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In the third (1860) edition of Anton Felix Schindler’s indispensable though somewhat unreliable Beethoven biography, several passages sing the praises of an obscure critic named Amadeus Wendt to what seems an unwarranted degree:

One man, however, deserves to be elevated above his fellows, a single voice that was the first to separate itself from the chorus, shattering the old prejudices that favoured only the traditional and the familiar in music. This writer endeavoured to approach the spirit of Beethoven’s compositions and to reveal their special qualities.... We have already met him in his review of the C minor symphony written for the AmZ: Amadeus Wendt.¹

But the C-Minor Symphony review discussed by Schindler is in fact the famous 1810 review of the Fifth Symphony, well established by documentary evidence to be E. T. A. Hoffmann’s, so obviously Schindler has made some mistake.² This is not surprising, however, given that


² The documentary evidence is given in E. T. A. Hoffmann’s Musical Writings, ed., annotated, and introduced by David Charlton, trans. Martyn Clarke (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 301. Schindler claims (Schindler-MacArdle, 155–56) that Beethoven himself had learned that Wendt had written this review, but given that Beethoven thanked Hoffmann in 1820 for his kind remarks, this is unlikely.
Wendt’s assessments of instrumental music so clearly resemble Hoffmann’s:

For in order to develop the wonderful power and effect of instruments ever more, it was necessary to make use of them in the most multifarious combinations and exchanges, which could only be sufficiently motivated by a romantic and fanciful play of ideas. It is Beethoven who has made the primary contribution to this and has thereby had a powerful effect upon the most recent period of music. Himself an instrumental virtuoso, endowed with bold fantasy and a deep knowledge of the souls of each instrument, touched by Haydn’s joking humor and Mozart’s deep seriousness, he developed his romantic world of notes in which fantasy, given over to feeling, is dominant throughout and determines the progression of the modulation.³

This, from Wendt’s 1815 Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (AmZ) essay “Thoughts on new music, and van Beethoven’s music, specifically his Fidelio, by Prof. Am. Wendt” (hereafter the Fidelio review), is very similar to Hoffmann’s assessment of instrumental music in his famous Fifth Symphony review as “the most romantic of all arts – one might almost say the only one that is purely romantic[,]” one which “reveals to man an unknown realm, a world quite separate from the outer sensual world surrounding him[.]” He similarly sees instrumental music as rising through Haydn and Mozart to Beethoven, whose instrumental music “unveils before us the realm of the mighty and the immeasurable” and “sets in motion the machinery of awe, of fear, of terror, of pain, and awakens that infinite yearning which is the essence of romanticism.”⁴

A commonly read version of these remarks on Beethoven’s Fifth also commented on the Op. 70 trios, which had Hoffmann “as one who walks


along stray paths interwoven with all kinds of rare trees, plants, and wonderful flowers and becomes ever more deeply lost in them.”5 This labyrinthian imagery also has its parallel in Wendt’s writing, again from the 1815 *Fidelio* review:

Many works of Beethoven, for example, various symphonies and sonatas of his, can only be understood and evaluated as *musical fantasies*. In them, even the attentive listener often completely loses sight of the fundamental idea; he finds himself in a magnificent labyrinth, where on all sides luxuriant foliage and wonderfully rare flowers draw attention to themselves, but with no thread leading back to the restful homeland. The artist’s fantasy flows further onward without stopping, points of rest are seldom offered, and the impression made by something earlier is not infrequently obliterated by what comes after; the fundamental idea has completely disappeared, or else it only shimmers to the fore out of the distant darkness in the flow of the agitated harmony.6

Subtitled “Beethoven’s Mannerisms,” this section of Wendt’s essay goes on to assert that the overuse of *fantasia* or imagination leads to Beethoven’s “great mistakes.”7 Though Schindler does not quote the “great mistakes” remark, he does report Beethoven’s response to this criticism: “There is


much wisdom in what he said, but much of the mentality of a school boy, too. They ought to re-read it now, and then read it again after a few more years.”

Nevertheless, Schindler praises Wendt’s insight and laments “If only this excellent member of the Leipzig art tribunal had been able to hear the Ninth Symphony as well!” In fact Wendt probably did hear the Ninth at its Leipzig premiere, though his judgement—another “great mistake”—likely would not have pleased Schindler. This article will demonstrate that Amadeus Wendt was most likely the musical correspondent from Leipzig who reviewed the Ninth Symphony in the pages of the Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung in 1826, in a review that famously suggested the removal of the choral finale (setting Schiller’s An die Freude or “Ode to Joy”) and inspired A. B. Marx to a passionate defense of the Ninth. The attribution can be well established on circumstantial grounds, i.e., by tracing references in the critic’s other reviews and solidifying Wendt’s activity with the journal. Moreover, the language and views that the correspondent employs are fully consistent with Wendt’s. Examining the consistency between this judgement against the choral finale and the aforementioned Hoffmanesque views of instrumental music allows us to observe, from another angle, a moment in which the Ninth disrupts the relatively new romantic aesthetics of instrumental and vocal music.

Who is this Amadeus Wendt? This ought to be more easily addressed, yet (at present) the New Grove Dictionary has no entry for Amadeus Wendt. No comprehensive list of Wendt’s writings, nor even of his Beethoven criticism, has been assembled (see Appendix 1 for a first attempt). A general assessment of Wendt’s Beethoven criticism has been done by Robin Wallace in Beethoven’s Critics and, as part of a study of the Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (BamZ), by Elisabeth Bauer in Wie

---

8 Schindler-MacArdle, 186.
9 Schindler-MacArdle, 184n., in a footnote to a particularly Hoffmanesque passage; cf. Schindler, Biographie, I: 216 “Wäre es doch dem trefflichen Mitgliede des leipziger Kunstribunals vergönnt gewesen, auch die neunte Sinfonie zu hören!”
Both engage Wendt’s Beethoven criticism in a serious and reflective way, though they examine only a few of his writings. Most knowledge of Wendt derives from the aforementioned Fidelio review of 1815. Though this review is a complex piece of aesthetic writing, spread across six issues and taking up roughly fifty columns, it was summarily dismissed in MacArdle’s Beethoven Abstracts as “a not particularly enthusiastic analysis of Beethoven’s style.” A large and impressive body of Wendt’s musical and aesthetic writings, including much on Beethoven, is similarly neglected, though appearing in such high-profile music journals as the Leipzig Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (AmZ), the Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (BamZ), Cäcilia—even the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik (NZfM) founded shortly before Wendt died.

Because so little about Wendt is known or available, some basic knowledge about Wendt’s career and movements is given here in order to demonstrate that he was in a position to write the infamous 1826 Leipzig review. We can further gain insight into Wendt’s philosophical and musical views and see how they were consistent with the 1826 review, taking steps toward assembling a complete list of his Beethoven criticism.

**WENDT AS A LEIPZIGER AND MUSICIAN**

Amadeus Wendt (1783–1836), a highly-regarded professor of philosophy and aesthetics, was once well known as a music critic. His profound accomplishments were scattered over many disciplines—philosophy,

---


12 See Appendix 1 for complete citation. Translated in Senner, Wallace, and Meredith, *Critical Reception*, 185–222.

poetry, aesthetics, and theology as well as music. Contemporaries greatly esteemed Wendt’s musical judgments; his Beethoven criticism reportedly gave Beethoven himself pause for thought. Often spoken of in the same breath as Hoffmann, nineteenth-century biographical sources chronicled Wendt at a length comparable to that given Friedrich Rochlitz (editor of the *AmZ*), Adolf Bernhard Marx (Beethoven supporter and editor of the *BamZ*), and Ludwig Rellstab (reputedly responsible for the “Moonlight” title of the Op. 27, no. 2 sonata). Wendt’s importance to aesthetics is shown in his correspondence with leading German thinkers. Hegel, who clearly influenced Wendt, referred to him as a friend. Among composers, Carl Maria von Weber befriended Wendt in Dresden—the critic had wintered there in his years as a private tutor. Robert Schumann names Wendt among the Davidsbündler and had his work reviewed in the *NZfM*, a project which Wendt supported and to which he certainly would have contributed had he not died soon after its inception.


15 Correspondence exists with Hoffmann, Goethe, Heine, Tieck, Novalis, Fichte, and others; see the Kalliope Verbundkatalog Nachlässe und Autographen <http://www.kalliope-portal.de/>., created by the Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft.


18 Schumann (*Jugendbriebe*) wrote that “A group of cultivated young people... have drawn together a circle about me[.] We are preoccupied with the notion of a major new music
Born Johann Gottlieb Wendt on 29 September 1783, he possibly adopted the Latinate Amadeus in emulation of his favorite composer, Mozart—as had E. T. A. Hoffmann (born Ernst Theodor Wilhelm). Thoroughly a Leipziger, Wendt was a day-student at the very Thomasschule where J. S. Bach had taught some fifty years earlier; his talent earned him free lessons with its cantor, J. G. Schicht (also director of the Gewandhaus).¹⁹ Wendt is listed as a discantist for the Singechor (later the Gewandhauschor) at the age of four and given free access to Gewandhaus concerts.²⁰ Later, around 1794, Wendt sang in the opera chorus for Italian and German operas and received free admission to the opera theater.²¹ Clearly by his teens Wendt had ample opportunity to cultivate a knowledge of concert and opera repertory, and his lifelong championship of proper expression in vocal settings, church music, and opera was probably founded in these early experiences.

Despite his musical interests, Wendt deferred to his parents’ wishes and enrolled in the course of theology at the University of Leipzig in 1801, which earned him the Doctor of Philosophy in 1804. Yet it was apparently his bent for philosophy and aesthetics that advanced him steadily through the academic ranks: Habilitationsschrift in 1808, außerordentlicher Professor of Philosophy at the University of Leipzig in 1810, ordentlicher Professor in
1816. Shortly thereafter he began editing the *Leipziger Kunstblatt* (1817–18) and continually had his hand in poetic anthologies. In 1821 he was elected to the board of directors for the Gewandhaus concerts, a position he retained until he left Leipzig in 1829. And he continued to sing, even being an officer for the Musikverein, one of Leipzig’s many amateur choirs. Wendt was clearly dedicated to the intellectual and cultural life of Leipzig, and was tied to all its major institutions—including one of its masonic lodges.

Wendt continued his academic publishing (in Latin and German) to the end of his life. Yet most of Wendt’s contemporaries considered his crowning achievement to be his first musical book, *Rossini’s Life and Acts* (1824), a translation-edition which developed his penchant for comparing German and Italian opera and was praised for its German patriotic slant. This book earned him the title of Privy Councillor (*Hofrat*) of Hesse-Darmstadt in 1825. In 1829, Wendt’s years as a Leipzig institution came to a close: he was named Royal Hanoverian Privy Councillor and at Easter took over the University of Göttingen position recently vacated by the philosopher Friedrich Bouterweck (1766–1828). Wendt lectured there on aesthetics until his own death on 15 October 1836 of apoplectic seizure. In the Göttingen years, as well as editing the *Musenalmanach* (1830–1832), Wendt published two more important musical books: the 1831 *On the Principle Eras of the Fine Arts*, which gives a general music history, and the

---

1836 On the Present State of Music, Especially in Germany.\textsuperscript{27} In the latter, as Leon Plantinga noted, he seems to have been the first to designate a “classical” period encompassing the works of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven.\textsuperscript{28}

**Wendt as Critic**

Although his extensive music criticism and literary pursuits were avocational, they won Wendt the most acclaim during his life. His critical strengths appeared in any capacity that combined poetic or dramatic criticism with musical. His most insightful writings are, like the 1815 review of Beethoven’s *Fidelio*, inspired by operatic performances—Weber’s *Euryanthe*, Spohr’s *Berggeist*, Mozart’s *Entführung*, and Marschner’s *Vampyr*—and are typically aesthetic essays more than performance reviews. Essays on the singer Madame Catalani, for example, discuss the difference between German and Italian opera, a pet topic of Wendt’s also manifest in the *Fidelio* review.

Wendt’s reputation as a music critic began as early as 1808 when he submitted his first essay to the Leipzig *AmZ*: “On the Influence of Music on Character.” In 1811 he wrote for the *AmZ* again, on the problems that result from employing music for edifying but not principally aesthetic purposes.\textsuperscript{29} On the strength of these essays alone Wendt was considered an important critic.\textsuperscript{30} The Leipzig *AmZ* was the natural choice for Wendt’s work—not just because it was the only major music journal, but because Wendt was a

\textsuperscript{27} Ueber die Hauptperioden der schönen Kunst; oder die Kunst im Laufe der Weltgeschichte (Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1831); *Ueber den gegenwärtigen Zustand der Musik, besonders in Deutschland, und wie er geworden* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1836).


\textsuperscript{29} See Appendix 1 of Wendt’s writings.

