ("the whole scale of expression of human sentiment") of the emotional life of human beings were transfigured, spiritualized, and freed of all the limits of realism."¹⁷ Here Strauss implicitly contrasted the elaborate, nearly literary representational musical strategy of Wagner (i.e. "realist") with the clearly artificial aesthetic character of Mozart's music, which, ironically, better approached the profundity of human experience. Although one thinks first of *Der Rosenkavalier* (completed 1910) when considering Strauss's turn to Mozart, the two versions of *Ariadne auf Naxos* (1912 and 1916) and the explicit effort in *Die Frau ohne Schatten* (1917) to write a sequel to *Die Zauberflöte* are the clearest examples of Strauss's mid-career appropriation of Mozart as a guide to a new aesthetic strategy.

Among the less reactionary fin-de-siècle proponents of a Mozart revival

were scholars and critics such as Guido Adler (1855–1941), Mahler's childhood friend and a seminal figure in the development of modern musicology. For Adler, a return to Mozart was justified by more than any need for a renewal of healthy musical aesthetics. Through an appreciation of Mozart's music, a set of crucial cultural and political ideas could be communicated. In a speech to secondary-school students held in the Musikverein of Vienna in honor of the 150th anniversary of Mozart's birth in 1906, Adler stressed four reasons why a new generation might well seek inspiration in Mozart:

1) Mozart's music rested on a love of all mankind, on an ethical universalism. Although Mozart had been a great German artist, his music transcended all national and religious barriers.

2) Mozart succeeded in reaching the hearts and minds of experts—those schooled in music—as well as the broader popular audience. He was, in a word, an artist who realized the democratic and egalitarian potentials of art.

3) Mozart utilized dissonance only out of necessity. The perfect integration of form and content made superfluous the modern habit of using the superficial and shocking aspects of chromaticism and extended tonality for their own sake.

4) Mozart realized the "only true manner" of rendering drama into music: He mirrored the human soul in sound.¹⁸

For Adler (and also Prosniz and Weingartner), there was also an aesthetic component to his position: at stake were the relation of so-called extramusical content to musical form and the idea that ultimately—despite Wagner—the only true content for music was music alone. The unique properties of music as opposed to those of words and images (to which music seemed, in modern times, to be subordinated) had to be reasserted against the use of music as illustrative of the extramusical, as in the famous tone poems of Richard Strauss or even the early symphonic narratives of Gustav Mahler, Adler's friend. Mozart, particularly in the operatic repertoire, displayed, with uncanny virtuosity, the seemingly unique autonomous power of music to speak to humanity on its own independent terms.

Precisely because Mozart stood for an independent, non-representational aesthetic divorced from mundane reality, his music seemed the ideal antidote to the stress, complexity, harshness, and emotional exaggeration of modern life—a welcome alternative in a world where music, presumably a universal language of art, had become merely another mir-

ror of a fragmented modernity. Art could therefore assist in rescuing the human soul from the inhuman and ugly facts of contemporary existence, which included the specter of decadence, excessive materialism, overconfidence in the notion of historical progress, and a heightened naturalism that tended towards the desire for extreme effects.¹⁹

The assertion of a dichotomy between the ideal, true nature of musical art (Mozart) and a fashionable, distinctly modern but ultimately deceptive technique of musical naturalism (Wagner) emerged in Vienna in the 1880s. The critic Theodor Helm (a passionate Bruckner enthusiast) described how the opponents of Wagner sought to exploit the fact that the applause at a performance of a Mozart work far exceeded that for Wagner's *Faust* Overture at a concert in Vienna, which took place in February 1883, twelve days after Wagner's death. Was it really a triumphant vote by the public for "nature" as opposed to "the unnatural" in music?²⁰ Or was it philistine anti-modern conservatism? Hugo Wolf, aware of a new tendency for the anti-Wagnerians to appropriate Mozart, devoted most of his 1886 review of the debut of a new production of the *The Marriage of Figaro*, organized to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the first performance, to quoting Wagner's lavish praise of Mozart.²¹

Not surprisingly, Eduard Hanslick took the occasion of the 1891 celebrations of Mozart's death to make the paradoxical and pessimistic observation that the performance of more of Mozart's music than had been heard for years in Vienna did not seem tedious. Yet although it had been a welcome balm—"a temporary return to a lost paradise" (by which Hanslick meant an era without Wagner and his followers)—an inevitable gap between Mozart and modernity would always remain. For Hanslick, music and life had evolved, perhaps unfortunately, beyond any "return" to Mozart. Hanslick, despite his conservative tastes, recognized that the nostalgic embrace of an excessively historicist aesthetic on the part of the audience would ultimately doom the future of any new music.²²

During the 1891 celebrations commemorating the 100th anniversary of Mozart's death, a generation younger than Hanslick's sought both to avoid a conservative Mozart-Wagner dichotomy and to counter Hanslick's view of Mozart ultimately as stylistically dated and emotionally foreign to a modern audience that was capable of responding to greatness in Wagner. In the 1891 Salzburg ceremonies, the Viennese critic Robert Hirschfeld (1858–1914) was careful to cite Wagner repeatedly in his *Festrede*. Hirschfeld attempted to win over the Wagnerians to a reconsideration of Mozart by using Wagner as a basis for correcting Wagner's own limited view of Mozart; he suggested (delicately, to be sure) that Wagner's view of Mozart as having been historically superseded had been premature. Mozart, as Wagner knew so well, was the master of light in music. Hirschfeld extended the

