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Beethoven’s works of state propaganda date from the years leading up to and during the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815—although he composed this kind of music throughout his career. Over the last hundred and fifty years, critics have marginalized these political compositions to the extent that the politics pervading Beethoven’s oeuvre are barely audible. This study reemphasizes the political dimension of Beethoven’s music by articulating the aesthetic, stylistic, and ideological continuities between his canonical works and his malign political compositions.

Chapter One explores the critical construction of Beethoven’s musical voice, which has come to be practically synonymous with what Romain Rolland dubbed the “heroic style”—the exhortative manner associated particularly with the odd-numbered symphonies from the Eroica onwards. It reveals the radically subtractive critical methods, encouraged in part by Beethoven himself, that sustain the perception of an “authentically Beethovenian” sound, and shows how Beethoven’s political compositions suggest a more complex vision of the composer’s voice as fundamentally collaborative and plural.
Chapter Two examines the aesthetic assumption, supposedly instantiated by Beethoven’s heroic music and its immediate reception, that “works” transcend their own time while mere “occasional works” remain shackled to it. The aesthetic of heroic works such as the *Eroica* emerges as fundamentally ambivalent, constituted by a gesture in which political and historically localized meanings are ascribed to the music and withdrawn—much as Beethoven withdrew the initial dedication to Napoleon; meanwhile, works such as *Wellingtons Sieg* are shown to borrow the idealizing and transcendent rhetoric of contemporary aesthetics even as they articulate more overt connections to political figures and historical events.

Chapter Three shows how analysts consider Beethoven’s overtly political music to be organized by external political programs rather than internal musical processes. For many critics, Beethoven’s political works are mere collections of contingent and disjunctive moments—works that are almost formless without an explanatory political program. Nevertheless, analysts have often explained away precisely such moments in Beethoven’s canonical works—disjunctive moments particularly susceptible to poetic interpretation and political appropriation. Formalist critical approaches thus conceal the routes through which politics enter Beethoven’s heroic masterworks.
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INTRODUCTION

Marzelline: “O weh mir! was vernimmt mein Ohr!?” (Alas! What does my ear perceive!?)

**Fidelio**

Musicians and critics are often dismayed to hear politics in Beethoven’s music. Yet Beethoven composed a great many compositions that performed political functions and expressed political sentiments. His most notorious works of state propaganda, such as the battle piece *Wellingtons Sieg* (Wellington’s Victory) and the cantata *Der glorreiche Augenblick* (The Glorious Moment), date from the years leading up to and during the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815. Nevertheless, Beethoven composed overtly political and functional music throughout his career: the two cantatas on the death of Joseph II and the elevation of Leopold II date from 1790, the short birthday cantata for Prince Lobkowitz from 1823. Over the last hundred and fifty years or so, most of this music has been marginalized and denigrated, with the result that it is now hard to detect the politics that permeate Beethoven’s oeuvre. The central aim of this study is to make us more sensitive to these politics—by articulating the aesthetic, stylistic, and ideological continuities between Beethoven’s canonical works and his political compositions.

The discipline of music history offers only the most rudimentary conceptual tools for defining and discussing “political music.” Indeed, what counts as Beethoven’s political music is not a question that can be answered at the outset of a project like this; rather, it is a question
that this study sets out to answer. Today, critics go about their business equipped with hermeneutic tools that enable them to find politics—ideological implications and hidden political agendas—in artefacts and interactions that previous generations would have considered the most politically indifferent. Conservative commentators, eager to demarcate a neutral zone of aesthetic experience or personal choice, have often deplored this situation. But, ironically, it actually makes the study of overtly political art more difficult: within a critical environment in which everything is potentially political, the claim that “Beethoven was a political composer” becomes either imprecise or a truism.¹

Granted, critical tradition has often regarded Beethoven as a political composer in a rather general and sanitized sense. In most biographies, as well as the popular imagination, Beethoven is a utopian thinker, advocating something more like a philosophical ideal than a political program. The Third and Ninth Symphonies, writes Martin Cooper, did not commit Beethoven to any closer political or social programs than the idea of “liberty,” which meant for him the destruction of feudalism rather than the establishment of egalitarian democracy.

Beethoven had no “sympathy with early socialism,” he adds, betraying Cold War anxieties of his own, perhaps.² Cooper’s formulation appears to rely on a distinction between material history—the history

---

¹ This is the opening line of Stephen Rumph’s Beethoven After Napoleon: Political Romanticism in the Late Works (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 1.
of economic relations, institutions, and governments—and a parallel but independent history of ideas. He thus implies that, unlike musical propaganda, Beethoven’s greatest music embodies ideas at one remove from the vulgarities of politics proper.

Cooper is able to maintain this position—even though it involves the dubious argument that the destruction of feudalism was not a political program—in large part because the values that he hears in much of Beethoven’s music, essentially the liberal values of revolutionary Europe and America, have remained central to Western intellectual and political life. In consequence, they appear both innocuous—who could regret the destruction of feudalism?—and natural. The politics of Beethoven’s music are less palatable and more palpable when they are associated with institutions or ideas that are outmoded, such as absolute rulers and oppressive imperial regimes. This perhaps explains the continuing notoriety of the ceremonial music that Beethoven composed in the reactionary climate of the Congress of Vienna. Meanwhile, one finds it easier to believe that liberty is a universal value, as the pronouncements of today’s Western leaders continually attest. Thus, Maynard Solomon’s influential portrait of Beethoven’s Schillerian utopianism appears somehow less politicized than Stephen Rumph’s revisionist argument that Beethoven’s later music partakes of the monarchism, incipient nationalism, and pre-Enlightenment nostalgia of political
Romanticism. In Beethoven scholarship, Friedrich Schlegel is political, but Friedrich Schiller is not.

Nevertheless, the observation that politics often becomes invisible within our language and thought is now a critical commonplace; one no longer has to be a member of the Frankfurt School or a child of the Thatcher-Reagan era to recognize that claiming immunity to ideological influence is the deluded mainstay of most ideologies. Because this recognition allows us to conceive of all of Beethoven’s music as in some sense political, however, it risks making compositions such as Wellingtons Sieg and the Eroica appear equivalent as expressions of political positions—a crude and reductive functionalism that ignores their radically divergent claims as works of art. The alternative is not to resuscitate the idea that art is oblivious to social and political forces, nor even to propose a more limited discursive space in which it is still possible to address art “purely” as art. Rather, if we are to avoid reducing Beethoven’s works to either smokescreens or apologetics—even works that perform precisely these functions—I would argue that we should take seriously their avowedly apolitical aesthetic context. While the nature of the politics that Beethoven appears to have endorsed through his music is a central concern of this study, I also want to emphasize how his music entered political discourse as art.