\textsuperscript{30} He is lauded as a critic in Gerber’s 1814 *Neues historisches-biographisches Lexikon der Tonkunst* (Kühnel), IV: 544, though his inclusion may also be because Wendt was such a prominent member of the Leipzig musical community.
Leipziger. Though he and editor Rochlitz were apparently not close, they were later both on the concert board of directors for the Leipzig Gewandhaus—the only qualified musicians amid a sea of lawyers and businessmen. After Rochlitz stopped editing the *AmZ* in 1818 the journal became increasingly stuck in the past; at the same time, Wendt’s byline disappears; there is no evidence that he participated in the journal after Rochlitz left. Perhaps Wendt’s move to rival journals was prompted by disenchantment with the turn the *AmZ* took under its later editors Härtel and Fink.

Perhaps he intended to rival the *AmZ* himself, for he launched the *Leipziger Kunstblatt* in 1817–18 which came out three times a week; he likely contributed most of the theater and musical reviews as well as several signed essays (including reviews of Beethoven works, such as the Eighth Symphony). Wendt was also writing extensively for the widely-read *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände* and the *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*. Somehow he also found time to edit the *Taschenbuch für geselligen Vergnügen* while working on the 1824 *Rossini* translation and the edition of Tennemann’s multi-volume *Geschichte der Philosophie* (1825), alongside his numerous commitments to the University, Gewandhaus, and other Leipzig institutions.

In this period Wendt likely became the regular Leipzig correspondent for the Viennese journal *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den österreichischen Kaiserstaat* (informally *Wiener allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* or *WamZ*), which began in 1817. Wendt’s signed 1820 *WamZ* article on Bernhard Romberg, “On Violoncello Concertos,” is a lengthy harangue claiming that—despite Romberg’s evident achievement—certain instruments (particularly bass instruments, such as the violoncello) are not suited to solo playing. The “Musical Reports from Leipzig” in 1820 signed A. W. are quite in Wendt’s style and probably represent his work as a musical correspondent for the *WamZ*, later

---

32 Schilling notes that Wendt made several anonymous contributions to various journals, but not whether any were to the *AmZ* specifically.

1824, a banner year for Wendt with his new Rossini book, was also a milestone for music journalism with the founding of two new and important rivals to Leipzig’s Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung: A. B. Marx’s Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (BamZ) and Gottfried Weber’s Cäcilia, in Mainz. Of course, 1824 also marks the completion and premiere of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, which became the subject of some debate in all these journals. Wendt participated in both the BamZ and Cäcilia from the first year on; the fact that he did so points to his commitment to music criticism and also suggests that he was far from reactionary. Wendt contributed important essays on expression to both, among other essays, opera and concert reviews. Two of Wendt’s characteristic opera review-essays appear in the BamZ in these years, on romantic operas: Weber’s Euryanthe and Spohr’s Berggeist—the latter, from late 1827, was a continuation of Wendt’s regular series on the Winter 1826–27 opera season titled “Opera in Leipzig,” appearing between April and June 1827.

VOCAL AND INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

Wendt’s opinions of instrumental music have already been hinted at by the comparisons to Hoffmann. Both critics outline the history of instrumental music as a progression through Haydn through Mozart to Beethoven, to position Beethoven as the pinnacle of instrumental music and the

---

34 Regarding signatures: in the Leipziger Kunstblatt, Wendt takes responsibility for theater articles in the Morgenblatt signed A. W., but not for poetry in the Zeitung für die Elegante Welt with the same signature. A spate of Viennese concert reviews by W____t in WamZ in 1822 and early 1823 do not match Wendt’s typical style and content, and they would suggest a Viennese writer. Wendt apparently did visit Vienna in 1819 according to the Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände, 13 No. 268 (9 Nov. 1819), 1072.

35 Despite the mistaken initials, Fétis’s Biographie Universelle lists this article as one of eight important ones for which Wendt is responsible. F. A. Wendt, “Über den Zustand der Musik in deutschland. Eine Skizze,” WamZ 6, no. 93 (20 Nov. 1822): 737–39; no. 94 (23 Nov. 1822): 745–50; no. 95 (27 Nov. 1822), 753–56; no. 97 (4 Dec. 1822): 769–71.
representative of romanticism. Wendt’s Hegelian-Hoffmanesque slant is also visible in the 1836 On the Present State of Music, which similar treats Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven as a progression from the “necessary” to the “beautiful” to the “overflowing”—Haydn adheres to form over content, Mozart gives them equal sway, Beethoven allows content to override form. Yet Wendt distinguishes himself from contemporaries such as A. B. Marx by preferring a retreat from Beethovenian decadence to the middle stage of Mozartean balance, and exhibits a distaste for orchestral accompaniments that overwhelm singers.

While Wendt’s aesthetics of vocal music can best be gleaned from his mature contributions on opera, his compositional activity may be a minor index as well. Frequently referred to by contemporaries but rarely specified, Wendt’s compositions were probably limited to lieder, cantatas, and choral works. Two early song publications are extant: a set of five Goethe lieder, published by the Leipzig firm Breitkopf und Härtel between 1804–5, and a collection of six songs by various poets including Schiller, Tieck, and Goethe from around 1810 by Simrock in Bonn (Figure 1). Gustav Schilling’s opinion that Wendt was a mostly competent but not brilliant

37 Lieder von Goethe, mit Begleitung des Claviers componirt und dem Dichter zugeeignet von Amadeus Wendt (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, [1805]), in the William A. Speck collection of Goethiana (Yale Collection of German Literature, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library). Sechs Lieder von Schiller, Goethe, Herder und Tiek... (Bonn und Köln bey N. Simrock, [1810]), Yale University’s Irving S. Gilmore Music Library special collections (Lowell Mason Catalogue), reviewed in the AmZ 20, no. 32 (12 Aug.): 584. A set of Romanzen und Lieder beym Clavier zu singen published by C. G. Weigel (Leipzig), not currently known to be extant, is reviewed in the Zeitung für die elegante Welt 5, no. 77 [27 Jun. 1805], 614–16, which also publishes a song “Hebe’s Antwort” in the Intelligenzblatt 54 (29 Oct. 1805); another song, “Kanonette,” is in the Intelligenzblatt 21 (12 May 1804), which may also be from this collection. Another similar title is published by A. Kühnel, Bureau de musique around 1808. There is also evidence for an Easter cantata, Die Auferstehung, written with Julius Otto (performed at his death); a Cantate zur Feier eines Friedensfestes (1806), a Frühlings-Cantate (1806), and a Hochzeits-Cantate (1808)—the latter three advertised in the AmZ. He also contributed to a Liedertafel for four male voices (Peters) around 1808, and several manuscripts in RISM suggest he planned a collection of Liedertafel settings in the 1820s.
musician seems borne out by these juvenilia. For example, “Das Mädchen am Ufer” (1810) exhibits jarring parallel fifths in the accompaniment (Figure 2, mm. 3–4).

**Figure 1:** Amadeus Wendt, *Sechs Lieder von Schiller, Göthe, Herder und Tieck*. Bonn: Simrock, [1810]. Irving S. Gilmore Music Library, Yale University.

---

The songs uphold the aesthetics outlined by Wendt in his criticism: a decided preference for strophic lieder, but whose music is nevertheless tightly bound to the text in expressive aim. One might expect Wendt, then, to denounce through-composition and the Romantic lied, yet he seems able to lay aside his strophic ideals in order to evaluate the expression. In his 1833 Cäcilia article “On German Song Composition,” Wendt’s skepticism of through-composed solutions is balanced by his consideration of Zumsteeg’s through-composed ballads as a genuine attempt to serve the poetry via the music. He credits Schubert as being inventive and
characteristic, although he has minor text-setting concerns. Interestingly, he blames poets (rather than composers) for the turn to through-composition. The composer’s inability to capture the dramatic arc of the poetry in a strophic setting is due to the poet’s injecting too much dramatic contrast and leaving behind the literary boundaries of the simple lied; the composer (swayed somewhat by the contrasts of opera) has only followed. In his own lieder, whose texts are carefully chosen for their simplicity, Wendt sometimes modifies the strophic form, giving directions to change the expression in subsequent stanzas or even including alternate passages (as in Figure 1) in order to achieve unity of expression between the text and melody. It is worth pointing out that Wendt himself composed a version of Schiller’s An die Freude for Liedertafel or convivial male choir (TTBB) in a “kräftig” or mighty C Major, and thus would have had fairly definite text-setting ideas that likely would not have agreed with Beethoven’s Ninth finale.

The essay “On German Song Composition” addresses not just song but instrumental music, observing:

A new period for song composition was entered when the grand triumvirate in German art music lifted instrumental music to the pinnacle of clarity, fullness and characteristic meaning. From now on harmony in the Lied would become richer and more meaningful.

Evidently already used to thinking of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven as a “triumvirate,” Wendt then divides song composers into those who submit to the claims of poetry and those who strive for the characteristic, viewing

---

it as natural that composers would tend toward the dramatic representations of operatic writing in the lied. Nevertheless, Wendt does defend the purity of the lied against admixtures with opera or instrumental music. Beethoven’s vocal writing is thus criticized as being overly instrumental and suffering from excessive Phantasie; Beethoven’s lieder show his genius in characterization and interpretation, “but his full strength really works against the symmetric limitations of the lied.”

Although the 1815 *Fidelio* review is overused as a representative of Wendt’s extensive output, it is nevertheless a fair representation of his views, which do not change much over his career (as the consistency with the 1833 “On German Song Composition” shows). The *Fidelio* review demonstrates Wendt’s preference for vocal music over instrumental; it shows the concerns of the philosopher; it also underscores his commitment to the necessities of repeated hearings, an open mind, and independent judgement. The review displays the expertise of the theater critic in his attention to the demands of the drama, and it certainly shows the reserve and verbosity characteristic of Wendt’s academic voice. Its colossal length is devoted mainly to questions about aesthetics, only focusing on the opera in question toward the end. The opening section “Higher Musical Art” introduces a rhapsodic tone to what is essentially a treatise on vocal music, leading to the section “Beethoven’s Musical Character” praised by Schindler. Sections titled “Reproaches on Difficulty and Incomprehensibility” and “The New German Instrumental Music; Instrumentation and the Reproach of a Too-Strong Instrumentation” reiterate Wendt’s frequent concerns about excessive virtuosity and an overwhelming instrumental accompaniment—his bête noir in any vocal work. Indeed, Wendt makes similar criticisms regarding the overwhelming of voices by instruments in his notes to *Rossini’s Life and Acts*; Beethoven, Cherubini, Mehul, Spontini, and Rossini all fall prey to “learned difficulty, forced melodies, overladen harmonies and modulations, drowning-out of

---

the vocal part, and especially a brooding and mannerism…” all of which, as he says, look better on paper than they sound to the ear.44

Schindler, as aforementioned, disapproved of Wendt’s comments on “Beethoven’s Mannerisms” from the 1815 Fidelio review. Yet Wendt’s judgement that “many works of Beethoven… can only be understood and evaluated as musical fantasies”45 is fundamental to Wendt’s thinking and would be at play in the critic’s reading of the Ninth. Wendt’s writings repeatedly note that a powerful Phantasie, contravening established generic and harmonic norms, is the main characteristic of Beethoven’s works—though indeed many others of Wendt’s generation shared this view. The critic does not target the use of Phantasie but its over-indulgence, which leads to “great mistakes”:

Musical fantasy is for the most part forgiven for sins against form and rules if a great spirit controls it; it is a delightful product if the technical assurance of the master brings it unintentionally but universally to light. But to carry this character of fantasy over into other works of music, and thus to make musical fantasy dominant in the domain of the world of notes, can only lead to great mistakes. An effusive wealth of ideas and an inexhaustive originality can thereby be made manifest, but clarity, comprehensibility, and order, by means of which the work of art becomes a work, not of momentary moods, but of continuous enjoyment, will often be missing. Here it is that I will speak also of Beethoven’s great mistakes, for I do not intend to become his eulogist, feeling myself neither called nor justified in doing so, but rather to evaluate impartially his influence on the

45 Senner, Wallace, and Meredith, Critical Reception, 199. See also note 80.
most recent musical art and his character according to my ability and insight.  

It is this fantastic element that is behind Wendt’s descriptions of Beethoven as the “Jean Paul” and the “Shakespeare” of music—compliments that are not without reservations.  

Those reservations inherent in a discussion of Beethoven’s “great mistakes” were incendiary to Schindler, but are less so if they are understood—as the philosopher-critic surely intended them to be—with respect to concepts of genius developed by Addison, Longinus, and Kant which became current in the eighteenth century.  

In such conceptions, the work of genius may come with inherent flaws, but because the greatness of intent would also be lost if the flaws were to be edited out, they are permitted to stand.  