image of enlightenment beyond its use as a metaphor to describe the character of Mozart's music. Mozart's mission had been "a harmonic one—to bind and unite." Mozart was to the history of music what Plato had been to philosophy, and the ethos of Mozart's art was the ideal synthesis of "wisdom, beauty, and strength." Despite the passage of time, the task for the modern age was to be able both to intuit and to understand Mozart in this manner. His music was akin to a metaphysical ideal, which, despite surface dissimilarities, Wagner's work mirrored in a thoroughly contemporary manner. Hirschfeld argued further that, as a result of Wagner's considerable success in raising the public's standard of taste, it was now (ca. 1891) possible to popularize Mozart's music and make it relevant without compromising it. By stressing Mozart's "German" character (by which Hirschfeld meant those qualities that Joseph Joachim described in 1898 as "the gift to assimilate, so that the material becomes universal ideal thought, intelligible to all nations"), Hirschfeld sought to amalgamate into one unified ethos Mozartean classicism, the idea of absolute music, the early romantic tradition of instrumental music, and Wagner. What eluded Hirschfeld was the ability to connect a return to Mozart with any constructive agenda for new music. In Hirschfeld's celebration of Mozart (in contrast to Hanslick's), one encounters an early example of how the cult of Mozart would be used later in the twentieth century as the basis of a regressive generalized critique of innovative musical modernism *after* Brahms, Wagner, and Bruckner.²³

By the early twentieth century a reconciliation between popular musical taste, between Wagnerism and the capacity to appreciate the classical tradition exemplified by Mozart, had become at best a remote possibility. Too much of the fin-de-siècle Mozart revival had been explicitly targeted against the Wagnerian heritage. Furthermore, even Schoenberg (not to speak of Stravinsky) doubted that Wagner's popularity had actually enhanced the public's capacity to understand Mozart's musical genius. The generation of performing artists born after 1870 (which included pianist Arthur Schnabel [1882–1951] and violinist Carl Flesch [1873–1944], two key advocates of Mozart) knew that there had too long been a great gap between the "official" praise given Mozart in the standard narratives of music history and his actual place in the repertoire.²⁴ The task of commemorating Mozart as more than a historical artifact required an alliance with twentieth-century modernism in new music.

The demand for Mozart on the part of the audience in the mid- and late-nineteenth century had been weak indeed. During his entire career Gustav Mahler conducted (apart from the operas) only the last two symphonies and the Requiem. Between 1848 and 1910, only seven symphonies were in the repertoire of the Vienna Philharmonic, which also in-

cluded three serenades, two overtures, five piano concertos, two violin concertos, and a host of operatic excerpts. Mozart was no more evident in the concerts of the other major Viennese sponsor of concerts in the nineteenth century, the Society of the Friends of Music. In Vienna the only exceptions were 1891 and 1906, the anniversary years.²⁵

From the perspective of an almost unbearable excess of "Mostly Mozart" in the late twentieth century, Bruch and Weingartner were perhaps accurate in their view that the essential greatness of Mozart seemed lost on the musical public. Concert performances of Mozart were comparatively limited, even though amateur readings of his music at home persisted. There was more extensive praise of Mozart spoken and taught than music heard. The accepted notion during the second half of the nineteenth century—that Mozart had been brilliant, elegant, and divine—did nothing to alter the perception that his music appeared mannered and dated. If Bach was seen primarily as the canonic composer of sacred music, Mozart remained certainly an indispensable icon of secular classicism within late-nineteenth-century musical education. But Beethoven, not Mozart, was (as Hanslick's views implied) the nineteenth century's pivotal source of emotional and aesthetic inspiration. Even Hirschfeld felt compelled to debunk the widespread idea that Mozart's music was neither deep nor reflective of sorrow and tragedy. In a startling concession to a primitive association of music and emotion, he countered by citing as evidence all the great Mozartean works written in a minor key.²⁶

The nineteenth century's sense of its distance from Mozart is evident in the following remark from Frederick Delius, who recalled, "as a child I had only heard the music of Handel, Bach, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, and shall never forget the thrill I got when I first heard someone play the posthumous waltz of Chopin, which seemed as if an entirely new world had opened up to me."²⁷ This happened in the late 1860s and vindicated Franz Liszt's lament from 1841 that in music the achievement of great figures, particularly Mozart, in contrast to those in art (Michelangelo, Rubens, and Raphael), would be "ephemeral and fleeting."²⁸

The estrangement from the power of Mozart among most nineteenth-century audiences did not escape a select group of musicians who saw in it a telling and dangerous limitation. In 1861, a year before Delius's birth, Clara Schumann, writing from Detmold, recounted the following experience to Joseph Joachim:

One reason will make my stay unforgettable. I used the opportunity of having an orchestra around and learned the concertos by Mozart in G and A major. As I did so I both rejoiced and wept. For music to bring me to tears means that it must certainly be heavenly—the

Adagio in the G major, which is heavenly pleasure, and both first movements, and in the A major, the last. What fresh life in all the instruments; what a wealth of feeling and humor! Had I only one individual around who would have rejoiced with me. To share such joy alone is quite difficult. How tragic it is that the public remains essentially unengaged faced with such music, and yet it needs nothing more than a natural capacity for feeling.²⁹

This striking lack of popularity for and receptivity to Mozart's instrumental music in the late nineteenth century was clearly bound up with the cultural politics of new music. Despite Wagner's praise of Mozart (which was restricted primarily to his operas), the progressive movement associated with the "New German School" and Liszt and Wagner paid little more than lip service to Mozart. The circle emanating from Mendelssohn's Leipzig—particularly Carl Reinecke (1824–1910)—and those around Clara Schumann, Joachim, and Brahms (who edited the Mozart Requiem for the Breitkopf and Härtel edition of the complete works begun in 1877) provided the main source of support for keeping Mozart's works in active concert use. In 1891 Reinecke was moved by the failure of the Mozart piano concertos ever to be played to write a book advocating their "reawakening."³⁰

For Brahms and Schumann, Mozart served as the guiding figure for a romanticism different from the one advocated by Liszt. The notion that Mozart had been a key figure in romanticism was fashioned first by Ludwig Tieck and E. T. A. Hoffmann. In Hoffmann's view, Mozart's romanticism offered a unique exit from the limits of musical classicism (Haydn and Gluck); he distilled classicism and integrated the need for a contemporary means of expression of the boundless (thereby setting the stage for Beethoven).³¹ As the divisions within musical romanticism deepened in the 1850s and 1860s, the romantic dimension of Mozart became identified exclusively with the operas, particularly *Don Giovanni*.