It is for this reason that this study endeavors to complicate and contextualize the idea of the “occasional work”—a pejorative term that

---

music historians have long used to describe functional music whose meaning and aesthetic viability are supposedly bound to particular historical periods or political events. It is worth remembering that the perceived problem of the relationship between art and politics—the very idea that such a relationship should be a problem at all—is the product of a Romantic–modernist aesthetic traceable to Beethoven’s own time. Early nineteenth-century German writers such as E. T. A. Hoffmann portrayed Beethoven as the central character in a narrative that retains an influence over music historiography even in the present day: Beethoven, taking the lead from his German forebears, liberated music from verbal, functional, and historical shackles. During the last twenty years or so, many critics and historians, champions of non-German music in particular, have uncovered the Germanizing cultural politics of the confluence of ideas that have often been called the “autonomy” aesthetic.\footnote{See, for example, the essays in Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance, and Reception, ed. Richard Leppert and Susan McClary (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987). More recently, Rumph has emphasized the localized political language of E. T. A. Hoffmann’s Beethoven criticism in Beethoven After Napoleon, chapter 1.} Important though such critiques are, I want to move beyond the mere debunking of this aesthetic in order to ask how its central claim—that great art is indifferent to social and historical forces—changed the relationship between music and politics, and consequently the nature of political music itself. Rather than decry the hidden politics of aesthetic autonomy, I want to explore its corollary—that a new kind of political music became possible only once political indifference became an aesthetic value; the very fact that we require sophisticated
hermeneutic tools in order to make the politics of “autonomous” music audible suggests that such politics exert their influence in a more subtle, surreptitious way. Further, just as the politics of “autonomous” music are submerged, so the power of self-confessed “political music” is undermined by the new status of its opposite—“pure” music. In an aesthetic context that posits the idea of unadulterated art, ascribing political meanings to music becomes a contingent and partial act of appropriation, rather than an unproblematic elucidation of what the music means. In short, the autonomy aesthetic makes avowedly political music seem ineffectual even as it makes avowedly apolitical music appear insidious.

Thus, while much of this study is devoted to placing Beethoven’s music in the context of early nineteenth-century political life and its copious musical by-products, I do not intend to reduce works of art to historical occasions. Yet neither do I want to discover redeeming aesthetic values in what were formerly considered mere “occasional works.” In this respect, my project differs from two recent studies of Beethoven’s political music. Stephen Rumph’s *Beethoven After Napoleon* (2004) is fundamentally historicizing in outlook, re-reading Beethoven’s later works in the light of Romantic politics that remain most palpable in the propagandistic compositions of 1813–1815. Meanwhile, Nicholas Cook’s 2003 article on *Wellingtons Sieg* and *Der glorreiche Augenblick* takes a revisionist aesthetic stance, rehabilitating these maligned pieces by arguing for the value of their

---

5 Rumph, *Beethoven After Napoleon*, particularly 92–245.
historical awareness and realism. I would argue that both studies, although important and instructive, unintentionally domesticate the marginal music that they discuss, explaining away the features of Beethoven’s political music that make modern scholars uncomfortable: Rumph asks us to hear Beethoven’s problematic music against the background of explanatory political and historical contexts; Cook asks us to accommodate the problematic intrusions of these contexts within a more catholic aesthetic. By contrast, this study employs a dialectical approach to Beethoven’s music, emphasizing the historical side of its aesthetic contexts and the aesthetic side of its historical ones. One of my central aims, therefore, is to situate the resistance to history that defines the autonomy aesthetic within history itself—not in order to debunk masterworks or to expose their aesthetic pretensions as illusory, but to explore the artistic and political consequences of the friction between music and the context that it resists. Indeed, it should become clear that both Beethoven and music critics are able only to gesture towards the vaulting ambitions of the autonomy aesthetic rather than to realize them, sustaining the ideal of the autonomous work through self-conscious gestures of resistance: the rhetoric of creative independence that recurs throughout Beethoven’s correspondence and Tagebuch; the struggles and triumphs that characterize his most vaunted works; and the unending critical task of purging the works of political meaning, rescuing the music from its latest political appropriation.

Thus, even though this study endeavors to incorporate the rich and hitherto under-researched musical and historical contexts of Beethoven’s political compositions, it is also concerned with criticism and historiography, setting out to describe and deconstruct the critical dilemmas that Beethoven’s political music creates. The study begins with Beethoven’s unmistakable musical voice—ostensibly the most personal dimension of his music, at the farthest remove from generic political or musical ideas. The first chapter explores the way in which critics, even since the early nineteenth century, have conceived of this voice as a powerful and singular force, dominating and binding the diverse materials of each of Beethoven’s works, just as it supposedly dominates all Western music. Since the early twentieth century, this Beethovenian voice has been practically synonymous with the “heroic style”—a term coined by Romain Rolland to describe the dramatic and exhortative manner found in a cluster of works that, with the notable exception of the Ninth Symphony, date almost exclusively from 1803–1812, including the odd-numbered symphonies from the Eroica onwards and most of the overtures. Even as some critics have heard a single and resolute voice in the heroic style, however, others have been troubled by the diversity of its voices—its characteristic contrasts of register, tone, and mood. Indeed, an examination of the finale of the Ninth, perhaps the most extreme example of Beethoven’s tendency to juxtapose contrasting voices, suggests that—ironically, in a work imbued with the imagery of unity and brotherhood—the sense of a binding authorial voice is sustained by the rhetorical and formal exclusion of inappropriate, foreign, or disjunctive voices, such as the
B-flat Turkish music. Beethoven’s musical rhetoric of exclusion, I argue, has informed the often radically subtractive methodologies of critics since the early nineteenth century.

By extension, it will emerge that the vision of a single Beethovenian voice dominating Western music is likewise sustained by acts of exclusion in which critics suppress music—not least music by Beethoven himself—that does not accord with the heroic paradigm. Indeed, the idea of the heroic style, for all its supposed ubiquity, applies to an extremely small amount of music, and very few whole works; the idea thus becomes meaningful in large part through the music that it excludes. Recognizing this allows us to articulate connections between Beethoven’s marginalized political music and his canonical works that we might otherwise overlook; excluded voices within Beethoven’s works, such as the Turkish music of the Ninth, allude to excluded pieces, such as the exotic Turkish numbers from Die Ruinen von Athen of 1811, which in turn allude to excluded styles and genres, such as Beethoven’s occasional compositions of 1811–1815. Moreover, uncovering our ears to the multiple voices in the finale of the Ninth permits us to hear even its joyous conclusion as one voice among many rather than the moment in which all voices are synthesized and superseded; indeed, the symphony ends with the kind of unequivocal affirmation audible in many of Beethoven’s compositions from the Congress of Vienna. I thus argue that, rather than imagining that one can divide Beethoven’s music into his authentic voice, which we take to be representative, and his inauthentic voice, which has been adversely affected or appropriated
by others, one should conceive of Beethoven’s voice as fundamentally plural. To be sure, his arresting personal and musical gestures of exclusion might suggest that some of his voices should be considered more “Beethovenian” than others; but there is also a sense in which none of these voices, deriving from and alluding to wider musical and social contexts, is ever fully his own.

The second chapter argues that the foundation of Beethoven’s instantiation of the autonomous musical work is a specific kind of musical and critical rhetoric—the rhetoric of resistance. His famous retraction of the dedication of the *Eroica* Symphony to Napoleon is, I argue, not merely the symbol of creative independence that it has become, but also an inaugural gesture of personal and aesthetic ambivalence in which a specific, historically localized, and political meaning is openly ascribed to the music and then withdrawn. I trace this gesture through music criticism from Beethoven’s contemporaries to the present day, in which writers associate Beethoven’s heroic works with the stormy currents of the Napoleonic era even as they portray them as transcending history. This contradiction becomes particularly clear in historical narratives about the rise and fall of the heroic style: explaining its origins, writers point to the exhortative political music of the French Revolution and Revolutionary Wars; explaining its decline, they blame the supposed period of torpor that greeted the end of the Napoleonic Wars. On either side of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, Beethoven composed political music that most commentators interpret as related to the heroic style, but different: the “proto-heroic” Bonn cantatas and war songs of the
1790s on the one hand, and the “mock-heroic” music of the Congress period on the other. It thus appears that the heroic style emerges from history in the 1790s and dissolves back into history again in 1811–1815—but mysteriously transcends history between 1803 and 1812. By comparing the form, style, and reception of the heroic works and their historically contaminated Others of the Congress period—in particular the *Eroica* and *Wellingtons Sieg*—I aim to show that history remains audible in Beethoven’s masterworks, despite the musical and mythic discourses of transcendence that resist it, and that Beethoven’s “occasional works” conversely borrow the universalizing language of myth, despite the explicit relationships they articulate with historical figures or events. This fundamental ambivalence, I argue, arises from Beethoven’s status as a modern culture hero—a quasi-mythic figure, even in his own lifetime.