(As the popular treatise on the sublime attributed to Longinus states, “Precision in every detail comes perilously...  


near littleness,” or in the words of Alexander Pope,

Great wits sometimes may gloriously offend
And rise to faults true critics dare not mend.\(^{50}\)

Wendt decrees that Beethoven’s fantasy or imagination is proof of his great originality and thus of his genius, but also (as unlearned or natural genius does) incidentally produces flaws. Yet these flaws themselves are not to be imitated, nor do they override the rules. Kant called the deliberate cultivation of original flaws “mannerism” in the *Critique of Judgement*:

But this imitation becomes a mere *aping* if the scholar *copies* everything down to the deformities, which the genius must have let pass only because he could not well remove them without weakening his idea. This mental characteristic is meritorious only in the case of a genius. A certain *audacity* in expression—and in general many a departure from common rules—becomes him well, but it is in no way worthy of imitation; it always remains a fault in itself which we must seek to remove, though the genius is, as it were, privileged to commit it, because the inimitable rush of his spirit would suffer from overanxious carefulness. *Mannerism* is another kind of aping, viz. of mere *peculiarity* (originality) in general, by which a man separates himself as far as possible from imitators, without however possessing the talent to be at the same time *exemplary*.\(^{51}\)

No doubt Wendt, who was after all a philosophy professor, intended to echo Kant in his warnings to Beethoven on “mannerism”:

His originality loses itself thereby in strangeness and caprice. We will not deny, though, that Beethoven can free himself from this mannerism when he *wants to*; his spirit is too great and original to find it necessary to *strive* for originality and, in place of it, to seize upon caprice and strangeness, into

\(^{50}\) [Longinus], 61; Pope, *An Essay on Criticism* (London: W. Lewis, 1711), 11.

which a too-little controlled susceptibility to outward circumstances may also lead him astray.\textsuperscript{52}

Such statements, that Beethoven’s originality occasionally shades over into a forced mannerism, are clearly what makes Wendt seem “not particularly enthusiastic” about Beethoven. But as Wallace rightly points out, the preceding parts of Wendt’s review had been “nothing less than ecstatic.”\textsuperscript{53} In fact, the \textit{Fidelio} review in general vindicates the idea that the inherent flaws of a work of genius ought not to be corrected, by applauding Beethoven’s original choices in \textit{Leonore} over the expediencies of the 1814 \textit{Fidelio} revision.

\textit{Phantasie} appears more tolerable to Wendt in instrumental music than in vocal music, and significantly his criticisms of Beethoven’s \textit{Phantasie} appear mainly in reviews of vocal music. Some concession is made to drama in operatic or dramatic vocal genres, and in the \textit{Fidelio} review he does claim that text can provide a thread through the labyrinth of \textit{Phantasie}:

[If] music consequently appears to be limited by being combined with poetry, it becomes at the same time more specific, more understandable—indeed, we might even say more human—through this combination. The poet becomes the expounder of its heavenly visions; he lends to the listener the thread upon which he descends into the subterranean depths that higher musical art opens up, so that its wings may carry him back into the happy, clear kingdom of heaven in which notes powerfully prevail.\textsuperscript{54}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{52} Wendt, “Gedanken über... \textit{Fidelio}, 388; trans. Senner, Wallace, and Meredith, 201. “Dabey verliert sich aber seine Originalität in Sonderbarkeit u. Willkür. Indes mögen wir damit nicht lügnen, dass Beethoven sich von diser Manier frey machen könne, wenn er will; sein Geist ist zu gross und originell, als dass er es nötig hätte, nach Originalität zu streben, und statt ihrer das Willkürliche und Sonderbare zu ergreifen, wozu ihn auch vielleicht eine zu wenig gehemmte Reizbarkeit fur äussere Verhältnisse verleiten mag.”

\textsuperscript{53} Wallace, \textit{Beethoven’s Critics}, 30.

\textsuperscript{54} Wendt, “Gedanken über... \textit{Fidelio}, 346; trans. in Senner, Wallace, and Meredith, \textit{Critical Reception}, 186; “Wenn demnach die Musik durch Verbindung mit der Poesie beschränkt zu werden scheint, so wird sie auf der andern Seite auch bestimmter, vernehmlicher, ja wir möchten sagen menschlicher durch diese Verbindung. Der Dichter wird der Ausleger ihrer himmlischen Gesichte, er leiht dem Höher den Faden, an welchem er hinabsteigt in die unterirdischen Tiefen, welche die höhere Tonkunst aufschliesst, den
\end{flushright}
Yet, again, Wendt also claims the *Phantasie* which makes Beethoven the foremost instrumental composer causes him the kind of error that particularly interferes with vocal composition. It would be a misunderstanding to ascribe this criticism to Wendt’s preference for vocal music, or to think that because of this preference he did not appreciate the transcendental nature of instrumental music. Rather, with both instrumental and vocal genres he claims Beethoven’s *Phantasie*, though the birthright of genius, represents a threat to musical beauty if not checked or if inappropriately imitated. It is as a philosopher and not as a listener that Wendt cautions Beethoven (or rather, his imitators) in the 1815 *Fidelio* review.

Nearly a decade later, in 1824, these complaints about *Phantasie* began to resurface in connection with Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, particularly its controversial vocal finale. Here we must weave together the journalistic aspect of Wendt’s career and the aesthetic angle he was likely to take on the Ninth in order to place him as the musical correspondent from Leipzig and understand the debate that took place between him and A. B. Marx in the pages of the *BamZ*. The controversy itself has been covered in depth, of course, not least because the *BamZ* controversy was an intelligent demonstration of the broader debate regarding Beethoven’s late works. Though much of the contemporary criticism concerning the Ninth has been dismissed as reactionary, the *BamZ* conversation was carried out on a particularly reflective level.

**THE NINTH IN THE BERLINER ALLGEMEINE MUSIKALISCHE ZEITUNG**

This relatively genial debate began with a review of two performances of the Ninth in Leipzig on 6 March and 30 March 1826 (following the Viennese premiere on 7 May 1824 and the 1825 performances in London, Frankfurt, and Aachen).\(^5^5\) The documents of this debate can be seen in Table 1. Most

---

analysis of the debate begins not with the review but rather with the gauntlet cast down by A. B. Marx in two contributions to the 22 November 1826 issue of his journal. For example, Wallace’s *The Critical Reception of Beethoven’s Compositions by His German Contemporaries, Op. 125* begins its translation of the debate with the first of these two contributions, a self-standing review of the score of the Ninth published in August, including Marx’s famous judgement of the finale:

[Beethoven] has not sought out a random concluding chorus for an instrumental piece..., nor a composition of Schiller’s ode, nor the musical expression of its content, or even of its words—just song, the simplest manner of human musical speech, in order to glorify it with the victory over the world of instruments.\(^{57}\)

Marx followed this up in the same issue with an anonymous defense of the Ninth, “To Berlin friends of art. From one in your midst.” It obliquely referred to the impressions of the Leipzig correspondent recorded in two installments of the unsigned serial review “On Several Music Performances in Leipzig” (28 June and 5 July), translated in Appendix 2. Wendt (or the Leipzig correspondent) responded to Marx on 20 December, apparently viewing this letter as a *sotto voce* criticism of his review—and a not-so-quiet criticism of the Leipzig orchestra and audience; Marx printed it with his own rejoinder.

**Table 1:** Dates of Leipzig Performances of the Ninth and Pertinent Reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Document</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 March 1826</td>
<td>First Leipzig performance: Konzert zum Besten des Orchester-Pensionfonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 1826</td>
<td>Second Leipzig performance: by request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence: On several performances in Leipzig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsigned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Score of the Ninth published.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[August 1826]</td>
<td>Schott [Mainz, Paris, Antwerp]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Third Leipzig performance: without Finale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 October 1826</td>
<td>BamZ III/47, 373–78.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. B. Marx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Symphony with concluding chorus on Schiller’s Ode to Joy, composed by Ludwig van Beethoven.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 November 1826</td>
<td>BamZ III/47, 383–84.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. B. Marx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Miscellaneous: To Berlin friends of art. From one in your midst.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–Der musikalische Korrespondent aus Leipzig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Some words on the interpretation of the new Beethoven symphony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 December 1826</td>
<td>BamZ III/51, 415–16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. B. Marx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Leipzig correspondent’s criticisms have become familiar to us. Despite the “greatness of intention [and] gigantic imagination,” he says it made an unfavorable impression on the audience, insisting that neither mistakes in
the performance nor the receptivity of the audience were to blame, though he admits that the orchestra worked from the parts alone without a full score.\footnote{58} Most of the criticism is, as might be expected, reserved for the finale, particularly the treatment and rearrangement of Schiller’s poem. On the bass singer’s recitative, he wrote: “How can a man who had grasped Goethe’s spirit in Egmont so deeply, introduce Schiller’s hymn with such triviality?”—reminiscent of Ludwig Spohr’s criticism of the finale (“so ugly, in such bad taste, and in the conception of Schiller’s Ode so cheap that I cannot even now understand how such a genius as Beethoven could write it down”).\footnote{59} The critic also found the poetry to be misaccentuated and the tune to be crass, saying it “bears not even the slightest amount of Schiller’s noble spirit, and, especially where it is taken up faster, is far more compatible with common drunkenness, than with the spiritual enthusiasm of that Poet’s[.]” The finale should be eliminated, recommended the critic, and the other three movements rearranged so as to end with the Scherzo. (A third Leipzig performance in this arrangement did take place, on October 19, suggesting that the critic carried some weight with the Gewandhaus directors.) The fact that the anonymous correspondent from Leipzig holds views similar to Wendt’s, particularly concerning musical expression, Phantasie, overwhelming orchestral accompaniments, and treatment of text, supports the attribution. Indeed, Robin Wallace conjectures that, if either \textit{had} reviewed it, neither E. T. A. Hoffmann nor Amadeus Wendt “would have thought much of the finale of the Ninth Symphony. No doubt Hoffmann would have found it too simplistic, Wendt too crass for his liking.”\footnote{60} The latter is what we find in the anonymous review, with its accusations of triviality and common drunkenness.

In this context (though some months later) came Marx’s full-fledged and highly positive review of the newly published full score of the Ninth—

\footnote{58}{"Ueber mehre[re] Musik-aufführungen in Leipzig,” \textit{BamZ} 3, no. 26 (28 June 1826): 203; no. 27 (5 July 1826): 214. See Appendix 2.}
\footnote{60}{Wallace, \textit{Beethoven’s Critics}, 56.}
of which neither the Leipzig performances nor its critic had had the benefit. In the same issue, writing anonymously to Berlin “friends of art,” Marx argues that the performances must have been inadequate, citing Leipzig’s overanxious zeal to hear the work. Contemporaries must have found it difficult to weigh these evaluations: Marx (or the “friend of art”) had perhaps never heard a performance, and Wendt (or the anonymous critic) had never seen the score. The Leipzig critic, now signing himself Der musikalische Korrespondent aus Leipzig, responded on 20 December to defend both the preparation of the Leipzig orchestra and his review, claiming the performance as a better indicator of the work than the score:

But here I ask, if that friend of art is suspicious of the impression which that work is said to have brought forth by a repeated performance in Leipzig, and of the insight of the undersigned, because it doesn’t agree with his own: through what means does he wish to ground his opinion that it is the deepest and most mature instrumental work of the most inspired composer, before the same is brought to public performance even a single time in Berlin? Perhaps from the score? Viewing that can replace hearing only to a certain degree, because much in musical compositions is easier to see than to hear; and in this case, judging after a mere examination of the score would likely be even more impetuous than from a two-performance run from the parts.61

Marx, as editor, rebuts in the same issue (“Erwiderung”) and reveals his identity as the “friend of art” while defending his objectivity. He suggests

that the symphony in question is too difficult to perform without a score and that the deaf Beethoven himself is the (somewhat circular) proof that one need not hear a work to realize it adequately.

Several subtexts make themselves felt in this debate. There are hints of issues that reach far into the future, such as whether the authentic work of art resides in the score or in the performance. No doubt the Leipzig critic felt a bit baited, as Marx had deliberately printed his review before the score was published—a footnote to the Leipzig review reads “At the Editor’s request the Author has not delayed the report on this work until the publication of the score.”