Used as a contrast to Liszt and Wagner, Mozart came to represent moderation, restraint, economy, subtlety, purity, and elegance of a so-called purely musical sort. To Brahms and his allies the romanticism of the "New German School" was decidedly anti-Mozartean: formless, excessive, dependent on effects created through color and not form; tied to emotionalism and appeals to the extramusical. Later in the century composers such as Tchaikovsky found themselves caught in a nearly schizophrenic web between the Mozartean model and contemporary late-Romantic expressive sensibilities. In his explicitly "Mozartean" works, Tchaikovsky (opp. 33 and 61) often resorted to a coy but distinctly affectionate historicist veneer to give voice to his Mozartean side.

In the mid-century Mozart remained a limited presence among composers and amateurs in those genres rejected by Wagner and his followers, especially chamber music and solo piano music. For much of the musical public, Mozart became almost exclusively a dimension of *Hausmusik*. It was in the arenas of concert hall orchestral music and symphonic form as well as even in opera that Mozart suffered most during the mid- and late-nineteenth century. Only *Don Giovanni*, *Figaro*, and *The Magic Flute* remained in the regular repertoire, with *Don Giovanni* regarded as the greatest and most "modern" Mozart, along with the three last symphonies, the Requiem, the late string quartets and quintets, and the D-minor Piano Concerto.³²

The fin-de-siècle call for a Mozart revival mirrored, however, social and cultural developments that went beyond the mere neglect of Mozart during the mid-century. With the expansion of the audience for music during the second half of the nineteenth century, a new pattern of tension between the audience and contemporary composers emerged, particularly after the death of Wagner. The evolution of conservative historicist aesthetic taste in music developed rapidly after Wagner. The fin-de-siècle slogan "Back to Mozart" among amateurs and concertgoers, as opposed to composers, became less a cry on behalf of one or another school of contemporary composition than a harbinger of how the taste for a canon of classicism and the repertoire of the past would be employed as a weapon against the seemingly radical surface of new music *per se*.

The audience and critical community of the later nineteenth century were the products of a new piano-based pattern of musical instruction that would redefine musical literacy in ways that made the assimilation of new music increasingly difficult. If the Bach revival before 1848 and the growing interest in music history influenced composers such as Mendelssohn and Brahms, the fin-de-siècle rediscovery of Mozart represented the use of the past by the audience not on behalf of the present but against it.³³

The fin-de-siècle Mozart revival marked the beginning of a twentieth-century process of domination of the concert repertoire by the past to the exclusion of contemporary music. The intense cultivation of Mozart after 1900 coincided with the gradual marginalization of twentieth-century music first from the home, then the concert stage, and finally the radio and gramophone. In contrast to the worlds of art and literature, in music the near fanatical enthusiasm for past masters became the ground and justification for the avoidance or rejection of music written in one's own time, even by composers who invoked explicitly the example of Mozart.³⁴

The debate surrounding the fin-de-siècle "return" to Mozart movement mirrored the divisions that had evolved within the reception of Mozart during the nineteenth century. It also set the stage for the direction that

twentieth-century Mozart reception would take. The Mozart we hear today and to whom we respond has been irrevocably mediated by the first 150 years of interpretation and categorization that followed Mozart's death.³⁵

* * *

During the turn-of-the-century Mozart debate, one of the most common clichés about Mozart's personality was the idea that he had been a "naive" composer. As Richard Batka, the eminent Prague music critic, put it in 1909: "Mozart was a naive composer insofar as a great deal streamed into his creations directly from the unconscious."³⁶ This use of the concept "naive" derived from two interrelated sources; 1) the legend (and fact) that Mozart had been a "natural" genius whose achievement seemed effortless, and 2) the consistent application of Schiller's distinction (from 1796) between the naive and the sentimental in aesthetics to the case of Mozart. A late-nineteenth-century psychological fascination with the artist and the process of artistic creation—the links between intellect, imagination, and emotion—merged with a tradition of early-nineteenth-century aesthetic discourse.

Mozart's stature as a "classical" master in fact owed a great deal to the Schillerian framework. For Schiller, the "naive" artist was "natural." He experienced the unmediated harmony of nature, morality, and humanity in an inspired way that combined reason and imagination with moral and aesthetic perfection. This made the contemporary "naive" artist the modern equivalent of the luminaries of antiquity in his achievement of the exemplary, flawless, finite balance between nature and art characteristic of classical antiquity. In the nineteenth century Viennese classicism became for music the moral equivalent of antiquity in art and architecture.