The last chapter examines the formal means by which Beethoven’s heroic music is thought to resist historical and political contamination. The dominant analytical models of Beethoven’s music since the early nineteenth century have been predicated on the idea of symphonic process, in which each musical element derives its meaning primarily from its place in the unfolding of an entire form. Beethoven’s political works rarely conform to this model: they tend to eschew sonata-type symphonic structures in favor of strophic forms, variation-type procedures, and melodic potpourris, and to incorporate self-consciously disjunctive, prolonged, or self-sufficient moments motivated by factors supposedly external to musical form, such as literary narratives, visual props, or political sentiments. I suggest that
the paradigm for formal procedures that embrace such self-aware, fractured, and fundamentally hybrid moments can be found in opera rather than symphony, and that Fidelio—in particular the version revised in advance of the Congress of Vienna—contains many such moments. Moreover, I argue that the self-awareness of the moments in Beethoven’s music for the Congress of Vienna—not least his cantata Der glorreiche Augenblick—in part reflects the self-awareness of the occasion itself, which, through public ceremonies invariably involving music, performed its own role as a historic moment. Nevertheless, it will emerge that disjunctive, prolonged, and self-conscious moments are by no means confined to Beethoven’s political music; rather, contrary to critical tradition, moments of this kind—such as the surprise return of the Scherzo in the Fifth Symphony and the prolonged celebration that follows it—are also responsible for the arresting drama of Beethoven’s heroic symphonic music, creating unexpected narrative turns, formal interventions, and emphatic moments of closure. Further, the reception history of the heroic style shows that these moments are the most susceptible to poetic interpretation and political appropriation. Ironically, analysts have often attributed the power of these moments to hidden formal sources, transforming Beethoven’s musical rhetoric into deeper analytical logic—and consequently concealing the routes through which politics penetrate Beethoven’s symphonic forms.
CHAPTER 1
Beethoven and His Others:
Criticism, Difference, and the Composer’s Many Voices

A voice! a voice! It was grave, profound, vibrating, while the man
did not seem capable of a whisper.

Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness*

**Naming Beethoven**
Beethoven’s friend and pupil Ferdinand Ries is the source of a
cautionary tale about the dubious power of famous names. In 1802,
Ries accompanied his teacher to Baden, where the pair spent the
summer among a group of Beethoven’s most ardent admirers. Seated
alone at the piano one day, idly improvising a little march tune, Ries
was jolted out of his musical reverie by the raptures of an old
countess, a woman who, writes Ries, “actually tormented Beethoven
with her devotion.” The countess mistakenly believed Ries’s
insignificant musical meanderings to be the latest Beethoven opus;
Ries had neither the chance nor the inclination to disabuse her. “Here
I had an opportunity to learn how in the majority of cases a name
alone is sufficient to characterize everything in a composition as
beautiful and excellent,” concludes Ries. Beethoven himself was
reputedly no less damning when he discovered Ries’s unintended
deception:
You see my dear Ries, those are the great cognoscenti, who wish to judge every composition so correctly and severely. Only give them the name of their favorite; they will need nothing more.\textsuperscript{7}

Ries thus added to the store of Beethoven anecdotes that one might call parables of authenticity. Here, we learn that the sound of a famous name deafens the modish to the musical voice that it denotes.

For all these warnings, critics writing about the power of Beethoven’s music have often found themselves writing about his name instead, almost instinctively invoking his name as a metaphor for the individuality and identity of his voice: by the middle of the nineteenth century, Beethoven’s name had become a kind of second nature in the musical world—a sound that was almost impossible to reimagine as unfamiliar. “Even if there were no name on the title page, none other could be conjectured—it is Beethoven through and through! [es ist Alles und durchaus Beethoven]” wrote Brahms upon seeing the rediscovered manuscript of Beethoven’s early Funeral Cantata for Joseph II.\textsuperscript{8} Brahms’s formulation conflates name and voice: Beethoven is as unmistakable as “Beethoven”—hearing the voice is as reliable a test of authenticity as reading the name. This is a common critical trope; Romain Rolland repeated it in his account of the \textit{Eroica}, dismissing the long line of heroes from Napoleon to Bismarck that a generation of critics had claimed to hear in the symphony’s monumental rhetoric: “each work of Beethoven bears one name alone—Beethoven.”\textsuperscript{9} Schumann’s overemotional alter ego

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{7} Thayer–Forbes, 307.
\item \textsuperscript{8} Ibid., 120.
\end{itemize}
Eusebius pushed the conceit to its farthest limit, fantasizing that
Beethoven’s name and Beethoven’s voice were somehow one and the
same thing:

BEETHOVEN—what a word—the deep sound of the mere
syllables has the ring of eternity. As if no better symbol were
possible for his name!10

“Beethoven.” Like Eusebius, critics sometimes seem to incant the
composer’s name, as if to suggest that the voice it denotes is as
unmistakable and singular.

To be sure, Beethoven’s name began to arouse certain musical
expectations even early in his career; but no sooner were such
expectations established than they were confounded. A critic writing
in the Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung in 1805 simulated perplexity
at the name that appeared on Beethoven’s Op. 52—a collection of
simple strophic songs, some of which had been composed more than a
decade earlier:

Could these eight songs also be by this outstanding artist, often
admirable even in his mistakes? Is it possible? But it must be
since they really are! At the very least, his name is in large
letters on the title page.11

Here, name and voice do not point unambiguously towards one
another as Brahms and Rolland imagined—and they certainly do not
mingle in some kind of mystical union as Schumann’s Eusebius
fantasized. The reviewer had evidently been expecting a Beethoven

10 Robert Schumann, On Music and Musicians, trans. Paul Rosenfeld (London:
Dennis Dobson, 1947), 101.
11 AMZ 7 (28 August 1805); Contemporaries I, 225.
“wholly devoted to the great and the sublime,” as Fischenich had put it, more than ten years earlier. Unlike the old countess in Ries’s cautionary tale, however, the critic of the Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung remains unmoved by Beethoven’s name, and certainly does not project its familiarity onto Beethoven’s musical voice. Instead, the reviewer responds as if to a transgression: there are certain voices that Beethoven’s name is not allowed to denote. Indeed, the reviewer’s reluctance to identify a particular musical register with Beethoven attests to a critical activity that, despite its ubiquity, is rarely so prominent in writing about the composer’s voice: the systematic exclusion or suppression of what “Beethoven” is not. To construct a Beethovenian voice as constant and singular as Beethoven’s name is also to identify unwanted or foreign voices; to put it another way, the composer’s voice, no less than the composer’s name, becomes coherent through the dynamic of difference.