There are also traces of cultural rivalry between Leipzig and Berlin: the Leipziger’s tone reveals injured civic pride in response to the perceived slight against the quality of the Gewandhaus performances and the receptivity of its music-going public. He notes Marx “seems to have forgotten” the degree to which Beethoven’s music had been celebrated and performed in Leipzig; indeed, just the previous year Marx had been lauding the Leipzig orchestra’s contrast to Berlin’s poor example in presenting and celebrating Beethoven symphonies. The correspondent further notes that Leipzigers have always treated the performance of a Beethoven symphony as a “Fest” (as Wendt repeatedly noted elsewhere, such as in his 1836 monograph) whereas some cities—like Berlin—had yet to hear all of them performed. As even Marx’s review pointed out that

63 Sanna Pederson, “A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German National Identity,” 19th-Century Music 18, no. 2 (Autumn 1994), 98: “Only when we in Berlin have come as far as Leipzig, where year-round all the Beethoven symphonies and those by other masters are performed, will then the sense of the public for such artworks be sharper and more responsive.” See Marx, “Korrespondenz: Berlin, den 30. November 1825,” BamZ 2 (1825): 396.
64 “Einige Worte über die Auffassung der neuen Symphonie Beethovens,” 414 (“...dass es dem größten Theile der Theilnehmer jener Anstalt stets ein Fest ist, eine Symphonie Beethovens wieder zu hören—während an vielen andern, selbst grossen Orten bisher nur mit einiger Symphonien Beethovens Aufführungsversuche gemacht worden sind.”) For Wendt’s descriptions of Leipzigers’ reception of Beethoven’s instrumental music as a Fest, see “Ueber das Abonnement-Konzert in Leipzig,” BamZ 4, no. 49 (1827): 400, regarding Egmont: “Es ist dies jedesmal unserm Publikum ein grosses Fest.” See also Wendt, Ueber den gegenwärtigen Zustand, 8: “ja wie einst, und nicht viel früher, das Erscheinen eines neuen Schiller’schen Drama’s, so war jedes Erscheinen einer neuen Symphonie von
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Leipzig was perhaps the best orchestra in Europe at that time (and the most practiced with Beethoven symphonies), the critic notes that if any audience was prepared to receive the work, it was that of the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra; Marx himself would have agreed there was no better ensemble to present it.

In Marx’s defense there is reason to believe that the first Leipzig performances were not as good as they later became under Mendelssohn. The number of players in the 1826 Gewandhaus orchestra was still small—probably fewer than 40.\(^{65}\) No doubt substantial difficulties were later removed because Mendelssohn used a baton, whereas the 1826 performances had been led by the concertmaster, Matthai, in the old style with a bow. Mendelssohn also ended the practice of dual direction of the orchestra and chorus. The use of women rather than boy sopranos in Mendelssohn’s performances also might have made for stronger and more experienced singers.\(^{66}\) Nevertheless there is also reason to believe the Ninth has become paradigmatic in part because Marx and others, taking Beethoven’s primacy as their guiding principle, put so much effort toward shifting contemporary judgement by invoking a vision of Beethoven’s intentions. As one follows criticism of the Ninth into the mid-century, it is evident that better performances and a younger generation of critics were at work in improving reception, but so was a willingness to trust Beethoven’s intentions despite repeated negative impressions. Without this willingness, neither the circumspect calls of the Leipzig audience for a repeat performance nor the enthusiasm of individual critics could have brought the Ninth into favor; it was far more than a few extra performances

---

\(^{65}\) Adam Carse, *The Orchestra from Beethoven to Berlioz* (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1948), 134–35. Carse denigrates the Gewandhaus orchestra’s capabilities because few of the musicians were virtuosi and Leipzig had no history of a court or opera orchestra (131–33). But because it was a standing orchestra, and because it was willing to undertake more rehearsals than other orchestras (133), and because the orchestra was judged to be doing well specifically in the 1820s, we can guess that its performances of the Ninth were better than the premieres in Vienna and London.

before the Ninth was performed to the satisfaction and understanding even of its supporters.

The correspondent, however, wished to take the Ninth on its own merits, and refused to use Beethoven’s intentions or past successes as presumptive for the success of the Ninth. Kanne and Marx—the most sympathetic reviewers of the Ninth until Berlioz—are both somewhat tainted in this regard. Kanne seems to view accepting the Ninth as an honor done to a composer who had suffered and achieved so much; the Leipzig correspondent wished to judge the work “without any regard for the master’s personal circumstances,” which the Viennese audience could hardly do when the spectacle of the composer deafly conducting was so much a part of the premiere.\footnote{“Ueber mehrere Musik-aufführungen in Leipzig,” 204. See Appendix 2. Kanne noted, “What feeling person who was present at both days of the performance and saw the transfigured master… would not wish from the bottom of his heart that the reward for his efforts… may cheer the master and lift him above the disturbing conditions!” \textit{WamZ} 8, no. 44 (1824): 173–74, trans. David Benjamin Levy, “Early Performances of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony: A Documentary Study of Five Cities,” Ph.D. diss. (Rochester: University of Rochester, Eastman School of Music, 1980), 97.}

But the correspondent’s admonitions seem particularly targeted at Marx. He warns specifically against the fallacy of petitio principii—begging the question by making the conclusion the premise, concluding Beethoven’s greatness from his greatness. Whereas Marx’s explicitly pro-Beethoven agenda for the \textit{BamZ} almost requires an \textit{a priori} assumption of the value of Beethoven’s work, the correspondent refuses to be “beat[en]… over the head with the authority of the earlier Beethoven works” in judging the present one.\footnote{“Ueber mehrere Musik-aufführungen in Leipzig,” 216. See Appendix 2. See Pederson, 102–3, also Burnham, 230–39, on Marx’s agenda.}

The consequences of accepting the Ninth, the correspondent indicates, would be an elevation of originality for its own sake over aesthetic judgement as it was known. He concludes with a prediction of the death of criticism and the ascendancy of a “might makes right” philosophy of art:

So now one wants to say: the great artist has cast off all the rules that applied before now and must be measured according to a completely new
standard, which he himself produces; this statement is generally true in relation to the historical advances of art and criticism, but it cannot be extended so far that all fundamentals of an art are also overthrown with it, whereby human judgement and comprehension could never enter into the discussion; and neither I nor anyone else might then indulge in judgement over such an object, because no difference would be recognized between the nature of art and of the subjective whim of the artist, and all suggestion that is expressed with that great strength must be esteemed for the best and highest of art. 69

Any sublime statement, anything that breaks the rules, must therefore be beyond criticism. Proponents of the work have employed just the tactic predicted here: “Away with the critical measuring-stick, it is too small” demands one; Tovey declares the Ninth must be treated as “a law unto itself.” 70 Behind the Leipzig critic’s adherence to formal standards lay a fear for which we can now muster some sympathy: the Ninth, if accepted, represented a crushing, suffocating burden of originality. Nor can we dismiss this concern for the role of criticism in the era of the originality imperative as misplaced, though we might believe the old (and somewhat obscure) critical standards to be as arbitrary as Marx’s a priori acceptance.

It is, of course, the vocal finale which prompted this concern. Marx’s well-known programmatic idea for the symphony, that song conquers and humanizes the instrumental world, requires the finale as a necessary


70 The first is from August Schmidt, in the 1843 Allgemeine Wiener Musik-Zeitung, cited in Levy, “Early Performances…,” 133. See also Donald Francis Tovey, Essays in Musical Analysis vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935), 6.
summation of the work, whereas the critic suggested eliminating it (cognizant that this would destroy the Marxian program). This idea that the vocal element humanizes music would seem almost Wendtian; Wendt had spoken in 1815 of poetry as humanizing the romantic ineffable in the passage quoted above, in which the poet “lends the listener the thread upon which he descends into the subterranean depths.” However, from a Wendtian perspective both poetry and song would have to presented in their characteristic form, neither fragmenting the poem nor challenging the boundaries of the singable. The correspondent challenges Marx’s program in a point-by-point rejoinder (the lines quoted from Marx are placed in quotation marks to avoid confusion):

[“]As soon as instruments and voices are scored together, the former is ordered under the latter as all that surrounds man is under him; because in song, which encompasses [both] speech and the musical world indwelling man, the human is represented, in opposition to instruments which are outside of man.[”] The creation of a musical world, in which ultimately song itself is lifted up, declaring victory over the instrumental, and whereby the realm of the human shines forth as the summit of the whole, or still more strictly expressed in the sense of the above view: the art of music is elevated from nature into the instrumental and strives toward song—this, we presume, is the idea of the work, or—it could be. But this idea still does not justify the type of performance. First is the question: is the instrumental really subordinated to the vocal? I leave this question to the decision of other impartial experts. Further in order to depict song as the flower, so to speak, toward which everything strives, surely the song must appear in its characteristic nature, and in union with the poetic language it must surely appear in most perfect unison with the poetic aim [Poesie]; the human voice may not leave the sphere of the singable, and not become surpassed or oppressed by the instrumental. Against this speaks Mr. Editor (because only the following words can I consider an opposed viewpoint) “not the musical expression of the contents of Schiller’s Ode, or even his words—only song, the simplest way of human musical language, has he sought.” But how is song possible according to its true and essential nature without the expression of what is sung? [“]He has sought it, in order to exalt it with the victory over the world of the instrument.[”] How can song have victory over instruments,
if the song scarcely breaks through over the mass of instruments[?] “He has left the voices alone and let them do as they please, that they shall triumph by themselves, so to speak, even without that diligence of the composer’s for declamatory, melismatic, and harmonic intelligibility of the song.” I must confess, that I cannot think of any song at all without these rightly understood conditions, even less understand how song can triumph over instruments without this meaning.\[71\]

The critic will not take Beethoven’s presumed intentions to cover what he views as communicative gaps. He rejects Marx’s program as unsupported

by the music. (Nor was he alone; Fétis said of it “I admit that the composer seems less unintelligible to me than his interpreter.”) The problem is that song does not gain its victory qua song, but only by taking over the quality of instrumental music. Wendt’s lifelong defense of pure song would have been outraged by the guise Marx had given it. He could never have agreed with Marx’s Idee for the Ninth and would have pronounced the finale a failure.

The issues opened up by this debate have generally occupied musicologists far more than the identity of the critic. Yet if the critic is Wendt, this elevates the aesthetic cachet of the discussion nearly as much as if it were Kant or Hegel. Let us establish this possibility of Wendt’s authorship beyond mere similarity of views.

**GROUNDs FOR IDENTIFYnG WENDT AS THE MUSICAL CORRESPONDENT**

Evidence of Wendt’s participation in the *BamZ*—especially concert reviews—increased dramatically in the years 1826 and 1827, though it had begun with the start of the journal in 1824. Perhaps this increase is because the primary Leipzig correspondent for the *BamZ*’s first two years, C. F. Ebers, had moved to Berlin in 1825, and Marx would have needed a replacement. Table 2 shows all the notices of Leipzig opera and concert performances written for the *BamZ* between 1826 and 1827. Fully signed contributions by Wendt include his *Euryanthe* and *Berggeist* reviews, whereas other signatures are generally attached to unsolicited reviews marked *eingesandt* or *aus einem Brief.* The debate between Marx and the musical correspondent is inserted in italics for context.

---

72 Levy, “Early Performances...,” 290.
73 One is by the unidentified Ciz, another is signed G. O. N., which is Gustav O. Nauenburg. For identification of signatures, see Bauer, *Wie Beethoven auf den Sockel kam*, 340.
Table 2: Correspondences and Reports from Leipzig to the *BamZ*, 1825-27. (Bold dates/pages show continuous or inter-referential reviews.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Concerts</th>
<th>Issue/Date</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Wendt</td>
<td>Ueber Webers Euryanthe</td>
<td></td>
<td>III/2 11 Jan 1826</td>
<td>11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III/3 18 Jan 1826</td>
<td>21–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III/4 23 Jan 1826</td>
<td>26–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III/5 1 Feb 1826</td>
<td>37–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III/6 8 Feb 1826</td>
<td>43–45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III/7 15 Feb 1826</td>
<td>54–56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III/27 5 Jul 1826</td>
<td>213–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III/27 5 Jul 1826</td>
<td>218–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ueber mehrere Musik-aufführungen in Leipzig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Konzert der Madame Milder in Leipzig [begins “ein zweiter Ihrer grossen Sängerinnen besuchte... unsere Mauern...”]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. B. Marx II. Recensionen. Symphonie mit Schlusschor über Schillers Ode an die Freude... komponirt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III/28 12 Jul 1826</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III/31 2 Aug 1826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

225–28
248–49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III/35 30 Aug 1826</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II/36 6 Sept 1826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

279–82
289–91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III/44 1 Nov 1826</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

352–53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III/47 22 Nov 1826</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

373–78
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. B. Marx</td>
<td>Erwiderung</td>
<td>III/51</td>
<td>20 Dec 1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV/2</td>
<td>10 Jan 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV/3</td>
<td>17 Jan 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Ueber die Musik in Leipzig...) Von der Oper (Oper in Leipzig after 1st issue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV/17</td>
<td>24 Apr 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV/18</td>
<td>2 May 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wendt also signed his name to reviews of Leipzig Gewandhaus concerts in November-December 1827 (as Table 2 also shows). Does this imply Wendt was also the critic who reviewed concerts in the previous year, 1826, including the review of the Ninth on 28 June/5 July? Given Wendt’s increased participation and the lack of other prominent Leipzig critics for the BamZ in that year, it seems likely. After all, Wendt certainly is a musical correspondent from Leipzig for the BamZ. Wallace and others have noted the difficulty Marx, as editor of the BamZ, had in securing correspondents—unsurprising with the number of upstart music journals
in the late 1820s and the hegemony of the Leipzig *AmZ*.\(^{74}\) In fact, Martha Bruckner-Biegenwald notes that the *AmZ* itself, even in its early, rival-free years, found it difficult to obtain enough suitable correspondents.\(^{75}\) There are only a few other critics who *could* have written it: who were active in Leipzig, not otherwise on record about the Ninth, not attached to the rival *AmZ*, and not presumably opposed to the statements made in the review. Most of the well-known names—and Marx states in the same year that most of his contributors were well-known—are otherwise accounted for.\(^{76}\)

Other *BamZ* critics corresponding from Leipzig have been mentioned, but they are unlikely candidates for the Ninth review. C. F. Ebers had already moved to Berlin in 1825 as aforementioned. Bauer

---

\(^{74}\) Wallace, *Beethoven’s Critics*, 44–45; Marx, not having the resources that Rochlitz had nor the decades’ worth of experience, found it difficult to “attract capable and objective correspondents” in particular; Helmut Kirchmeyer and Wallace discuss how some writers were more or less publicity agents for the theaters (Wallace, 63; Kirchmeyer, “Ein Kapitel Adolf Bernhard Marx. Über Sendungsbewußtsein und Bildungsstand der Berliner Musikkritik zwischen 1824 und 1830,” in *Beiträge zur Musikanschauung im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Walter Salmen [Regensburg: Gustav Bosse Verlag, 1965], 76).