The "sentimental" artist, in contrast, was forced in the making of art to confront the consequences of irrevocable historical change. Although the sentimental artist sustains a longing for a bygone era, of necessity he must develop skills of reflection and idealization. Because of historical progress, these abilities have become indispensable to the task of realizing through art the infinite aesthetic possibilities suggested by modern existence. In modern times, only Shakespeare and Goethe, Schiller argued, could be considered as possessing elements of the "naive" gift.³⁷

This distinction was used in music during the nineteenth century to characterize the difference between Mozart and Beethoven. Beethoven seemed to engage modernity, to employ reflection, idealization, and a moral impetus concerning modernity in a manner that appealed to one's sense of the infinite, the imaginary, and the unknown. Beethoven was to classicism what Michelangelo had been to the Renaissance. In contrast, Mozart was compared repeatedly to Raphael and Plato.³⁸

In a leading musical lexicon of 1857, Mozart was described as the most perfect embodiment of "musical beauty and musical-artistic completeness. If one wants to speak of a classical artistic ideal (in the sense of antiquity), and if one wants to contemplate its realization in a total unity including the reciprocal integration of form and content, then Mozart stands in first place, before all other composers."³⁹ Likewise in Saphir's famous *Conversations-Lexikon* from the mid-century, the by-then tiresome cliché that Mozart had been uniquely endowed with "genius of heavenly harmony" and had been the "olympian" recipient of the ideal ethereal spirit of the Promethean flame of "genius" was subject to satire filled with reminders of Mozart's "earthly" pursuits such as billiards and women.⁴⁰ Crucial to this view of Mozart as a unique classical model, as the naive, pure, and exceptional artist, was of course the widespread awareness of Mozart's unrivaled precocity and talent.

It was as if the facile labeling in the early nineteenth century of Mozart as the "naive" modern analogue to antique classicism functioned as a way of setting Mozart apart from contemporary music in order to avoid an invidious comparison. One might say that a sort of revenge on Mozart's greatness was taken by composers and critics in the several generations after the death of Beethoven. Since they realized that they lacked the incomparable facility and divine gift of Mozart, what better response than to enshrine him in a remote temple, all by himself, as an object apart. Robert Schumann repeatedly resorted to this rhetorical ploy. He distanced himself from Mozart by praising Mozart's "tranquillity, grace, ideality, and objectivity."

Schumann utilized a familiar linkage between Mozart's unique childhood achievement and his presumably lifelong naive, natural, and child-like character to enhance Mozart's status as the symbol of ideal (immortal as opposed to concrete mortal) classicism; as an almost deracinated, ethereal, and pure superhuman figure beyond comparison with ordinary humans. Schumann believed that Mozart had somehow developed into an "ideal" artist independent of sensual reality, unlike Beethoven or Haydn (or anyone else).⁴¹ Schumann wrote in an epigram: "What a genius, what a child: O truly I tell you, if you don't become like him, you will never enter the heavenly sphere of art."⁴² As Leon Plantinga noted, Schumann applied Winckelmann's categories about the greatness of ancient art to Mozart.⁴³

By mid-century Mozart had come to symbolize pure music, naively created, heavenly in nature, perfect in form—the moral equivalent to Platonic philosophy. One music historian at the end of the century summarized this line of Mozart interpretation by calling Mozart's music a kind of "natural philosophy" bordering on the transcendence of subjectivity. It rendered into music a Platonic ideal of beauty. The notion that music was

essentially abstract and in the non-pejorative sense "artificial" in relation to nature made logical the notion that the Platonic ideal of beauty would be essentially musical. In 1898 Heinrich Köstlin summarized Mozart's achievement as residing in the fact that "his pathos was none other than beauty itself, as the classic master in the strictest sense of the word; as the embodied genius of music—of the beautiful in music in all its separateness from any ancillary purpose and meaning."⁴⁴

Mozart emerged from this post-Beethovenian discourse as an artist in a class by himself. His music (particularly the instrumental works) readily became regarded as disconnected from everyday life. The nearly philosophical status of his music set it apart from the emotional and sensual experience of music—the perfect realization of the pure spirit of beauty.

Not surprisingly, Mozart easily became the symbol of the aesthetics of absolute music in the mid-nineteenth century, despite his operatic output. Although Brahms (who had played the D-minor Concerto, K. 466 at the Hamburg centennial festival in 1856) was frequently associated with this ideology, the emotional power of Mozart did not appear distant. To him Mozart's instrumental and vocal music was so direct and powerful that listening to it became nearly unbearable.⁴⁵ As Ludwig Wittgenstein noted with some irony in commenting on Franz Grillparzer's assertion that Mozart wrote only "beautiful" music, there was something "ungrateful" and "mischievous" about the way posterity in the mid-nineteenth century treated Mozart in the name of the concept of the beautiful. Wittgenstein reacted against the mid-nineteenth-century extraction of the word beautiful from its associations with the kind of emotional "distortion" we associate with grief and pathos, from the nineteenth-century pseudo-realist musical representational language of emotional states. Not only was the "extension" of the "range" of musical language after Mozart poorly construed, but Mozart was too neatly and inadequately understood.⁴⁶

In contrast to this process of aesthetic distancing and idealization on the part of composers of the 1809–1810 generation was the early-Romantic line of interpretation of Mozart as the first romantic, as the acute observer and representor of emotion and the infinite character of human imagination. In this view (derived from E. T. A. Hoffmann) only a romantic and profound spirit rooted in modernity could genuinely appreciate Mozart. In the 1830s Joseph Eichendorff regarded the music of Mozart as quintessentially romantic, as evocative of the mysterious and mystical in the human spirit that could transform, through art, the finite into the infinite.⁴⁷

Richard Wagner did the most to enhance this alternative nineteenth-century, anti-classical image of Mozart as a figure of romanticism. Using the precise language and rhetoric of the classicizing school, Wagner, in

The Art Work of the Future (1849) and *Opera and Drama* (1850), accepted the premises of Mozart's "naive" genius and the unique clarity and classical beauty of his work. But Wagner detected a romantic "unending sea of yearning." Mozart breathed not an idealized spirit of form, but for the first time "the passionate breath of the human voice" into music. Mozart had been guided by human love. The "endless" desire of the human heart was translated into the singing power of Mozart's melodic line.⁴⁸