Indeed, the sound of foreign voices in Beethoven’s music has been hard to ignore. Even as critical tradition has heard his voice as perhaps the most individual and forceful in Western music—at times

---

12 Thayer–Forbes, 121. Fischenich’s description of Beethoven’s taste for the monumental was contained in a letter to Charlotte von Schiller along with the song “Feuerfarb,” published as the second of the Op. 52 set: “Ordinarily he does not trouble himself with such trifles as the enclosed.”
13 My use of the term “difference” here alludes to the terminology of Saussurean linguistics and its later appropriation and critique in the work of Jacques Derrida. Saussure maintained that words become meaningful and functional not because of any inherent property of sound or sense but because of their difference from all other words. Several writings by Derrida expand on this idea and use it to deconstruct the metaphysical assumptions of meaning itself, suggesting that even foundational ideas such as being or presence are constituted by an idea of what they are not; see “Différence,” in Margins of Philosophy, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 3–27 and Of Grammatology, trans. Gayatri Spivak (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1976), chapter 2.
even heard it as the voice of Western Music itself—a recurring theme of Beethoven reception well into the twentieth century was also a negative or confused reaction to his music’s contrasts and disjunctions, its apparent cacophony of musical voices, its tendency to “harbor doves and crocodiles at the same time,” as one Parisian critic put it. In fact, some critics imply that there are moments, even in the course of his most famous compositions, when Beethoven is barely Beethoven at all.

“Not These Tones”

As, for example, in the finale of the Ninth. Critics have often heard even this most canonical of movements as a confused bustle of voices—a relatively common assessment of Beethoven’s late music in the nineteenth century. After all, the finale makes its way through recitatives from the cellos and basses, famously interspersed with recollected excerpts from earlier movements, and through variations on the tune that eventually sets Schiller’s “An die Freude”—a setting that itself incorporates boisterous choruses, mystical pseudo-plainsong, and learned double fugue.

Perhaps the most foreign voice in the movement can be heard with the earliest departure from D major–D minor, which dominates the opening 330 measures. The pregnant silence that follows the majestic common-tone turn from the global dominant to a sustained F–major chord with the line “und der Cherub steht vor Gott” (and the

---

cherub stands before God) is broken by a curious kind of grunting from the bassoons and bass drum. This grunting becomes increasingly rhythmical until, with the entrance of a small wind band, along with triangle and cymbals, a B-flat march based on the Joy theme begins—a disjunctive, perhaps even comical moment amid the hitherto sublime discourse of the movement. Moreover, the dotted rhythms of the march and its jangling and tooting instrumentation signal the topical language of what contemporary critics and musicians considered Turkish Janissary music. It has not been lost on recent critics that, in the midst of one of Western music’s most canonical works, Beethoven appears to allude to the Orient—the voice belongs to “one of [Europe’s] deepest and most recurring images of the Other,” as Edward Said put it.15

Granted, whether Beethoven intended this moment to be overtly exotic is open to question, given the prevalence of the Janissary topic in contemporary Viennese music.16 Nonetheless, an important 1824

16 Stephen Rumph is the most recent critic to take issue with Kramer, arguing that the Alla marcia in the Ninth finale is militaristic but not exotic, and that the topics of Turkish music were no longer marked as Oriental or exotic by the time of the Ninth; see Beethoven After Napoleon, 187. There is no doubt that the idea of Turkish music was a fluid one in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, embracing all varieties of militarism, whether overtly identified as Other or not. By the same token, it also seems clear that a particular kind of hyper-masculine militarism in music, especially when accompanied by noise-making percussion instruments, was always marked as in some sense exotic—its noisy extremity pushing it into the realms of Otherness. Among the wide literature on musical exoticism and orientalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, see Mary Hunter, “The Alla Turca Style in the Late Eighteenth Century: Race and Gender in the Symphony and the Seraglio,” in The Exotic in Western Music, ed. Jonathan Bellman (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998), 43–73; Matthew Head, Orientalism, Masquerade and Mozart’s Turkish Music (London: Royal Musical Association, 2000); and Eric Rice, “Representations of
review of the Ninth by the writer and musician Friedrich August Kanne—a confidant of Beethoven’s circle, as well as one of the composer’s many collaborators—unequivocally identifies an “Oriental percussion orchestra” in the finale, and betrays considerable anxiety about it. In fact, Kanne is the earliest of many critics eager to show that Beethoven’s own voice is not lost amid all the outward musical commotion. First, Kanne insists that Beethoven is obviously putting on a voice: “the authentically Turkish lies in the arbitrariness with which a composer erases all the artistic laws accepted by cultivated nations,” he writes, whereas in the finale “[Beethoven’s] imagination is always in charge” (seine Phantasie schafft immer fort). Second, Kanne suggests that Beethoven’s imagination is palpable as an overarching Besonnenheit or self-awareness—a controlling authorial force that brings together the disparate voices of the diverse finale: the piece brings “the stamp of classicism” to its “almost resistant materials” through the “organic interweaving” of its parts. To hear Beethoven’s voice is to hear the agent of musical unity.

---


19 Ibid., 481. Besonnenheit—which one might also translate as “reflexivity” or “self-possession”—is an important concept in Beethoven’s Romantic reception, particularly in the Beethoven writings of E. T. A. Hoffmann, where it denotes Beethoven’s commanding authorial presence and formal control.
The instinct to make a unified whole from Beethoven’s multiple musical voices has since informed many studies of the Ninth’s finale—from the analyses by Heinrich Schenker and Rudolph Réti to Maynard Solomon’s compelling reading of the entire symphony as Beethoven’s personal and philosophical “search for order” and Ernest Sanders’s theories about the finale’s sonata form.\(^\text{21}\) The impulse to perceive unity in Beethoven’s disparate fragments holds fewer attractions in today’s more or less postmodern critical climate. Nicholas Cook has been the most prominent critic to take issue with what he considers the critical domestication of Beethoven’s musical disjunctions, arguing that the Janissary music in the Ninth “deconstructs” Schiller’s poem by intruding upon the foregoing imagery of the divine.\(^\text{22}\) Cook even suggests that Schiller prompts this “deconstruction” with the incongruity of the poetic language in “An die Freude”; the juxtaposition of worm and seraph that precedes the Turkish music is one of the clearest examples: “Wollust ward dem Wurm gegeben, Und der Cherub steht vor Gott” (ecstasy was granted to the worm and the cherub stands before God).\(^\text{23}\)


\(^{22}\) Cook, *Symphony No. 9*, 103; see also 92–93.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., 103.
Suggestive as Cook’s observations are, it is nevertheless hard to maintain that Beethoven composed his Ninth Symphony with anything other than a grand unifying intent. The Enlightenment aesthetic of the symphony had long been founded on the principle of unity in diversity—an aesthetic that was surely the ideal complement to Schiller’s famous paean to brotherhood: “The closer things cohere in their variety, the more delicate will be the enjoyment they provide,” pronounced Johann Georg Sulzer’s encyclopedia.24 Indeed, as Solomon and many other critics have argued, the utopian urge to unify is what makes the Ninth such a bold gesture of Enlightenment nostalgia: “With the Ninth Symphony, the anachronistic Enlightenment dream of a harmonious kingdom has returned to the stage long after the exhaustion of the social and intellectual impulses born of the philosophes.”25 Besides, even among the earliest conceptions of the piece, one finds Beethoven sketching an “overture” in which unity emerges from opening fragments: “selected lines from Schiller’s Joy brought together into a whole,” he noted to himself.26 That the finale contains such a variety of musical voices need not be evidence of Beethoven’s “deconstruction” of the idea of musical unity—