\(^{76}\) Marx boasts that the critic v. d. O…r. [in fact Carl Loewe], is a well-known figure “like most of the participants in this journal.” Marx, “Allerlei. Oppositionen im Vorbeigehen,” *BamZ* 3, no. 35 (30 Aug. 1826), 282. Among critics of the appropriate caliber, Rochlitz’s ties to the *AmZ* make him unlikely. Hoffmann died in 1822. Fink, who might have agreed with the conclusions of the review but stated them more vociferously, was poised to take over editorship of the *AmZ* and perhaps would not have contributed to its rival. Ludwig Rellstab, busy with the *Vossische Zeitung*, was living in Berlin. E. A. Ortlepp (1800–1864)—a Davidsbündler as well as poet and music critic—might have had a long history of working against the *AmZ*. But as a younger man who befriended both Schumann and Richard Wagner shortly after 1826, it seems unlikely he would have come out so strongly against the vocal finale.

Realistic lower-profile alternatives include C. F. Michaelis (1770–1834), a *Dozent* in Wendt’s field of philosophy and aesthetics in Leipzig who had contributed to the *AmZ* in its early years, though he is not known to have contributed to the *BamZ*. Gustav Nauenburg contributed several works to the *BamZ*, but he was not a Leipziger and sent only one review definitely from Leipzig. Other Leipzigers who had contributed to the *AmZ* in its early years (Wilhelm Traugott Krug, philosopher; M. F. W. Lindner, vocal pedagogue; Friedrich Wilhelm Riem, musician) are probably too one-sided in their expertise to have written the series from which this review stems.
assumes the Leipzig correspondent to be Christian Gottlob Rebs (a figure so obscure his dates are unknown), which would seem reasonable as it is assigned to him in the journal’s table of contents; however, a glance at the item itself shows that this is an error and he has actually contributed a different item on a performance of Haydn and Naumann (see Table 2). If Marx already had Wendt’s cooperation for other items, would he not have taken advantage of one of the era’s most highly reputable critics (Marx calls him “highly esteemed”) already writing for him, of proven objectivity, connected to Leipzig’s concert scene, and clearly willing and able to write at length?

There are stronger reasons that we should consider Wendt to be this anonymous correspondent from Leipzig. The 1826 series “Ueber mehrere Musik-aufführungen in Leipzig” is clearly in a continuous voice even though there is a significant gap between the issues in March, the late June and July columns that reviewed the Ninth, and the conclusion in August. This series is also clearly continuous from the series “Ueber die Oper in Leipzig,” for which Wendt’s responsibility is nearly certain (he takes credit for the 1827 Opera in Leipzig, and the 1826 series seems to stem from the signed Euryanthe review). A close look at Table 2 shows how these series overlap and abut in the BamZ—the reviews of instrumental music simply begin after the opera reviews in 1826, then in 1827 reviews of concert music in Leipzig move seamlessly back into reviews of opera and are eventually credited to Wendt (bold dates/page numbers show the contiguous nature of those reviews). The journalist’s language often includes phrases along the lines “I have promised you some time ago” or “as I discussed before,” also linking the opera and concert series reports (for example, the 30 Aug/6

77 Bauer, Wie Beethoven auf den Sockel kam, 302. Rebs, from the small town of Zietz outside Leipzig, wrote devotional literature and tracts on educational reform. The 5 July installment of “On Several Music Performances in Leipzig” 1826 is the first of three foreign correspondences in that issue; the second is from Paris, and the third—marked “inadvertently delayed”—is from Leipzig again and signed by Rebs. Yet the fact that the two Leipzig correspondences are separated by an item from Paris implies that the correspondences are independent; Rebs does not appear to be responsible for both. In addition, it seems unlikely that Marx would have permitted a relatively unknown critic to make a pronouncement on this seminal work.

September 1826 “Oper in Leipzig” review of Madame Schulz begins “As I have reported many of our musical joys and sufferings...,” and the contiguously reviewed 6 Sept Concert of Madame Milder begins “a second of your great singers visited,” which is moreover signed “W.”) Although no internal references of this nature definitively tie Wendt to the Ninth review, by December 1827 the tone of his signed reviews is that of a regular correspondent from whom the readership has frequently heard.

Moreover, the very style of writing and choices of expression are Wendtian, as is easily demonstrated from comparisons to Wendt’s signed criticism. Such similarity might be missed when consideration is limited to Beethoven criticism—after all, many people thought Beethoven’s late works bizzare and the finale of the Ninth was roundly censured. The most obviously Wendtian statements do not deal directly with the Ninth or with Beethoven at all. For example, Wendt’s distaste for virtuosity on the lower-register instruments is recorded across his career. In the 1820 WamZ Wendt had praised and excused Bernhard Romberg’s cello virtuosity but—much as with Beethoven’s tendency toward excessive Phantasie—forbade it in imitators.

If I might lay my beliefs about violoncello concertos before the public, then I would say that to me, in the current state of our music, a cello concerto seems an entirely unmusical event.... [A]ll that I say here goes more or less for other instruments (e.g. Horn). 79

A similar sentiment appears in the Leipzig correspondent’s segment just previous to the review of the Ninth, on the effect of a trombone concerto also on the program:

The brilliant and the deafening was overly provided for in this concert; thus, now followed a Concertino for the tenor-trombone (originally for the horn) by Carl Maria von Weber. It was presented by Herr Queiser with the

rare virtuosity which this artist has acquired – but shall I give my opinion without reservation? it is the following: ... In music, the egoism of the virtuoso is placed on the highest pinnacle in a trombone-concerto; because the purpose and the nature of the instrument is generally such that we wonder more at the artist’s skill than at Art.... Give honor to the great bravura and skill, but a trombone concerto ever remains an unhappy foray and its effect unsatisfying, even if it is just as artfully performed as Herr Queiser always does. The Bear is not made for dancing, but for growling.80

The poor Weber concertino may thus be the unspoken target of Wendt’s 1836 statement about concertos for wind instruments:

[T]he limited nature of these [wind] instruments sets boundaries on their free creative ability, and a decline in composition due to that type of virtuosi, who seek more amazement at their accomplishment than honor for art, has never once been desired. What a mongrel does even a good composer make of an old-fashioned concerto for the bassoon or the oboe, let alone a concertino for trumpet or trombone!!81

The critic’s discussion of Phantasie is also characteristic of Wendt—particularly the diagnosis of originality as being simultaneously Beethoven’s strength and weakness. The anonymous correspondent’s description of the first movement of the Ninth as a “Phantasy or Capriccio” is, by itself, not significant, as many others use Phantasie to describe Beethoven’s works. But when the Leipzig correspondent evokes the musical labyrinth as an image for the Adagio, it cannot help but recall Wendt’s 1815 Fidelio review, in which the labyrinth appears as a metaphor for Beethoven’s imaginative power. The labyrinth metaphor used by the Leipzig correspondent suggests that the third movement of the Ninth threatens to lose its listeners, but the thread is found:

81 Wendt, Ueber den gegenwärtigen Zustand, 20. “[D]er beschränkte Charakter dieser Instrumente ihrer freien Schöpfungskraft Gränen setzte, und eine Zurückführung der Composition auf jenem Charkter den Virtuosen, welche mehr Bewunderung ihrer Fertigkeit, als die Ehre der Kunst suchten, nicht einmal erwünscht war. Wie michte auch ein rechter Componist ein Concert im alten Zuschnitt für den Fagott oder doe Hóboe, oder auch nur ein Concertino für Trompete oder Posaune schreiben!”
One of the most beautiful Adagios which Beethoven has written, reviving with its heavenly comfort, is the third movement, the *Adagio molto e cantabile* in [time signature] 3/4, B-flat Major....Soon, however, melody piles up on melody; the texture becomes artful, difficult, and in some places overloaded; one loses even the meter in the development of the rhythms and is lead in labyrinthian paths, which one fruitlessly struggles to break through; then the main melody quietly rings out, the sounds of the blossoming days of innocence return, and the soul finds itself back home again.\footnote{Wendt, “Gedanken über... *Fidelio,*” 398–99, trans. in Senner, Wallace, and Meredith, *Critical Reception,* 203; “[N]ur der Kenner, welcher beyde Bearbeitungen zu sehen und hören, und die vollständigen Partituren zu vergleichen im Stande wäre, könnte hier vollkommen entscheiden.”}

Wendt’s attention to objectivity also has a distinctive cast to it, one he had already displayed in 1815 regarding *Fidelio,* saying: “However, the deeper masterpiece may also demand that it be received *repeatedly, attentively, and without prejudice,* with a complete submission of the soul. Whoever finds this *impossible* may pass *no* judgment on it.”\footnote{“Ueber mehrere Musik-aufführungen in Leipzig.” 215. See Appendix 2.} He notes with pride that his judgement of Beethoven’s *Leonore* rested on “four attentive hearings of the *original* arrangement,” and apologizes for his reliance on the libretto and piano reduction of the newer *Fidelio,* “of which we will take notice here and there to the extent permitted by the partial understanding that it provides[.]”\footnote{Wendt, “Gedanken über... *Fidelio,*” 402, trans. in Senner, Wallace, and Meredith, *Critical Reception,* 205. “[A]ber das tiefere Meisterwerk darf auch verlangen, dass es öfterer, aufmerksam und unbefangen, mit völliger Hingebung des Gemüths aufgenommen werde,—wem dieses *unmöglich* ist, der hat über dasselbe *kein* Urtheil.”} Wendt cautioned the reader that “only the expert who was in a position to see and hear both arrangements, and to compare the full scores, would be able to give a perfect judgment.”\footnote{Wendt, “Gedanken über... *Fidelio,*” 399, trans. in Senner, Wallace, and Meredith, *Critical Reception,* 203; “[N]ur der Kenner, welcher beyde Bearbeitungen zu sehen und hören, und die vollständigen Partituren zu vergleichen im Stande wäre, könnte hier vollkommen entscheiden.”}
Likewise the Leipzig correspondent wrote with professional caution about the sources for his appraisal of the Ninth:

I speak here, however – I want it well marked – only of the complete impression which this work made on me after two performances prepared with uncommon industry by our orchestra; I want to make no claim to a judgement against such a master and his work; I merely ask, that those who have become acquainted with this work compare the impression which it makes on them unbiasedly with what is expressed here, without any regard for the master’s personal circumstances.86

The Leipzig correspondent’s concern to judge the work itself and its effect, independent of externals such as the performance or partiality to the composer, is characteristic of Wendt. He admits that further evidence could change the reception of the work but gives his opinion anyway as “even mistakes must prepare the truth.”87 Even though his response to Marx suggested the performance trumps the score, the original review had admitted that the lack of a score was a “hindrance.”88

Although the re-use of the labyrinth metaphor particularly catches the eye, in the end it is really more general similarities which are compelling: the academicism and aesthetic stance (note his academic *petitio principii*); the persistent view of Beethoven’s music as *Phantasie*, simultaneously genius and error; the protective attitude toward vocal music; the insistence on objectivity and on returning to the work. These characteristics are Wendt’s from his first review to his last, and they are also present with the Leipzig correspondent.