Wagner could deal more easily than Schumann or even Brahms with the formidable legacy of Mozart because he had abandoned the instrumental genres of Mozart. Liberated from any possible direct comparison except in the arena of opera, Wagner argued that Mozart remained trapped by the literary, operatic conventions of his time. Since Mozart lacked musically adequate poetic and dramatic texts, he started to use music in a genuinely dramatic manner only in his operatic overtures. The true dramatic power of music had been left unexploited, even though Mozart showed, through his use of music alone, the immanent power of music to express the essence within drama and poetry. By focusing on the operatic work, Wagner stressed the gestural and emotional rhetoric in Mozart's music rather than its abstract and formal attributes. His observations on Mozart's magical transformation of classical melodic practice into an individualized instrument of emotional expression implied the aesthetic and historical links between the continuous linear melodic strategy of his own writing and the legacy of Mozart.

Wagner's analysis and praise of Mozart also picked up on a third strand of argument within nineteenth-century Mozart criticism. This strand emphasized the political dimensions of Mozart's achievement. Particularly after the publication of Otto Jahn's massive Mozart biography, the image of Mozart as the first composer to fight the feudal system of aristocratic privilege became widespread. Jahn's four-volume biography and the growing familiarity with Mozart's letters helped to deepen the late-nineteenth-century portrait of Mozart. Jahn stressed Mozart's independence, his refusal in Paris and Salzburg to submit to authority. Mozart the Freemason came to the fore, as did Mozart's sympathy for egalitarian ideas and the popular audience (as opposed to aristocratic patrons). *The Magic Flute* became the *locus classicus* of this line of argument from the mid-nineteenth century until the writings of Adorno.⁴⁹

Coincident with these claims was added the later-nineteenth-century appropriation of Mozart as a particularly German composer. Even Jahn took pains to point this out.⁵⁰ The most vociferous claimants were, of course, the Wagnerians. Houston Stewart Chamberlain was explicit on this score.⁵¹ Mozart's apparent concern for the general public, as well as for the accessibility of his music and his independence of clerical and aristo-

cratic power, became important to polemicists who wished to use Mozart to counter the idea of concert music as primarily an esoteric high art, as the exclusive province of aristocrats and middle-class parvenus (who sought to achieve social standing through the display of refinement in aesthetic judgment). To these fin-de-siècle nationalists, Mozart's music mirrored not merely the social aspirations of a few but a popular national imagination later fully realized by Wagner. In Wagner, the German ideal of the spiritual audience-composer relationship, first hinted at by Mozart's operas, triumphed.

The nineteenth-century struggle over the political soul of Mozart continued into the early twentieth century. The two warring parties were the one claiming Mozart for a distinctly German sensibility and the other (exemplified by Adler, Hirschfeld, and Joachim, all, ironically, born as Jews) who regarded Mozart as the apostle of a cosmopolitan universalism. The political intersected with the aesthetic. The view of Mozart as an early romantic and the Germanocentric interpretation ran together. Likewise, the image of Mozart as the embodiment of absolute music fit neatly into the claim that his work mirrored the principles of universalism.⁵² The final irony rests, of course, in the historical realization that the "cosmopolitan" view of Mozart's art among individuals such as Adler and Hirschfeld was itself a form of Germanocentrism. To these men (and to Arnold Schoenberg, Heinrich Schenker, and Paul Hindemith as well), the so-called purely musical and formal achievements of Mozart were concrete pieces of evidence of a transcendent universalism inherent in German culture. That unique universalism lent credibility to the idea that the musical creations of Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Brahms formed the proper objective measures against which all compositional technique, in the strictest sense, might properly be judged.

This antimony would reach its macabre apotheosis in the Mozart Jubilee celebrated in Vienna by the Nazis in 1941, graced by enthusiastic participation of Strauss, Furtwängler, and members of the German musical community.⁵³ The 1941 portrait painted in Vienna of the great German Aryan Mozart should be placed side by side with the claims of Kurt Weill and Arnold Schoenberg dating from the 1940s in America. In 1941 both emigré composers were writing music in the full conviction that they were the true legitimate heirs of Mozart.⁵⁴

Looking back at the late-nineteenth-century debate about Mozart, one can argue that the linkage between Mozart and the aesthetics of cultural reaction triumphed over the connection between Mozart and aesthetic modernism in the twentieth century. The success of postmodernism in the late twentieth century has coincided with the most radical popularization of Mozart in history, a rage for Mozart that has

developed in tandem with the decline in audiences for new music. The connection between contemporary music and the example of Mozart sought by Reger, Busoni, Schoenberg, and Strauss in the early twentieth century has resulted in a vacuum in the late twentieth century; Mozart has now fully become part of a musical museum, separate from contemporary musical and cultural life. We argue less about the political significance of Mozart's art perhaps because it no longer seems to matter.

* * *

What remains from the fin-de-siècle Mozart revival is, of course, its aesthetic influence on twentieth-century neoclassicism and modernism, particularly within the tradition of the Second Viennese School. Despite the fantastic commercial popularity that Mozart's music now enjoys, from the historian's perspective the turn to Mozart in the early twentieth century constituted an effort to revive the claims among many musicians on behalf of a model of purely musical hearing and listening. A premium on form and procedures of musical development within works of music—on structural devices overtly detached from the sort of extramusical illustration associated with Wagner—became a hallmark of much twentieth-century concert music. The turn away from the associative musical strategies of late Romanticism helped make much of twentieth-century music less accessible and therefore less popular. Wagnerism held the key to the mass audience. Therefore, from the vantage point of the late twentieth century, the rediscovery of Mozart during the early 1900s helped lead, on the one hand, to the most extreme deification and dissemination of Mozart and his music within the museum of music, and, on the other (albeit indirectly, through the medium of modernist advocates of theories of absolute music) to the relative marginalization of contemporary music and musical modernism in our own time.