25 Solomon, Beethoven, 404–405. Stephen Rumph has recently taken issue with this reading, situating the Ninth in the intellectual context of a more reactionary political Romanticism. Rumph argues nonetheless that the Ninth presents a pre-Enlightenment vision of mystical unity rather than (say) Romantic fragmentariness: “there is no reason to doubt that Beethoven intended anything less than a totalizing vision in the Ninth Symphony.” See Rumph, Beethoven After Napoleon, 220.
26 In the Petter sketchbook of 1811–1812; JTW, 209 and 215. The dotted-rhythm thematic material that Beethoven jotted down in conjunction with this idea ended up as the introduction to the Overture in C Major, Op. 115.
rather, it might reveal the extent of his compositional ambition: the success of the symphony’s utopian vision of oneness would surely be proportional to the diversity of its elements. For Kanne, Beethoven introduced the Turkish music precisely because his aim was to unite the most heterogeneous musical and poetic materials. To be sure, Cook might argue, like more than a handful of nineteenth-century critics, that Beethoven’s attempt to transform his materials into the semblance of a unified whole is ultimately unsuccessful. But he is perhaps less convincing when he maintains that Beethoven deliberately casts doubt upon the ideal of unity itself—that he is intentionally both “earnest and ironical,” as he puts it. First, this groundlessly infers authorial intention from Beethoven’s alleged failure to unify his materials. Second, it manages to reinscribe precisely the univalent and singular conception of the composer’s voice that Cook resists by creating an ironic distance between the composer and his more extreme moments of Otherness.

In any case, the presence of musical contrasts alone does not amount to a “deconstruction.” It seems to me that a critical approach that takes into account Cook’s important arguments about the finale and its reception without also recasting Beethoven’s intentions as

---

27 Kanne, “Academie des Hrn. Ludwig van Beethoven,” 481; see also Cook’s reading of Kanne’s review in Beethoven: Symphony No. 9, 39 and Levy’s reading in Beethoven: The Ninth Symphony, 142.
28 Levy argues that Cook’s doubts about the structural integrity of the finale are as old as the critical desire for unity that he rejects; see Beethoven: The Ninth Symphony, 143.
29 Cook, Beethoven: Symphony No. 9, 105. Stephen Hinton has also argued that the Ninth finale is ironic, although in the sense appropriate to contemporary Romantic philosophy and literature; see “Not Which Tones? The Crux of Beethoven’s Ninth,” Nineteenth-Century Music (Summer 1998), particularly 75–76.
ironic might lead to more radical conclusions; indeed, one might observe—in a more thoroughly “deconstructive” spirit, perhaps—the contradictions and suppressions from which Beethoven’s finale and its critics have set out in pursuit of a unified musical whole.

Schiller’s ode provides us with a good starting point. If one could take the injunction to the multitude to be embraced—“Seid umschlungen, Millionen!” (Be embraced, ye millions!)—as representing the core sentiment of Beethoven’s finale, then a second passage gives an unsettling glimpse of how such a magnificent synthesis might be achieved:

Wer ein holdes Weib errungen! Mische seinen Jubel ein!/ Ja—wer auch nur eine Seele Sein nennt auf dem Erdenrund!/ Und wer’s nie gekonnt, der stehle weinend sich aus diesem Bund.

(Whoever has won a noble wife, let him mingle his rejoicing [with ours]!/ Yes—also he who has only one [kindred] soul to call his own in the entire world!/ But he who has never known these [joys], let him steal weeping from this circle.)

In other words, amidst this general coming together, an outcast steals away. Troublingly, this suggests that Beethoven’s and Schiller’s vision of inclusivity is founded on, or at least creates, a kind of exclusivity. “Fraternity is intolerant of difference,” writes Solomon of this passage; he continues:

That is why—for us, if not for Schiller and Beethoven—the hidden hero of “An die Freude” may be precisely that weeping heretic who rejects joyful conformity and accepts exile.31

30 James Parsons has examined the aesthetic, philosophical, and ideological contexts of this sentiment in his “Deine Zauber binden wieder: Beethoven, Schiller, and the Joyous Reconciliation of Opposites,” Beethoven Forum 9 (2002), 1–53.
Thus, just as the Ninth reflects one of the central ideals of Enlightenment liberalism—namely, an inclusive, ideologically neutral vision of unity in diversity—it also snags itself on one of the most enduring problems of the modern liberal worldview, a problem that is as relevant as ever in present-day Europe and America: is there a model of integration that does not also involve overtly or covertly suppressing difference?

Following Schiller’s weeping outcast, the critic is introduced to a range of characters who have also been exiled from the Ninth. Beethoven edited and reorganized Schiller’s ode, of course, and the casualties are notable: there are fewer boisterous drunkards who formerly made the poem into an elevated drinking song, and there are no radicals who long for “rescue from the chains of tyrants” (*Tyrannenketten*). Further, besides the drinkers and the revolutionaries, the weeping outcast also lives out his exile among beggars—the only people whom Beethoven had mentioned in his earliest ideas for the composition: “selected lines like Fürsten sind Bettler [Princes are beggars] etc.,” he scribbled in the Petter sketchbook. The actual line, from the 1785 version of the ode, reads “Bettler werden Fürstenbrüder” (beggars become the brothers of princes); Beethoven’s rendering of the line was either a mistake or a joke. In any case, by the 1820s, Beethoven was working with a version of the poem that had already been edited by Schiller himself. Many critics have observed how the 1803 ode removes or softens some

---

of the more inflammatory sentiments of 1785: it was at this time that “Bettler werden Fürstenbrüder” became the more familiar “Alle Menschen werden Brüder” (All men become brothers). In other words, what is perhaps the grandest unifying sentiment of the Ninth, repeated again and again by chorus and soloists, conceals a small act of expurgation: “all men” does not truly mean all men. In Schiller’s case, the politics of this alteration were plain—by the start of the nineteenth century he had openly deplored the consequences of the French Revolution and repudiated many of its ideals; in 1802 he sought and received a patent of nobility.33

One could argue that Beethoven’s music effects several analogous expulsions, which critics have often reenacted in their pursuit of musical unity and an attendant conception of the composer’s singular voice. After all, the expulsion of unsettling musical Others is one of the basic narratives of the symphony, even as it strives towards a synthesis. Indeed, the finale of the Ninth, perhaps more than any other composition by Beethoven, makes use of the rhetoric that Rudolf Bockholdt has characterized as “nicht so, sondern so” (not like that—but like this).34 Like much of Beethoven’s music, it sets up obstacles in order to overcome them: D triumphs over B flat, the major mode triumphs over the minor, and the Joy theme triumphs over most of the preceding thematic material in the symphony. In Beethoven’s sketches, the opening recitatives in the cellos and basses,

which famously comment on the recollected fragments from earlier movements, are even translated into verbal dismissals: “this is a mere farce,” wrote Beethoven of the Scherzo reminiscence; “this is too tender,” he remarked of the Adagio.\(^\text{35}\) The utterance that Beethoven penned for the entrance of the baritone after the reprise of the stormy opening fanfare in m. 208—a passage structurally parallel to the earlier recitatives in cellos and basses, of course—plainly restates the theme: “O Freunde, nicht diese Töne!” (O friends, not these tones!).