Wallace, in *Beethoven’s Critics*, suggested on the other hand that Wendt may be the author of the far more negative *AmZ* review of the Ninth on 29 April 1829.89 Though it is just possible that the same person could

---

86 “Ueber mehrere Musik-aufführungen in Leipzig,” 204. See Appendix 2.
89 Wallace, *Beethoven’s Critics*, 66. *AmZ* no. 17 (29 April 1829): cols. 270–73. Bauer follows this. Others, such as George Grove, have presumed the *AmZ* review to be Fink’s. This is problematic as well, however, because Fink-as-editor distances himself from the review with a preface requesting a more objective ground for the debate—but he may have been
have written both the *AmZ* and *BamZ* reviews, the change in tone (from restrained to vituperative) would seem to imply a change of heart—or a loosened reserve after the composer’s death. Further, Wendt does not otherwise seem to have written for the *AmZ* in the 1820s, whereas we know that he is strongly represented as a reviewer in the *BamZ* at that time. Wendt had also already left Leipzig at Easter 1829, before the *AmZ* review was printed. Admittedly his authorship of the *AmZ* review cannot be ruled out without other evidence, just as his authorship of the *BamZ* one cannot be definitively ascertained. The defense of Wendt as Marx’s Leipzig correspondent is thrown back on the similarity of language and judgement in the review of the Ninth to that of Wendt’s other works, and on his otherwise well-documented participation as a Leipzig correspondent for the *BamZ* during the years 1826–27.

Though aesthetic essays (like the *Fidelio* review) are generally signed, anonymity was normal for concert reviews—especially with so controversial a subject as the Ninth, and when the writer was as well-known as Wendt. Bruckner-Biegenwald suggests that *AmZ* correspondents almost always chose to be anonymous to avoid jeopardizing their working relationships in their home towns.\(^9\) If Wendt authored the review of the Ninth, the question is not why he left it unsigned but rather why he signed his concert reviews in the *BamZ* thereafter. Perhaps the pretense of anonymity was too thin after the controversy, or perhaps Marx and Wendt felt that more disclosure ought to be made (particularly after Marx revealed himself to be the “friend of art” in his rejoinder to the correspondent). Along these lines, Wendt is careful to report potential conflicts of interest in the 1827 reports on music in Leipzig; he promises to review the Gewandhaus concert series “so far as I am objective concerning this establishment and am in condition to judge their performance (given my position with the

---

\(^9\) Bruckner-Biegenwald, *Die Anfänge*, 47.
same).”  

Perhaps attaching Wendt’s name was a solution to the conflict of interest revealed when Wendt, a member of the Gewandhaus board of directors, was rankled by Marx’s criticism of the orchestra’s choice to program the Ninth before having a score.

**CONCLUSION**

The judgement that Beethoven’s work failed would by no means have been inconsistent—in Wendt’s view—with a regard for Beethoven’s genius in the Kantian sense. Nor is it even inconsistent with Beethoven’s own view of his work: the composer himself expressed doubts about the advisability of the vocal finale, according to Czerny, and sketches exist for what is presumably a replacement instrumental finale. As Maynard Solomon notes, Beethoven’s late works often saw their finales become divorced from their original conceptions—most famously seen in the replacement of the *Grosse Fuge* in Op. 130, but also in Beethoven’s suggestion that the “Hammerklavier” Sonata could be converted into a three-movement work using the same means the Leipzig critic suggests for the Ninth Symphony.

Although we would tend to view Beethoven as making or submitting to such changes for expediency’s sake, Solomon suggests that Beethoven was able to re-envision the meanings of his late works after they left his pen, with much more flexibility than Marx’s guiding poetic Idee allowed.

Neither the Leipzig review nor any of Wendt’s signed writings seem to accuse Beethoven of “losing his touch” or to connect his late style with

---


his increased disability. Rather, Beethoven’s late music is seen as an intensification of his central tendency to excessive originality against which Wendt had warned the composer in 1815; the review of the Ninth suggests that this tendency has reached its ne plus ultra and gone beyond the tolerance of art, not merely of the audience. In 1826 the Leipzig critic was suggesting—as Wendt would surely have done in his role as Professor of Aesthetics—that to accept this work meant the demise of aesthetic judgement as it was known; that works would be declared a law unto themselves; that originality for its own sake would trump generic standards. Indeed, Wendt had already said as much when reviewing Beethoven’s Symphony No. 8 for the Leipziger Kunstblatt:

[W]here is the art of tones supposed to go, if every stubborn idea of a composer’s is allowed to break the laws of harmonic succession, and break off the thread of melody, wherever he prefers? ... What shall become of music, if this beautiful agreement of its relationships is sacrificed to a fragmentary capriciousness?94

Wendt had always insisted that the ordinary standards remained even if admired works of genius broke them and became concerned that the acceptance of Beethoven’s transgressions would abolish any basis for criticism.

If the acceptance of Beethoven’s Ninth does represent a decided shift in aesthetic judgement, Wendt (as a better musician than either Kant or Hegel) is one of the few voices that adequately represents the stage it left behind.95 More than those of any other philosopher, Wendt’s may be the

94 “[W]ohin soll die Kunst der Töne nun noch kommen, wenn jeder eigensinnige Einfall eines Componisten das Gesetz der Tonfolge durchbrechen, und den Faden der Melodie abbrechen darf, wo es ihm beliebt...[?] Was soll die Musik werden, wenn diese schöne Uebereinstimmung ihrer Verhältnisse der fragmentarischen Laune geopfert wird...?” Ueber Beethovens neueste Symphonie. (On Beethoven’s newest symphony [the eighth].) Leipziger Kunstblatt 1/5, no. 67 (14 Feb.): 280. Signed A. W.

95 For an understanding of the mismatch between Kant’s ideas about music and the first decades of the nineteenth century, see Mark Evan Bonds, “Idealism and the Aesthetics of Instrumental Music at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century,” Journal of the American Musicological Society 50, no. 2/3 (Summer-Autumn 1997), 387–420, esp. 409–13.
musical aesthetics of Beethoven’s time. His writing captures a moment in which Beethoven’s genius was recognized but did not yet exert a suffocating influence—in which he was still human enough to be criticized. To take seriously the judgement against the Ninth in which Wendt may have participated is not to denigrate the work. It is only to demonstrate one more way in which the Ninth has been epoch-making.

APPENDIX 1: AMADEUS WENDT’S MUSIC AND THEATER WRITINGS

Abbreviations and Indications:
* attribution presumed

Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung – AmZ
Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung – BamZ
Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung, mit besonderer Rucksicht auf den österreichischen Kaiserstaat – WamZ
Zeitung für die elegante Welt – ZfdeW


1813* Würde eine Gemeinde an Erbauung gewinnen, wenn sie beym Gottesdienste den Choral vierstimmig sänge? [Would it build community in a congregation, if
chorales were sung in four voices in a church service?] *AmZ* 15, no. 21 (26 May 1813): 341–45. Signed W.


1815 Musikalische Curiosität [Musical Curiosity (on Buttstett’s *Ut, re mi, fa sol, la, tota musica et harmonia aeterna* etc.)]. *AmZ* 17, no. 50 (13 Dec. 1815): 841–42. Signed Prof. Am. Wendt.

1816 Ueber Friedrich Schneider’s vierstimmige Misse mit concertirenden Solostimmen, nebst einigen vorangeschickten Bemerkungen über Compositionen der Misse, und über den Charakter der Vocalmusik von Prof. A. Wendt [On Friedrich Schneider’s four-voiced mass with concert solo voices, with some prefatory remarks on the composition of masses, and on the character of vocal music by Prof. A. Wendt]. *AmZ* 18, no. 10 (6 Mar. 1816): cols. 145–53; no. 11 (13 Mar. 1816): 161–70. [Prof. A. Wendt]


On Beethoven’s newest symphony (the eighth)]. Leipziger Kunstblatt 1/5, no. 67 (14 Feb. 1818): 280. Signed A. W.

On some Singspiels in the Leipzig theater (including Fidelio)]. Leipziger Kunstblatt 1/6, no. 80 (17 Mar. 1818): 332. Signed A. W.


1824 Ueber die Musik gesetzte Bestimmung, die Sprache nachzuahmen von Professor Wendt [On the purpose given to music, to imitate speech]. Cäcilia 1 no. 3 (1824): 267–74.


1831 Über die Hauptperioden der schönen Kunst; oder die Kunst im Laufe der Weltgeschichte [On the main periods of fine art; or art throughout world history]. Leipzig: J. A. Barth. 1831.


*BamZ* 3 no. 26 (28 June 1826): 203–4; no. 27 (5 July 1826): 213–17.


Den ersten Theil eröffnete die angeführte große Festouvertüre mit den einladenden Fanfaren. Ist sie auch an Gedanken nicht so reich, wie frühere dieses Meisters, dreht sie sich auch gar zu lange auf einem Flecke – in C – herum; – doch hält, ich entsinne mich aus Nro. 10, daß eine gewisse Dame über diesen Vordersatz leicht empfindlich...
werden könnte, darum schnell zum Nachsatz: so ist doch die Ausführung kunstreich und
die Wirkung im Ganzen glänzend und erfreulich.

Hierauf sang Dem. Quick aus Gotha, die bisherige Sängerin des Konzerts eine
Scene und Arie von einem gewissen Viktor Rifaut, die gar nicht so gewöhnlich, wie die
meisten italienischen Arien von unbekannten und bekannten Meistern war. Die
Gesangspartie ist gut gesetzt, die Melodie fließend und ausdrucksvoll, (sie bezeichnet die
Empfindungen eines Mädchens, das durch die Trennung vom Geliebten ihrer Liebe inne
wird) aber in der Instrumentalpartie zeigt sich einmal ein ungehöriger Oktavengang. Die
Sängerin that ihr Möglichstes.

Für Glänzendes und Betäubendes war in diesem Konzerte übermäßig gesorgt;
denn nun folgte ein Konzertino für die Tenor-Posaune (eigentlich für das Horn gesetzt)
Künstler sich erworben hat, vorgetragen. – Aber soll ich meine Meinung ohne Rückhalt
sagen? so ist sie folgende: Man hat unserem Zeitalter vornehmlich die Herrschaft des
Egoismus vorgeworfen. In der Musik stellt sich der Egoismus des Virtuosen in einem
Posaunen-konzert auf die höchste Spitze; denn die Aufgabe und die Natur des
Instruments ist überhaupt von der Art, daß man dabei mehr seine Kunst, als die Kunst zu
bewundern hat. Allein in einer solche Bewunderung ist kein reines Vergnügen. Wie ist es
denn möglich, auf diesem Instrument eine zusammenhängende Kantilene in engen
Interval len hervorzuzeigen, und wenn können die bei einem längern Solo unvermeidlich
wiederkehrenden, der Empfindung sogar nichts sagenden Sprünge aus der Höhe in die
Tiefe und umgekehrt, oder die einförmig gebrochenen Akkorde auf die Länge gefallen?
Wie vieles streift dabei nicht unwillkürlich ans Lächerliche? Ehre der großen Bravour
und Fertigkeit, aber ein [204] Posaunenkonzert bleibt immer eine unglückliche Aufgabe und
seine Wirkung ungenügend, auch wenn es noch so kunstfertig ausgeführt wird, wie es
Herr Queiser immer thut. Der Bär ist nicht zum Tanzen, wohl aber zum Brummen
gemacht. – Für das einzige Tuba mirum spargens sonum in Mozarts Requiem,
wie es der
genannte Künstler vorträgt, schenkt ihm ich gern alle seine Posaunenkonzerte, auch wenn
die Kompositionen noch besser wären, als sie gewöhnlich sind.

In einem egoistischen Zeitalter, sagt man, drängt sich der Künstler vor die Kunst
hervor; er will statt ihrer gelten. Das müßte denn auch von dem Komponisten gelten, und
der Egoismus des Komponisten könnte in nichts anderm, als in dem Eigensinne sichtbar
sein, der seine Laune mit Widerstreben der Kunst geltend macht, Tonsätze erfindet, welche
das gesunde Gehör zurückstößt (in dem doch alle Tonkunst ihre äußere Grundlage hat)
und Gedanken verknüpft und trennt, wie es die Willkür der Laune fordert. Die
Erscheinung eines solchen Egoismus kann klein und widrig sein, wo es dem Komponisten
an Kraft der Phantasie und des Gefühls gebracht, und leere Künstelei sich an die Stelle der
Kunst setzen will, ja wohl lächerlich, wo Armuth und Ohnmacht Originalität affektiren; es
cann aber auch einen Egoismus geben, der mit prometheischer Kühnheit auftritt und den
Ossa auf den Pelion thürmt, um die Götter in ihren Wohnsitzen zu finden. Wie solcher
Gigant – ich muß meine Meinung unbefangen bekennen – erscheint mir Beethoven in
dieser letzten Symphonie,96 die in allen Beziehungen so sehr über das Vorhandene hinausgeht, daß sich in früheren Werken zwar die Spur seiner Kunstrichtung erblicken läßt, in diesen aber alle Züge seiner Eigenthümlichkeit zu einer unerhörten Höhe gesteigert sind. Er stößt durch seine Kraft eben so oft feindlich ab, als er anzieht und erfreut, er spannt, betäubt und er müd, und läßt den Zuhörer seiner Gedankenfülle nicht recht froh werden, und das Alles – wie es scheint, will er so. Ich spreche hier aber – will ich wohl bemerken – nur den Gesammteindruck aus, welchen dieses Werk nach zwei mit ungemeinem Fleiß von unseren Orchester vorbereiteten Aufführungen auf mich machte; ich will einem solchen Meister und seinem Werke gegenüber keinen Anspruch auf ein Urtheil machen; ich verlange blos, daß der, der es kennen gelernt hat, den Eindruck, den er auf ihn macht, uneingenommen mit dem hier ausgesprochenen vergleiche, ohne noch etwa auf des Meisters persönliche Verhältnisse hinzublicken.