NOTES

* This paper is a revised version of a talk presented at a symposium entitled "Mozart and the Riddle of Creativity: A Program Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of Mozart's Death," at The Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C., December 2-5, 1991.

¹ "Zurück zu Mozart? Warum zurück? Warum zu Mozart? . . . Betrachten wir die etwa seit Wagners Tod geschriebenen Hauptwerke der Musik, so läßt sich sehr viel zu ihrem Lobe sagen; . . . Trotzdem läßt sich ein mehr oder weniger deutliches Gefühl nicht bannen, daß in der Gesamtentwicklung, welche die Tonkunst in unseren Tagen genommen hat, etwas nicht stimmt, daß irgendwo etwas faul sei. . . .

Keiner der großen Meister ist uns so ferne gerückt wie Mozart. . . . Das Publikum . . . schlägt bewundernd die Augen auf, wenn von ihm die Rede ist, bleibt aber fern, wenn seine Werke aufgeführt werden. Vor allem gälte es, Mozart selbst wieder aufzufinden, bevor man erwägen könnte, ob man zu ihm zurückkehren kann. . . .

Die tiefe Befriedigung, nach der wir uns unentwegt sehnen, sie ist uns hier nicht gegönnt. . . . Wir werden gereizt, nicht befriedigt, erhitzt, nicht erwärmt, geschleift, nicht erhoben. . . .

Sie [die Musik] ist hysterisch geworden wie eine unglückliche Frau, die man unverschuldet in langer Kerkerhaft gehalten hat. Sie muß wieder gesunden. . . .

Mit unseren modernen Ausdrucksmitteln im Geiste Mozarts zu schaffen, das wäre vielleicht das Richtige. Sehen wir aber Mozarts Kunst recht tief in die wunderbaren hellen Kinderaugen! Darf da noch von einem "Zurück" die Rede sein? Ich glaube, es muß viel wahrhaftiger lauten: 'Vorwärts zu Mozart!' "Feliz Weingartner, "Zurück zu Mozart?" in *Akkorde: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1912), 108–12.

² Weingartner's views are contemporary with those of the theorist Heinrich Schenker (1868–1935), who advocated a more historically faithful performance practice located in the establishment of an authentic text, which eliminated the printed overlay of interpretive habits accumulated over time.

³ See the excellent contemporary assessment of the fin-de-siècle malaise, together with a thorough review of contemporary composition, in Rudolf Louis, *Die deutsche Musik der Neuzeit* (Munich: Georg Müller, 1912).

⁴ On this point, see, for example, the comments in Walter Niemann, *Die Musik seit Richard Wagner* (Berlin: Schuster and Loeffler, 1913), 98.

⁵ The modifiers in this sentence mirror the vocabulary and views of Weingartner in his essay "Originalität," in *Akkorde*, 173–83.

⁶ See Niemann, *Die Musik seit Richard Wagner*, 41, 62, 65, and particularly 287–88.

⁷ Louis, *Die deutsche Musik der Neuzeit*, 262–65.

⁸ Beyond Wagner's famous Beethoven essay from 1870, see Klaus Kropfinger, *Wagner and Beethoven: Richard Wagner's Reception of Beethoven*, trans. Peter Palmer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), which describes the character and significance of Wagner's view of Beethoven. For a less subtle but nevertheless useful book, in which the impact of Wagner's view of Beethoven on the fin de siècle can be gleaned, see Alessandra Comini, *The Changing Image of Beethoven: A Study in Mythmaking* (New York: Rizzoli, 1987), 252–305.

⁹ In Rudolf Louis's book, for example, Haydn is mentioned once, in passing, whereas Mozart is discussed extensively. Furthermore, in the concert and stage repertory, Mozart held a more prominent place than Haydn circa 1900 in German-speaking urban centers.

¹⁰ "In diesen Tagen Viele mit dem Munde Mozart preisen, die ihm im Herzen ganz fernstehen und jedes Verständnis für wahre musikalische Schönheit und organische Form verloren haben." Letter of 29 November 1891 from Bruch to Joseph Joachim, in *Briefe von und an Joseph Joachim* (Berlin: Julius Bard, 1913), 3:404.

¹¹ "Ich bete jeden Tag: Gott der Allmächtige möchte uns einen Mozart senden; der tut uns so bitter Not." Max Reger, *Briefe eines deutschen Meisters*, ed. Else von Hase-Kochler (Leipzig: Kochler, 1938), 123.

¹² See Busoni's "Mozart Aphorismen" from 1906 in Ferruccio Busoni, *Wesen und Einheit der Musik* (Berlin: Max Hesse, 1956), 143–45; his references to Mozart in letters dated 1 June 1908 and 12 October 1910 in Ferruccio Busoni, *Selected Letters*, ed. Antony Beaumont (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987), 89, 114; and also the references to Mozart in Arnold Schoenberg's 1911 *Harmonielehre*.

¹³ See Mara Reissberger and Peter Haiko, "Alles ist einfach und glatt." Zur Dialektik der Ornamentlosigkeit," in *Moderne Vergangenheit: 1800–1900 [Ausstellung] Kunsterhaus Wien, 21. Mai bis 9. August 1981* (Vienna: Das Kunsterhaus, 1981), 13–19.