Thus, just as the weeping outcast reveals the pattern of exclusion that is the corollary of Schiller’s vision of brotherhood, so Beethoven’s rhetoric of expulsion belies his vision of symphonic synthesis. In such a rhetorical context, the Turkish Janissary music is an unwelcome foreign incursion, destined to be expunged. After the sudden swerve to an F–major chord, D becomes B flat, the lofty musical register becomes a lowly one, and Western music becomes Eastern—until an instrumental fugato modulates back to a grand homophonic reprise of the Joy theme in the chorus, along with the opening stanza of Schiller’s ode. Sanders hears the new mood and key area of the Turkish music as the start of a “second theme” in his account of the finale as a modified sonata form.\(^\text{36}\) Moreover, in his later essay on the finale, Sanders describes the process by which the

\(^{35}\) The sketches in question are from Landsberg 8, bundle 2; see JTW, 292–298. These readings of Beethoven’s words are Gustav Nottebohm’s, translated in Solomon’s “Sense of an Ending,” 220. There is some disagreement over the correct reading of Beethoven’s commentary; see Stephen Hinton’s brief summary and literature review in “Not Which Tones?” 68. Hinton nevertheless concludes that “the sketches make explicit that the quotations from the earlier movements are being rejected.”

\(^{36}\) Sanders, “Form and Content in the Finale of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony,” in particular the diagram on 76.
movement pacifies the tonal area and pitch of B flat as “developmental elimination”: Beethoven almost literally “composes out” B flat—that is, purges it from his finale.\(^{37}\)

There is no reason to think that Beethoven would have wanted anyone to understand his aesthetic enterprise in these terms, of course. Indeed, it is safe to say that critics remain more or less true to the Ninth’s artistic aspirations when they base their interpretations of the finale on moments that appear to bring about a kind of synthesis. Nevertheless, although certain passages might reasonably be understood as symbolic of the ideal of synthesis, whether one believes that a synthesis has actually been achieved often depends on the metaphors that one chooses. For example, some critics describe the pianissimo dominant ninth chord on “über Sternen muß er [ein lieber Vater] wohnen” (he [a loving father] must dwell beyond the stars) as a “synthesis” because the pitch of B flat appears to gain a place, albeit a peripheral one, in the tonal context of D minor-D major.\(^{38}\) But one could just as easily describe this passage as the moment in which the progressive expulsion of B flat is completed: the pitch has been reduced to a dissonant inflection atop the structural dissonance of the global dominant, whose function is precisely to revert to the concluding section of D major that follows.\(^{39}\)

\(^{37}\) Sanders, “The Sonata-Form Finale of Beethoven’s Ninth,” 58.


\(^{39}\) Not only do the following sections avoid B flat, but they apparently strive to eliminate any residual influence it might have. This might be a reason for the soloists’ cadenza-like turn to B major before the Prestissimo—a harmonic digression
This is not to say that there are no unambiguous moments of synthesis in the finale. The most palpable synthesis is surely the double fugue, which superimposes a subject derived from the Joy theme onto the subject of the Andante maestoso on “Seid umschlungen.” Precisely because its musical synthesis is so demonstrative, however, some critics have been encouraged to consider the double fugue as, to all intents and purposes, the conclusion and culmination of the movement. Schenker is not alone in arguing that the subsequent sections “manifest only cadential character”—thus suggesting that they serve merely to reinforce and repeat the foregoing resolution. Given the aesthetic ambitions of the Ninth, Schenker is on one level justified; one might legitimately conceive of the double fugue as the symbolic culmination of the piece—“a symbolic contrapuntal union,” as David Levy puts it. But such a symbolic conception of the conclusion is contradicted by the actual behavior of the music. James Webster has convincingly argued that only the very last sections achieve complete tonal and gestural closure. Indeed, from an empirical perspective, one might argue that Beethoven, rather than concluding his symphony with synthesis, is compelled to end with the kind of ruthless reductionism familiar from

---

42 Webster, “The Form of the Finale of Beethoven’s Ninth,” particularly 28 and 60.
the Fifth Symphony—a systematic tonal and thematic purification that casts out any element that might interfere with the business of closure. In the final twenty-one measures of Prestissimo, beginning with the resolution of a firm authentic cadence, the music expands to the limits of the available instrumental resources, but at the same time contracts into a rapidly narrowing tonal and thematic space: the Joy theme is reduced to a compressed symbol of itself, reiterating over a string of tonics and dominants—a fragment circling around the third and fifth scale degrees. After an urgent doubling of the rate of harmonic change, this fragment is reduced even further—ultimately to a hammering series of two-note slur figures, which fall from the fifth to the third scale degree. All that remains is a flourish in the woodwind and a final upbeat-downbeat fall of a fifth—the ultimate musical compression, marking the very end of the end; only silence can follow.43

To be sure, critics more commonly describe closure in Beethoven’s music as completion in the most emphatic sense—the provision of a necessary syntactical element that the music has previously denied us. Closure conceived along these lines is something like the resolution of a large-scale cadence.44 Walter Webster invokes Lawrence Kramer’s description of closure in the Fifth Symphony—an ending that “cannot be followed” (Kramer’s emphasis). See Lawrence Kramer, Music and Poetry: The Nineteenth Century and After (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 235; Webster, “The Form of the Finale of Beethoven’s Ninth,” 61–62 and 62n41.

Nicholas Marston provides a further list of possible meanings of the term “closure” in music criticism (derived from literary critic Don Fowler) in his essay “The Sense of an Ending: Goal-Directedness in Beethoven’s Music,” in The Cambridge Companion to Beethoven, ed. Glenn Stanley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 85. Webster’s account of the finale of the Ninth as through-composed depends on a conception of closure as completion, although his resistance to reductionism and
Riezler, perhaps alluding to Schenker’s more reductive theories of the 1930s, described the falling fifth that concludes the Ninth as if it were a microcosm of the cadence-like progress of the entire piece, echoing and resolving the falling fourth of the work’s very opening theme: “the whole work at once seems to be spanned by a great arch stretching from the first note to the last,” he wrote. But even this metaphor of architectural enclosing cannot conceal an attendant gesture of expulsion: projecting Beethoven’s closing tonal and thematic purifications onto the entire work, Riezler’s inclusive rhetoric substitutes the diverse content of the Ninth for a single quasi-cadential operation, much as Schenker’s late theories expunge surface details almost until each composition resembles an authentic cadence—a fundamentally subtractive methodology that was nonetheless “the resolution of all diversity into ultimate wholeness” to Schenker himself.

Ironically, the subtractions implicit in these conceptions of musical synthesis might seem to impede the critical pursuit of Beethoven’s single authorial voice: once critics have followed what seems to be Beethoven’s lead and eliminated all alien voices from the advocacy of a multivalent approach to analysis suggest that he would accept that various conceptions of closure (and perhaps also open-endedness) in the Ninth can coexist. Indeed, although the idea of through-composition privileges both unilinear temporal progression and end-orientedness, Webster also articulates connections between the various sections of the finale of the Ninth in a quasi-spatial manner—connections that do not depend on temporal succession to be analytically valid; see “The Form of the Finale of Beethoven’s Ninth,” 35–36.

45 Walter Riezler, Beethoven, trans. G. D. H. Pidcock (London: M. C. Forrester, 1938), 216. Schenker’s most reductive theories were formulated some years after his monograph on the Ninth, of course.

finale, the composer’s unadulterated voice is rarely identifiable in the inconsequential musical residue. To be sure, when Riezler takes the final cadence of the Ninth as emblematic of the progress of the entire work, his cultural message is clear (just as it is in the most reductive Schenkerian theories): Beethoven’s authentic voice, like an authentic cadence, is one of the most fundamental sounds in Western music; Beethoven is the home key of the musical canon, so to speak. But this sentiment still risks eradicating Beethoven’s unique voice altogether by universalizing it.