[213] (fortsetzung)

Sollte ich von dem Eindruck sprechen, den diese Symphonie auf unser musikalisches, [214] und wie gesagt für Beethovens Symphonien vorzüglich gebildetes Publikum gemacht hat, so könnte ich nicht anders berichten, als daß er im Allgemeinen ungünstig ausgefallen, und daß er die Meisten, die nicht ungebildete Zuhörer, vielmehr rüstige Freunde der Musik sind, und Beethovens früheren Werken mit großer Theilnahme sich hingegeben haben, ihres Glaubens an die fernern Produktionen des Meisters beraubt hat. Indeß man kann anführen, was oft in ähnlichen Fällen gesagt worden ist, daß ein großes originales Werk nicht immer sogleich anspricht und richtig verstanden wird, daß es seine Zeit verlangt, um das noch unvorbereitete Publikum ganz zu durchdringen – und in der That klärte sich schon bei der zweiten Anhörung manches erfreulich auf; auch kommen wohl noch viele Fehler und Mängel in der Aufführung eines so schwierigen Tonstückes vor, und manches, was der Götzendienst derer, die den Buchstaben verehren, als einen originalen Zug des angebeteten Meisters preiset, mag vielleicht bei genauer zusammenschumpfen, und darum mag ich auf solche Autorität, wie sie der Eindruck auf ein Publickum giebt, noch kein Gewicht legen. Zudem stimmt meine Ansicht mit der Meinung einer großen Menge von Zuhöern, insofern nicht überein, als diese, abgestoßen von einer Seite, die Größe der Intention, die riesenhafte Phantasie und das Kunstreiche in einzelnen Partien auf der andern Seite nicht sehen und den Künstler im innersten Gebiete seiner Wirksamkeit nicht erkennen wollen. Dagegen kann ich auch nicht einer bloßen Möglichkeit gegenüber meine Ueberzeugung verläugnen. Uebrigens ist nichts daran

96 Auf den Wunsch der Red. hat der Herr Verf. den Bericht über dieses Werk nicht bis zum Erscheinen der Partitur aufgehalten, was auf sein Begehren hier angemerkt wird. Möge die höchst verdienstvolle Schottsche Handlung uns mit der Partitur bald Gelegenheit zur weiteren Besprechung dieses größten Instrumental-Werkes geben. d. Red.
gelegen, ob ein späteres Urtheil des musikalischen Publikums diese Ansicht umwirft; auch Irrthümer müssen die Wahrheit vorbereiten.


Eines der schönsten Adagio’s, welche Beethoven geschrieben, ist der mit himmlischem Troste erquickende dritte Satz, das Adagio molto e cantabile 3/4, B-Dur. In demselben herrschen die sanften Blas-Instrumente. Die fließende Grundmelodie, die etwas sehr Eindringliches hat, wird in jedem Abschnitte von antwortenden Instrumenten
gleichsam bekräftigt. Bald aber baut sich Melodie über Melodie, der Satz wird künstlich, schwer, ja an einigen Orten überladen, man verliert sogar in der Verwickelung der Rythmen den Takt und wird in labyrinthische Gänge geführt, die man zu durchbrechen sich fruchtlos abmüht; da tönt die Grundmelodie leise durch, die Töne der blühenden Unschuldszeit kehren zurück, und die Seele findet sich in ihrer Heimath wieder.

Nach diesem im Ganzen des Karakters herrlichen Satze kann man fast nur Unwillen empfinden über den vierten Finale; presto, in welchem die Masse des Orchesters mit der Masse der Stimmen vereinigt wird, um auf die bizarrste Weise auf der Welt das Thema von der Freude zu besingen. Ich will die groteske Art, wie der Gesang eingeleitet wird, noch gar nicht in Anschlag bringen – wie zuerst die Kontrabässe ein Recitativ-Solo aborganeln und brummen, dann erst die themen der drei früheren Sätze nach einander angegeben werden (ohne daß sie dadurch in eine andere, als gedächtnäßige Verbindung traten) und nun endlich das eigenthümliche Thema gleichsam nur gezeigt wird, worauf es wild, wie bei einem wilden Baccanale durcheinander geht, einige Abspannung eintritt, endlich die Solo-Baßstimme das Wort nimmt und in einem höchst prosaischen Aufruf (dent [sic] man hier noch so gut, als es bei den verschorkelten und verrenkten Figuren, welche der Komponist in diese Partie gelegt hat, gehen wollte, verbesserte) ohngefäh er die Worte recitirt: “Ihr Freunde, ihr Brüder, nicht diese Töne, nein andere etc. läßt uns anstimmen.” Wie konnte ein Mann, der Göthes Geist im Egmont so tief erfaßt hat, solche Trivialität dem Schillerschen Hymnus zur Einleitung geben? Doch das alles könnte ich noch übersehen. Aber die Behandlung des Schillerschen Textes selbst zieht das hohe, schwungvolle Gedicht tief herab und mißhandelt die Poesie auf eine unbegreifliche Weise. Denn erstens ist dieses Gedicht ganz aus seinen Fugen gerissen, nicht blos abgekürzt worden, – was, wenn es anders in einem großen Musikstücke behandelt werden sollte, unvermeidlich war; sondern in der That verstümmelt, indem ohne Sinn und Grund jetzt einzelne Strophen in ganz anderer Ordnung, wie Bruchstücke, die der Tonkünstler zufällig in seinem Gedächtnisse fand, auf einander folgen, und die erste Strophe immer dazwischen wiederholt wird. Zweitens trägt die Hauptmelodie selbst auch nicht das Geringste von Schillers hohem Geiste in sich und verträgt sich, besonders wo sie schneller vorgetragen wird, weit eher mit einem gemeinen Weinrausche, als mit dem begeisterten Schwunge jenes Dichters, und sie wird dadurch besonders ärgerlich, daß die poetischen Worte mehr rythmisch gezählt, als nach ihrer Bedeutung gemessen sind.

Das Schema lautet: (Ex. 4)

[216] Daß dadurch auch ganz fehlerhafte Accente entstehen, wie z. B. an den Brüsten der Natur; alle Menschen werden Brüder etc. ist natürlich. Endlich geht der Gebrauch der Stimme in diesem Stücke, im Solo wie im Tutti, über alle natürliche Gräben hinaus; und so scheint es, wenn wir noch das türkische Orchester dazu rechnen, allerdings, als wenn im Quantitativen nichts mehr übrig gelassen worden wäre, während der Meister im Qualitativem so sehr hinter dem großen Karakter des Gedichts zurückgeblieben ist. Nur in einer einzigen Stelle nähert sich der Komponist dem Tone des Dichters; nämlich bei den Worten:
Ihr stürzt nieder, Millionen.
Ahnest du den Schöpfer, Welt!
Such’ ihn über’m Sternenzelt!
Ueber Sternen muß er wohnen.

Ich sage mit Absicht im Tone, denn bei näherer Beleuchtung bleibt nicht viel Wahres an diesem Gedanken zurück. – Dagegen ist wieder die Strophe “froh, wie seine Sonnen fliegen – freudig wie ein Held zum Siegen” so leichtin fröhlich genommen; und einzelne Stellen, wie dei Tr

–

Dagegen ist wieder die Strophe “froh, wie seine Sonnen fliegen –

freudig wie ein Held zum Siegen” so leichthin fröhlich genommen; und einzelne

Stellen, wie dei Tr

ennung der Worte

Diesen Kuß der | ganzen Welt.
und früher die ötere Wiederholung der Worte vor Gott; ferner ein durchaus ins Lächerliche fallender Eintritt des Fagotts, welche mit einzelnen abgestoßenen tiefen Tönen einsetzen, während das ganze Orchester schweigt (vielleicht könnte man um diesen Eindruck zu vermeiden, die Hörsen an deren Stelle setzen) macht eine so störende Wirkung, daß alle übrige Kunst, die sich in der kanonischen Behandlung der Stimmen am Anfange bei dem Zusammentritte der Massen zur Figurirung des Thema und sonst darthut, nicht im Stande ist, den Eindruck eines so schreienden Mißgriffs zu mildern oder gar auszulösen. Da nach mehrern Proben, so wie bei einer zweiten Aufführung, bei welcher auch, und mit Recht, das Tempo des letztern Satzes etwas gemäßigt wurde, ungeachtet der Gewöhnung dasselbe Resultat geblieben ist, so kann es nicht gemißbilligt werden, wenn bei einer künftigen Aufführung dieses Werks der letzte Satz hinweggelassen, das Adagio vor das Scherzo gestellt, und mit letzterm geschlossen wird. Man dürfte einwenden, daß dadurch des Komponisten Intention verloren gehe, der doch im Anfange des letzten Satzes, wie gesagt, die Themat der frühern zusammen bringt und nun mit diesen das Thema des vierten verbinden will; wenn nur

–

damit erwiesen wäre, daß dieses mehr als eine bloße künstliche Reflexion wäre, und jene Themat wirklich in einer innern und nothwendigen, z. E. durch die Idee bestimmten Folge ständen; wovon ich wenigstens nebst mehreren andern Verehrern der Beethovenschen Muse mich nicht habe überzeugen können.97 Wollte man mich mit der Autorität der früheren Beethovenschen Werke zu schlagen versuchen, so würde ich darin eine petitio principii erkennen, die ich gern entschuldige, wenn sie aus dem gutgemeinten Bestreben hervorgeht, einen großen [217] und verehrten Mann, der in der Kunst Epoche gemacht hat, über das Loos der Menschlichkeit hinauszustellen, welchem der Maler und Tonkünstler insbesondere um so mehr unterworfen ist, jemehr ihm der leichte Verkehr mit der Aussenwelt entzogen wird, in deren Formen er als Künstler darstellt, welchen Verkehr auch die Einbildungskraft auf

die Länge der Zeit ihm nicht zu ersetzen im Stande ist – und je kühner er diese Formen zu handhaben gewohnt ist. Das woge ich mit Beistimmung aller Unbefangenen, welche dieses Musikwerk gehört haben, auszusprechen, daß in demselben mehr Kunstaufwand, in den früheren Symphoniewerken mehr Natur ist, oder auch mit andern Worten, daß sich in diesen die Kunst des Tondichters mehr mit der Natur vereinigt hat, während sie in diesem vorzüglich mehr mit der Natur zu streiten, und die widerstrebende mit Zwang unterwerfen zu wollen scheint. Und indem ich dies auspreche, lasse ich Einzelnes noch dahin gestellt, wie z. B. die unerträgliche Stelle, wo die Violinen (Ex. 5) aushalten, während die Soprane (Ex. 6) Fortissimo singen; weil diese Stelle in der Partitur leicht anders aussehen kann. –

[203] On 6 March we finally heard the newest grand symphony of Beethoven’s, which very shortly will appear in score and parts as Op. 125 (or Symphony No. 9) in Schott’s Musikverlag, Mainz; at the same concert we heard the Consecration Overture [Die Weihe des Hauses] Op. 124. The orchestra gave its annual benefit concert for the pensions of retired and disabled orchestra members and their widows, and as it finds its principal fame in the powerful performance of large-scale instrumental works, also knowing the decided inclination of the public for the same, particularly for Beethoven’s brilliant works. Thus great public participation in this concert might safely be expected if one were able to present Beethoven’s newest, still-unknown work on it. Through the courtesy of the aforementioned publishers, the orchestra-managers succeeded in obtaining parts for this work – the score was not yet printed, and thus the rehearsals began, with great hindrances but still greater zeal, for the gigantic symphonic work which was finally performed on the aforesaid day for the first time. But I will report to you about the musical works in the order in which they occurred in this excellent concert.

The alluded-to grand festival overture opened the first act with the inviting fanfares. If it is not so rich in thoughts as earlier ones of this master, droning on as it does far too long on one patch – in C – but wait; I recollect from No. 10 [of this journal, referring to a review of this work by a woman] that a certain lady could easily become sentimental over this first part, quickly then to the next part: in any case the performance was artful and the overall effect brilliant and enjoyable.