¹⁴ "Es kam die Zeit der musikalischen Romantik, und vor ihrer schwärmerischen, subjektiven Tonsprache, ihrem leidenschaftlichen Stimmungsleben zog sich die Kunst Mozarts, die nun als altmodisch und harmlos galt, zurück. In unseren Tagen, in denen eine gärende

Bewegung die Musikwelt durchwühlt, das Poetisierende, das Malerische an die Oberfläche drängt, selbst die Unnatur wahre Orgien feiert, macht sich, der nervösen Überreizung müde, in den Kreisen der Musikfreunde eine Gegenströmung bemerkbar. Es ist die Sehnsucht nach dem erhebenden, beglückenden Genuß reiner und schöner Musik, nach der klassischen Ruhe des Kunstwerkes, und so lassen sich zahlreiche Stimmen vernehmen mit dem Rufe: Zurück zu Mozart!" Adolf Prosniz, *Compendium der Musikgeschichte 1750–1830: für Schulen und Konservatorien* (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1915), 157.

¹⁵ In 1908 Schreker, influenced in part by the back-to-Mozart discussion, composed a ballet for orchestra entitled "Rokoko," which ignored the visual and dramatic elements of the stage. See R. S. Hoffmann, *Franz Schreker* (Vienna: Universal, 1921), 99–102.

¹⁶ For a comparison see Schoenberg's polemical articles written between 1909 and 1911 collected in Arnold Schoenberg, *Stil und Gedanke: Aufsätze zur Musik*, ed. Ivan Vojtech (Reutlingen: S. Fischer Verlag, 1976), 157–73.

¹⁷ "Ist es gleich richtig, daß er derjenige ist, der gleichsam alle 'Probleme' bereits gelöst hat, bevor sie nur aufgestellt werden, . . . so enthält sein Werk, wenn auch verklärt, vergeistigt und von Realität befreit, alle Phasen des menschlichen Empfindungslebens. Seine nicht-dramatischen Schöpfungen [durchlaufen] die ganze Skala des Ausdrucks menschlichen Empfindens." Richard Strauss, *Betrachtungen und Erinnerungen* (Zurich: Atlantis Verlag, 1949), 91.

¹⁸ Guido Adler, "Mozart. Festrede bei der Mozart-Feier für die Mittelschulen Wiens," April 18, 1906, in: Adler Archive. The University of Georgia Library, Athens, Georgia.

¹⁹ One among the many sources for this view of modernity and the need to use musical classicism and Mozart as antidotes is found in the eleventh edition of Bernhard Kothe's *Abriß der allgemeinen Musikgeschichte*, ed. Rudolph Procházka (Leipzig: F.E.C. Leuckart, 1919), 365; and Karl Storck's *Geschichte der Musik* (Stuttgart: Muth'sche Verlagshandlung, 1910), 782–84.

²⁰ Theodor Helm, *Fünzig Jahre Wiener Musikleben: Erinnerungen eines Musikkritikers* (Vienna: Im Verlage der Herausgebers, 1977), 1:169–70.

²¹ Hugo Wolf, *Musikalische Kritiken* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1911/1983), 274–76.

²² Eduard Hanslick, "Die Mozart Feier," in *Fünf Jahre Musik* (Berlin: Allgemeiner Verein für deutsche Litteratur, 1896), 149–60.

²³ Robert Hirschfeld, *Festrede zur Mozart-Centenarfeier 1891 zu Salzburg* (Salzburg: H. Kerber, 1891); for the Joachim quote see his letter to his nephew (in English) from 1898 in Joseph Joachim, *Briefe*, III:482.

²⁴ See Artur Schnabel, *My Life and Music* (New York: Dover, 1988), 27; and Carl Flesch *Memoirs*, trans. and ed. Hans Keller and C. F. Flesch (New York: Da Capo, 1979), 27, 59, and 174.

²⁵ See Knud Martner, *Gustav Mahler im Konzertsaal: eine Dokumentation seiner Konzerttätigkeit, 1870–1911* (Copenhagen: K. Martner, 1985); Richard von Perger, *Denkschrift zur Feier des 50jährigen ununterbrochenen Bestandes der philharmonischen Konzerte in Wien 1860–1910* (Vienna: C. Fromme, 1910); and Robert Hirschfeld and Richard von Perger, *Geschichte der k. k. Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien* (Vienna, 1912).

²⁶ As the narrative in Storck suggested, it was Beethoven's work that truly divided the past from the present; it was the "most powerful boundary stone in the whole history of music." Mozart, by contrast, represented, apart from pure genius, the essentially "immortal . . . most unfulfilled beauty [and] . . . eternal youthfulness" (552–55).

²⁷ Lionel Carley, *Delius. A Life in Letters 1862–1908* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), 379.

²⁸ Franz Liszt, *An Artist's Journey*, ed. Charles Suttoni (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 195.

²⁹ "Der Aufenthalt in Detmold wird mir um Eins unvergeßlich sein. Ich benutzte dort die Gelegenheit des Orchesters und lernte die Concerte in G dur und A dur von Mozart kennen.

Gejubelt und geweint habe ich dabei. Bis mir die Thränen bei der Musik kommen, da muß sie schon herrlich sein—das Adagio im G dur Concert, welche Himmelswonne ist das, und die ersten Sätze, und im A dur der letzte Satz, welch frisches Leben in all den Instrumenten, was ein Reichthum an Gemüth und Humor! Hätte ich nur Einen noch gehabt, der mit mir gebubelt hätte—solche Freude allein tragen, ist auch schwer. Wie betrübt ist es, daß das Publicum bei solcher Musik beinah theilnahmlos bleibt, und es brauchte doch weiter nichts als natürliches Empfinden." Letter of 10 February 1861 in Joseph Joachim, *Briefe*, 2:129. The reference is to K. 453 and, most likely, K. 488.

³⁰ See Carl Reinecke, *Zur Wiederbelebung der Mozart'schen Clavier-Concerte* (Leipzig: Gebrüder Reinecke, 1891). Busoni also pursued this point.