One might maintain that Riezler’s “great arch” spanning the Ninth is in essence a formalist translation of Kanne’s idea of an ever-present Besonnenheit—an authorial structure that shelters the diverse voices of the symphony within it. Then again, as we have seen, the composer’s voice is most palpable when it intervenes to evict unwanted Others rather than invite them in: when an actual voice enters the symphony for the first time uttering Beethoven’s own words, it delivers a negative injunction—“not these tones.” Generations of critics have cast about both within and without the Ninth in search of the tones that Beethoven rejects; among the candidates are the dissonant fanfare that opens the finale, all earlier movements of the symphony, and, in Wagner’s famous interpretation, all instrumental symphonic music. But the identity of these Others is perhaps less important than the rhetoric of rejection itself. That so many critics have treated this moment as the hermeneutic crux of the finale perhaps suggests that Beethoven’s voice is less perceptible as a constant authorial

\[47\] See Hinton’s summary in “Not Which Tones?” 67.
presence than as a constitutive gesture of rejection—a gesture that becomes meaningful only in relation to everything that it is not.\footnote{There is perhaps a parallel between this argument and Leo Treitler’s idea that the Ninth Symphony in some sense demands that its interpretation become a constitutive part of the work; see “History, Criticism, and Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony,” in \textit{Music and the Historical Imagination} (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), chapter 1.}

Indeed, one is tempted to say that, rather than shaping or superseding all Others in the finale of the Ninth, Beethoven’s voice paradoxically manifests itself primarily as difference—a perpetual nicht diese, which constantly defers the moment of authorial presence until the moment of silence.

Even the Turkish music is not wholly banished; the clattering percussion returns in the closing Prestissimo.\footnote{Webster lists the presence of the Turkish percussion as one of several multivalent connections between the B-flat Alla marcia and the rest of the finale; see “The Form of the Finale of Beethoven’s Ninth,” 35; see also Kramer, “The Harem Threshold,” 89–90.} Levy argues that this is yet another example of the synthesis that the Ninth achieves—although the relevant percussion instruments are all that ultimately survive of the tonally wayward Janissary march.\footnote{Levy, \textit{Beethoven: The Ninth Symphony}, 119.} In any case, while Beethoven might have intended the final inclusion of the percussion instruments to symbolize a kind of synthesis, their meaning is by no means plain: they might more strongly recall, even in the very last measures, the voices that have been cast out of the finale; or perhaps their persistent jangling suggests that the composer can only speak when he borrows the voices of Others—that his voice, even until the decisive end of his work, is irreducibly plural.
The Heroic Style and Its Others

We will return to the Ninth and its ambiguous Turkish percussion. First, however, I want to suggest that the critical mindset that has shaped the reception of the Ninth has constructed Beethoven’s entire oeuvre and its place in the Western canon in much the same way. After all, just as the internal story of the Ninth has been retold as a series of overcomings, so the entire symphony has been portrayed as a victory in a wider historiographical story of conquest—“the shining hour of music history in which the Ninth began its glorious march around the globe,” to use the bombastic image of one critic.51 The Ninth has come to be seen as the summation and culmination of Beethoven’s defining musical register, “the crowning work of the heroic style,” as Solomon puts it.52

The heroic style—a label traceable to the florid writings of Romain Rolland—has come to describe not only Beethoven’s music in its most triumphant vein, but also the cultural triumph of this music. The idea of the heroic style is thus inseparable from Beethoven’s most canonical works: the dramatic and often densely thematic pieces that, with the exception of the Ninth itself, were composed in or around the first decade of the nineteenth century (or, more precisely, from around 1803 to 1812)—the odd-numbered symphonies from the *Eroica* onwards and the overtures from *Prometheus* to *Egmont*, many of

---

which are associated with real or mythic heroes.\textsuperscript{53} In his landmark 1995 study of Beethoven’s cultural preeminence, \textit{Beethoven Hero}, Scott Burnham argues that these works have colonized and conditioned all musical thought: “the values of Beethoven’s heroic style have become the values of music.”\textsuperscript{54} Burnham’s thesis warrants particular attention because, in its terse encapsulation of what it claims to be received critical wisdom, it cannot avoid portraying Beethoven’s voice as an agent of unity—not only on the level of individual works, but also on the level of musical culture as a whole, which is unified under Beethoven’s dominion. Burnham’s guiding concept, which he deduces from the heroic style and its reception history, is “presence”—the presence of an overpowering voice within the heroic style, as well as the omnipresence of this voice in Western musical culture.\textsuperscript{55}

Given his emphasis on presence, it is perhaps revealing that Burnham should reprise the trope of naming even in his opening lines: “Beethoven. When asked to name the single most influential composer of the Western world, few would hesitate,” he writes, giving the name a sentence of its own before imagining music lovers unhesitatingly naming the greatest of them all.\textsuperscript{56} Even at the outset, the composer’s

\textsuperscript{53} The only book-length study of Beethoven’s heroic music in the form of a conventional style history is Michael Broyles, \textit{Beethoven: The Emergence and Evolution of Beethoven’s Heroic Style} (New York: Excelsior, 1987); the most influential article on the subject remains Alan Tyson, “Beethoven’s Heroic Phase,” \textit{Musical Times} (February 1969), 139–141.


\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 31. For Burnham’s model of presence, see chapter 1, passim; and, used as a critique of process-oriented accounts of the heroic style, 162–166.

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., xiii. Burnham is not the only Beethoven scholar to have begun a book with the trope of naming; Martin Cooper starts his study of late Beethoven with this rhetorical device: “‘Think of a flower’—‘Rose.’ ‘Think of a color’—‘Red.’ ‘Think of a
unmistakable name stands in for his presence, the familiar name
distracting us from the few who, he admits, would hesitate to say it—
scholars of Mozart or Bach, perhaps, not to mention Josquin or
Elvis. Thus, even as Burnham pursues his argument from a
standpoint associated with ideology critique—he reveals how a
contingent and localized set of values has become Just The Way
Things Are—he makes the heroic style appear unassailable. The
conversation continues to be monopolized by talk about a few pieces of
Beethoven, only it has turned to why we must talk about them.
Burnham goes as far as to suggest that critics might be incapable of
talking about anything else: “It may in fact be impossible to say
anything new about this music (or any music) when all that we say
about music in general is conditioned by this very music”—an open
admission of a hermeneutic dead-end.

Burnham explains how Beethoven came to be omnipresent with
what he describes as a “phenomenology”—an empirical account of the
qualities of “presence and engagement” in the heroic style. Again,
names prove crucial: “phenomenology” connotes an approach that in
some way purports to circumvent or at least minimize theoretical
mediation—a model of criticism that ostensibly matches the

---

57 The most vociferous critique of the exaggerations that sometimes sustain
Burnham's argument has come from Michael Spitzer—although his polemic is
perhaps itself prone to overstatement; see “Convergences: Criticism, Analysis, and
58 Burnham seems to accept this, and is careful to avoid the giving the impression
that his argument is a critically facile exercise in debunking: “my motivation here is
not to critique and then dismantle the status quo” (*Beethoven Hero*, xvii).
59 Ibid., xix.
60 Ibid., chapter 2.
immediacy of its subject with the immediacy of its response.\textsuperscript{61} Thus, while Burnham assures his readers that he does not intend to stake out “some sort of neutral level of purely musical significance,” he implies instead that his observations preempt the mediated reflections of more conventional musical analysis.\textsuperscript{62} Despite this, however, many of his central claims depend upon existing analytical conceptions of musical form and syntax—his contention, for example, that Beethoven expands and comments on what he calls “classical-style form,” surely one of the most pored-over constructions of modern analysis and historiography.\textsuperscript{63} In fact, Burnham’s writing is much like Tovey’s or Kerman’s insofar as it artfully mixes technical description and vivid imagistic language. For example, he writes of the “complex instance of nonclosural falling motion”—the falling semitone articulated by two falling thirds—that opens the Fifth Symphony, but continues:

the force of assertion does not lift anything up, does not push open a space to be explored, in short, does no such day work, but instead thrusts downward, pushes below, falls like night.\textsuperscript{64}

The problem here is not the combination of technical description and vivid imagery but rather the claims that Burnham makes for it. Vivid prose might aspire to match the immediacy of the listening experience,

---

\textsuperscript{61} Valentine Cunningham polemicizes against the idea that one can engage directly with a text without the mediation of theory in his (hence punningly titled) Reading After Theory (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002). Burnham does not reveal all the sources of his musical phenomenology, although he mentions David Greene’s Temporal Processes in Beethoven’s Music (New York: Gordon and Breech, 1982).