After this Demoiselle Quick from Gotha, previously the concert singer, sang a scene and aria from a certain Viktor Rifaut, which was not at all as common as most Italian arias by unknown and well-known masters. The vocal part is well set, the melody flowing and expressive (it depicts the feelings of a maiden who becomes aware of her love via separation from her lover), but in the instrumental parts there is an unseemly octave-passage. The singer did her best.

The brilliant and the deafening was overly provided for in this concert; thus, now followed a Concertino for the tenor-trombone (originally for the horn) by Carl Maria von Weber. It was presented by Herr Queiser with the rare virtuosity which this artist has acquired – but shall I give my opinion without reservation? it is the following: our era has
been accused above all of the dominance of Egoism. In music, the egoism of the virtuoso is placed on the highest pinnacle in a trombone-concerto; because the purpose and the nature of the instrument is generally such that we wonder more at the artist’s skill than at Art. Such an admiration, by itself, is no pure satisfaction. How is it possible, then, to have a coherent cantilena in narrow intervals on this instrument, and who can be pleased by a long, relentlessly recurring solo, completely unemotional leaps from the heights to the depths and back, or tedious passages of arpeggios across the range? How can much of this do anything but inadvertently touch on the ridiculous? Give honor to the great bravura and skill, but a [204] trombone concerto ever remains an unhappy foray and its effect unsatisfying, even if it is just as artfully performed as Herr Queiser always does. The Bear is not made for dancing, but for growling. For that sole Tuba mirum spargens sonum in Mozart’s Requiem, as played by the above performer, I will gladly trade him all his trombone-concertos, even if the compositions were better than they usually are.

In an egotistic era, it is said that the artist puts himself before Art; it is he rather than it which he wants considered. That must also go for composers, and the Egoism of the composer could be visible in nothing other than in the obstinate one, who asserts his mood in opposition to Art, invents musical phrases which repulse the healthy ear (in which all musical art has its external basis), and connects or disconnects thoughts as the whim of mood dictates. The appearance of such an Egoism can be little and unpleasant, where the composer is lacking in power of imagination and of feeling; and wants to put empty artifice in the place of art – even amusingly so, wherever poverty and powerlessness of thought pass themselves off as originality. There can also, however, be Egoism whenever one appears with Promethean boldness and piles Ossa on Pelion to storm the gods in their abodes. Such a Titan – I must make my unbiased opinion known – Beethoven appears to me as such a Titan in this most recent symphony,98 which in all respects has departed so much from the previous. Though to be sure traces of this direction of his art can be seen in his earlier works, in this one, however, all the tendencies of his idiosyncrasy are increased to an unheard-of height. He repels through his strength antagonistically just as often as he draws near and delights, he rouses, stuns, and exhausts us, and never allows the listener to be completely happy with his wealth of thoughts, and all of it – as it seems, just as he wants it. I speak here, however, – I want it well marked – only of the complete impression which this work made on me after two performances prepared with uncommon industry by our orchestra; I want to make no claim to a judgement against such a master and his work; I merely ask, that those who have become acquainted with this work compare the impression which it makes on them unbiasedly with what is expressed here, without any regard for the master’s personal circumstances.

98 At the Editor’s request the Author has not delayed the report on this work until the publication of the score, which is remarked here at his behest. May the highly meritorious Schott firm soon give us the opportunity for further discussion of this most grand instrumental work with the score.
Were I to speak of the impression that this symphony made on our musical public, which as aforementioned has been excellently trained on Beethoven symphonies, then I could make no other report than that it generally did not go over well, and that the majority who are not uneducated listeners but rather active music appreciators, and devoted themselves with great interest to Beethoven’s earlier works have lost their faith in the later productions of the master. However, one could venture what has often been said in similar cases: that a great original work is not always immediately appealing and rightly understood; that it requires time in order to completely permeate the still unprepared public—and indeed many things were already gratifyingly clarified by the second hearing. Also, many mistakes and deficiencies in the performance of such a difficult piece do occur, and some of what those whose idolatry worships the written notes praise as an original tendency of the venerated master may perhaps dry up when the mistakes do. And thus I do not lay any weight on such authority as that which is given by the impression on the public. In addition my view does not agree with the opinion of the large number of listeners, as these, turned off by the one side, fail to see on the other side the greatness of intention, the gigantic imagination and the artistic in individual parts, and do not want to recognize the effectiveness of the artist in the innermost regions. On the other hand neither can I deny my conviction for a mere possibility. Incidentally it makes no difference if a later judgement of the musical public’s overturns this view; even mistakes must prepare the truth.

The whole now consists of four altogether very long movements. The first is an Allegro, ma non troppo in D Minor. First after an almost monotonous introduction—in which the orchestra “tunes up” so to speak, and the upper voices play the two intervals (Ex. 1 A5-E5, E5-A4) which are then imitated, till the string tremolo (Ex. 2 on the fifth A4/E5) enters; then a stronger, nerve-wracking section begins, which then becomes relieved by a softer secondary phrase. The soft and the strong battle, as in the violent battle of nature; soon the themes intertwine in an interesting and lovely way, and a deeper call of nature emerges out of this battle; soon even pain is done to the ear by the collision of heterogeneous musical elements, which seems to exist only to further only the interest of the nature depiction, or as has otherwise been said the [mimetic] Imitation of the Nature Principle. The artist’s intention often seems to be to choose an unyielding material to handle, in order to build from it the most manifold forms with amazing skill, piling up horrors and obstacles in order to free it from them again; a magnificent harmonic development is tied to rare ideas and some is less the result of an inner objective necessity as the arbitrariness of a quirky mood—such that the whole comes close to the Phantasy and Capriccio in its character. I am sorry not to have the score in front of me, to back up these words of mine with examples.

After the terrible tension occasioned by the musical war which flared up in the first movement, no rest is granted by the Molto Vivace or Scherzo in D Minor, 3/8 meter, in that although it has a light, playful thought or rather motive at its base, it is nevertheless
very elaborately spun out and interwoven. There is a rich, humorous life in this bouncing staccato phrase, an unbounded joy, a light trifling, in which even the usually subordinate timpani (tuned in F) play an active role, often interjecting the rhythmic head-figure of the movement (Ex. 3 the rhythmic motive of the second movement). One [215] can opine that this scherzo goes beyond Beethoven’s earlier ones in boldness and in the inexhaustible richness of artistic deployment, especially in the alternation of instruments, which often seem to bask in playful flights; however, it does not have the freshness and clarity of the earlier ones in regard to his melodic basis, though it is reminiscent of them (particularly of the Scherzo of the “Eroica” Symphony through its character). The boldness goes so far, that the brilliant tone-architect often stops his gushing and hurrying forces all of a sudden, and has them be silent – like the old master in Goethe’s Sorcerer’s Apprentice does with the animated brooms – and then lets them go again so to speak, and looks on laughing at their play; like the place where he allows the Alla Breve to enter, from which he comes back to the previous tempo and where the major gives way to minor.

One of the most beautiful Adagios which Beethoven has written, reviving with its heavenly comfort, is the third movement, the Adagio molto e cantabile in 3/4 B-flat Major. In this movement the softer wind instruments reign. The flowing main melody, which has something very haunting about it, becomes augmented with each segment of answering instruments. Soon, however, melody piles up on melody; the texture becomes artful, difficult, and in some places overloaded; one loses even the meter in the development of the rhythms and is lead in labyrinthian paths, which one fruitlessly struggles to break through; then the main melody quietly rings out, the sounds of the blossoming days of innocence return, and the soul finds itself back home again.

After this movement, magnificent as a whole in character, one can almost feel only indignation about the fourth, Finale: Presto, in which the mass of the orchestra is united with the mass of human voices, in order to sing, in the most bizarre way in the world, on the theme of joy. I do not even want to consider at this stage the grotesque way in which the song is introduced – how at first the contrabasses growl and bark a solo recitative, then first the themes of the three earlier movements come on the heels of each other (without treating them in any other relationship than mere recollections) and now finally the real theme (so to speak) is stated only, whereupon things become wild, as in a wild Bacchanale; some tension sets in; finally the solo-bass voice speaks up and in a most prosaic call to attention (and this part was improved as much as the ornamented and contorted motives that the composer has set in these parts would allow) blandly recites the words “you friends, you brothers, not these tones, but others etc. let us intone.” How can a man, who had grasped Goethe’s spirit in Egmont so deeply, introduce Schiller’s hymn with such triviality? Yet I could still overlook all this. But the treatment of Schiller’s text itself draws the high, sweeping poem down into the depths and mishandles the poetry in an incomprehensible way. Because first, this poem is completely torn apart at the seams, not merely abridged, – a thing which would be inevitable if it is to be handled differently in a large-scale musical work, but in fact mutilates it – in that individual strophes now follow each other in a completely different order without rhyme or reason, like fragments which
the composer found by happenstance in his memory; and the first strophe is always repeated in between. Second, the main melody itself bears not even the slightest amount of Schiller’s noble spirit and, especially where it is taken up faster, is far more compatible with common drunkenness, than with the spiritual enthusiasm of that Poet’s, and thereby it becomes particularly irritating that the poetic words are more rhythmically narrated than measured according to their meaning. The scheme goes: (Ex. 4 rhythm of the Ode to Joy theme).

[216] Naturally, some completely mistaken accentuation results thereby, as for example “an den Brüsten der Natur; alle Menschen werden Brüder, etc.” Finally the use of the voice in this piece, in solo and tutti alike, exceeds all natural bounds; and so it certainly seems (we still have to add the Turkish orchestra) as if in the quantitative nothing more could possibly be left to add, while in the qualitative the master fell so very far short of the great character of the poem. Only in one single passage does the composer approach the poet’s tone, namely at the words:

Ihr stürzt nieder, Millionen.
Ahnest du den Schöpfer, Welt!
Such’ ihn über’m Sternenzelt!
Ueber Sternen muss er wohnen.

I should say in the intention of the tone, because on closer examination there is not much truth in this thought. By contrast the strophe “froh, wie seine Sonnen fliegen – freudig wie ein Held zum Siegen” is so lightly and cheerfully treated again; and individual passages, such as the division of the words

Diesen Kuss der | ganzen Welt.

and earlier the more frequent repetition of the words “vor Gott”; further, a thoroughly ridiculous bassoon entrance, which is set with repellent individual low notes while the whole orchestra remains silent (perhaps this impression could be mitigated by substituting horns for bassoon), creates such a disturbing effect, that all the other artistry which presents itself, in the canonical treatment of voices at the beginning with the simultaneous entrance of forces to the ornamentation of the theme and more, is not able to soften, let alone efface, the impression of such a screaming error.

After several rehearsals, and also a second performance in which the tempo of the last movement became (correctly) somewhat more moderate, the same result remained despite getting used to it. Thus it can not be objectionable if, in a future performance of this work, the last movement were left out, the Adagio placed before the Scherzo, and the Scherzo were to close the work. One might object that the composer’s intention is lost through this, since in the beginning of the last movement, as aforementioned, the themes of the earlier movements are brought together and now the theme of the fourth movement is intended to tie them together; if only it could be proven, that this were any more than a mere artificial reflection, and that those themes really stood in an intrinsic and necessary series, i.e. determined by the idea; but of this I at least am not able to convince myself, nor
can several other admirers of the Beethovenian muse.\textsuperscript{99} If one were to try to beat me over the head with the authority of the earlier Beethoven works, then I would recognize in it the \textit{petitio principii} [logical fallacy of “begging the question”], which I gladly excuse if it comes from the well-meaning striving to help a great and [217] admired man, epoch-making in art, to transcend the common lot of humanity, to which the painter and musician in particular is so much more subject, the more he is deprived of easy traffic with the outside world in those forms he as an artist represents, a traffic for which even his imagination is no substitute over the long term – and the more boldly he was used to manipulating these forms. I daresay, with the approval of all objective people who have heard this music, that in this symphony there is a more artificial bent, and in the earlier symphonic works more nature; or in other words, that in the earlier ones the art of the tone-poet was more united with nature, while in this one it mainly strives more with nature, and seems to want to force it into submission. And as I say this I am still setting aside individual passages, as for example the unbearable passage, where the violins hold out (Ex. 5 A5 whole note), while the sopranos sing fortissimo (Ex. 6 G-sharp5 whole note), because this passage could easily appear differently in the score. –

\textsuperscript{99} Also the expansion of the individual movements and the excessive tension produced in the listener recommend this measure. As for the swapping of the two middle movements, A. Kanne has already advised this earlier (in the Viennese music magazine \textit{WamZ}). It seems to us, he says, almost necessary for the troubled mind to allow the soft melodically rich Adagio, melting into wistful enchantment, to follow the violent Allegro, and take up the Scherzo later.