³¹ David Charlton, ed., *E. T. A. Hoffmann's Musical Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 261.

³² The best sources for this general assessment are the collections of reviews by Theodor Helm, Eduard Hanslick, the collection of the reviews of Wilhelm Kienzl (*Im Konzert* [Berlin: Allgemeiner Verlag für deutsche Literatur, 1908]), and the program listings for the musical calendars of Vienna and Berlin.

³³ See Leon Botstein, "Listening through Reading: Musical Literacy and the Concert Audience," *19th-Century Music* 16 (1992): 129–45.

³⁴ This is a distillation of the critical position articulated by Theodor W. Adorno—itsself a subject of needed scrutiny, but polemically appropriate in this context. See the essays "Anmerkungen zum deutschen Musikleben (1967)," in *Impromptus* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1968), 9–28; and "Über die musikalische Verwendung des Radios" from "Der getreute Korrepetitor" (1963), in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1976), 15:369–402, both of which extend the argument Adorno put forth in his 1938 essay "Über den Fetischcharakter in der Musik und die Regression des Hörens" (reprinted in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 14.), whose arguments apply more closely to the fin-de-siècle habits of listening.

³⁵ See Thomas Seedorf, *Studien zur kompositorischen Mozart-Rezeption im frühen 20. Jahrhundert* (Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 1990), 1–36.

³⁶ "Mozart war ein naiver Komponist, insofern sehr viel aus dem Unbewußten in sein Schaffen einströmte." Richard Batka, *Geschichte der Musik* (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1909), 177.

³⁷ See Friedrich von Schiller, "Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung" (1796), in *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 4 (Frankfurt: Insel Verlag, 1966).

³⁸ See, for example, Anonín Dvořák's views of Mozart as "sunshine" and his comparison of Mozart to Raphael in Othar Šourek, ed., *Antonín Dvořák: Letters and Reminiscences* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1955), 139–41.

³⁹ "Er die wunderwürdigste musikalische Organization repräsentiert, welche je dagewesen ist, und daß Keiner, weder vor noch nach ihm, die Idee der musikalischen Schönheit und musikalisch-künstlerischen Vollkommenheit so verkörpert hat, wie er. Wenn in der Musik vom klassischen Kunstideal (im antiken Sinne) die Rede ist, und wenn die Verwirklichung dieses Ideals in der vollkommenen Übereinstimmung und wechselseitigen Durchdringung von Inhalt und Form zu suchen ist, so steht Mozart allen Tondichtern voran." Eduard Bernsdorf, *Neues Universal-Lexikon der Tonkunst* (Dresden: Schaefer's Verlag, 1855–56), 2:1039.

⁴⁰ *M. G. Saphir's Konversations-Lexikon für Geist, Witz und Humor*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Gnadenfeld u. Comp., 1889), 2:94–107.

⁴¹ Robert Schumann, *Gesammelte Schriften*, 5th ed. (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1914), 2:213.

⁴² "Solch' ein Genius, solch ein Kind?—O wahrlich, ich sag' euch, / Werdet ihr so nicht, ihr kommt nie in den Himmel der Kunst." *Ibid.*, 278. For a closer examination of the childlike attributes of Mozart, see Maynard Solomon, "Mozart: The Myth of the Eternal Child," *19th-Century Music* 15 (1991): 95–106.

⁴³ Leon Plantinga, *Schumann as Critic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 92, 105.

⁴⁴ "Sein Pathos kein anderes war wie das der Schönheit, als der Klassiker im engsten Sinne, als der verkörperte Genius der Musik, des musikalisch Schönen in seiner Abgezogenheit von jeder Nebenabsicht und jeder Nebenbedeutung." Heinrich Köstlin, *Die Geschichte der Musik im Umriss*, 6th ed. (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1910), 433. It is ironic that the two major nineteenth-century biographies—by G. N. von Nissen (who married Mozart's widow) from 1828 and by Otto Jahn from 1856—contained a far more differentiated picture of the composer, despite a veneer of idealization. Jahn even questioned the quality of the early work and posited stages of development in Mozart's style. Nissen managed to integrate the romantic view of Mozart's human character with the usual rhetoric of genius and normative aesthetics.

⁴⁵ See Max Kalbeck, *Johannes Brahms* (Berlin: Deutsche Brahms-Gesellschaft, 1921), I/i:239, 255, and III/i:87.

⁴⁶ Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Culture and Value* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1980), 55.

⁴⁷ Gernot Gruber, *Mozart und die Nachwelt* (Munich: Piper, 1987), 97.

⁴⁸ Richard Wagner, *Prose Works*, trans. W. A. Ellis (New York: Broude, 1966), 1:121, and 2:34–41, 81–82.

⁴⁹ T. W. Adorno, *Einleitung in die Musiksoziologie* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1968), 31.

⁵⁰ See, for example, Otto Jahn, *W. A. Mozart* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel 1858), 3:300, 405.

⁵¹ *Die Grundlagen des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Bruckmann, 1909), 1:557.

⁵² See, for example, Emil Naumann, *Illustrierte Musikgeschichte* (Berlin and Stuttgart: Spemann, 1885), 2:726–95.

⁵³ See Gert Kerschbaumer, "Mozart schweigt," in *Die Zeit* 43 (October 18, 1991).

⁵⁴ See Kurt Weill's 1925 commentaries on Mozart's *Magic Flute* and *The Abduction from the Seraglio* in Kurt Weill, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1975), 141–44, and the references to Mozart in Schoenberg's great essay "Brahms the Progressive" from 1947, in *Style and Idea*, ed. Leonard Stein (London: Faber and Faber, 1975).