\textsuperscript{62} Burnham, Beethoven Hero, xvii.

\textsuperscript{63} See, for example, ibid., 62.

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 33.
but vividness alone does not create a phenomenology. It merely makes striking language the proxy of presence.

Burnham’s promised shift of critical position is thus a function of rhetoric, and when he uses his “phenomenology” to ground a metatheory of music analysis in his third chapter, uniting the theories of A. B. Marx, Schenker, Réti, and Riemann, he necessarily grants his own analytical reflections ontological priority.65 Burnham accepts that “each generation projects onto Beethoven a somewhat different aesthetic concern,” but his main aim is to demonstrate that “the musical values of the heroic style are preserved in the axioms of the leading theoretical models of the last two centuries”—to reveal once again Beethoven’s omnipresence.66 Beethoven speaks with one, imperious voice, and so do the theorists, since Beethoven speaks through them. Indeed, like the finale of the Ninth, Burnham’s story of Beethoven’s cultural presence becomes one of grand synthesis: under Beethoven’s direction, all critical voices join together in a chorus of consent.67

---

65 Ibid., chapter 3.
66 Ibid., 110–111.
67 Burnham’s unifying spirit here reveals the influence of Hans Eggebrecht’s monograph Zur Geschichte der Beethoven-Rezeption: Beethoven 1970 (Mainz: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1972), which aims to show how Beethoven reception has been dominated by a limited number of tropes and topics that he calls “reception constants.” Burnham approvingly quotes Eggebrecht’s claim that the history of Beethoven reception reads like “one book written by a single author”—a deeply revealing textual metaphor (Burnham, Beethoven Hero, xiii; Eggebrecht, 38). This image transforms Beethoven’s diverse critics into something singular and trans-historical—something with the coherence and permanence of a book. Indeed, Eggebrecht’s book itself makes this metaphor literal: historical voices become a text, produced by a single author, and with all of the Autorität that Eggebrecht sees critics repeatedly perceiving in Beethoven’s music (Eggebrecht, 41). Beethoven criticism thus ends up as the mirror image of Beethoven’s timeless works.
By articulating the structure of Beethoven’s dominance, Burnham reinforces, even exaggerates, existing distinctions between Beethoven and his critically maligned or marginalized musical Others: the heroic style “dictates the shape of alterity,” he writes.\(^6\) Without doubt, one can point to a proliferation of oppositions that seem to support his contention. One only need consider the frequently gendered opposition of Beethoven and Schubert—the active, teleological, and developmental versus the passive, digressive, and melodic. Or Beethoven and Mendelssohn—the struggling, avant garde, and revolutionary versus the facile, retrospective, and Biedermeier. Or Beethoven and Rossini—the authentic, challenging, and textual versus the compromised, populist, and performative. Further, each of these personified binary oppositions implies a number of musical ones: vocal music versus instrumental music; sonata and symphony versus opera and potpourri; inviolable works versus mutable performances; themes and development versus tunes and repetition. And, of course, such musical oppositions in turn imply wider cultural frames of reference: serious versus light; structure versus decoration; rational versus capricious; German versus Franco-Italian; masculine versus feminine; straight versus gay.

Despite Burnham’s insistence on the impregnability of Beethoven’s dominance, however, he ultimately expresses frustration with critics who “simply display the binary opposite of each term of the Beethoven paradigm” when they discuss Beethoven’s musical

---

Others.69 Susan McClary’s gendered readings of the Schubert–Beethoven opposition are singled out for criticism: “With such a model of the feminine we seem not to have progressed beyond Adam’s rib in the way we conceptualize the feminine in tonal music.”70 His epilogue recommends an alternative perspective: a composer such as Schubert might help critics to see the value and distinctiveness of music that has often been defined as “merely” non-Beethovenian; critics might thus strive to conceive of Schubertian and Beethovenian aesthetics as parallel and equally valid modes of musical thought rather than a hierarchical opposition.71

The desire to transcend such binary oppositions is grounded in a kind of inclusive liberal pluralism—the belief that all kinds of music could comfortably coexist if only critics and listeners tried to understand what is unique and admirable about each of them. Without our Beethovenian preconceptions “we will ask why we value the presence of any given music and how we are present in the

69 Ibid.
71 Burnham’s attempted dissolution of the Beethoven–Schubert opposition has an analogy in the framing device with which Carl Dahlhaus begins his Nineteenth-Century Music. Echoing Raphael Georg Kiesewetter, Dahlhaus writes of the “twin styles” of Beethoven and Rossini that inaugurated the century’s music—a formulation that, in Dahlhaus’s hands, is designed to avoid an evaluative hierarchy within the opposition. Indeed, with a characteristically inclusive gesture, Dahlhaus maintains that today’s critics need not choose between the aesthetics of Rossini and Beethoven, which can comfortably co-exist. See Carl Dahlhaus, Nineteenth-Century Music, trans. J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley: California University Press, 1989), 8–15. Several scholars have argued that Dahlhaus is far from even-handed in his treatment of opera; see, for example, Philip Gossett, “Carl Dahlhaus and the ‘Ideal Type’,” Nineteenth-Century Music (Summer 1989), 49–56 and James Hepokoski, “The Dahlhaus Project and Its Extra-Musicological Sources,” Nineteenth-Century Music (Spring 1991), 221–246.
experience of that music,” argues Burnham. Perhaps the reader is to assume that these questions can be answered with a musical phenomenology unencumbered by the Beethovenian preconceptions of conventional analysis; having given a complete phenomenological description of Beethoven’s heroic style, one might go on to describe Schubert’s piano sonatas, Rossini’s arias, or Mendelssohn’s overtures.

And yet, this pluralism may be as reductive as the binary oppositions that it seeks to transcend. Indeed, Burnham observes that McClary’s essentializing arguments about Schubert remain parasitic on the Beethoven paradigm, yet goes on to imply that McClary is not essentializing enough: after all, Burnham appears to argue that critics should instead seek to define what is essentially Schubertian, preferably without regard to Beethoven at all. This approach risks turning the complex negotiations, exchanges, and entanglements that make up musical styles and musical cultures into a collection of merely adjacent, self-contained “values”; it reduces an intricate, hybrid musical culture to a series of ghettos. Nor is it obvious that the principled critic should try to engage with Beethoven’s Others as if the Beethoven paradigm were an irrelevance, especially given the influence that it exerted, in various forms, on his contemporaries and successors.

Further, and crucially, Burnham’s notion that Beethoven’s heroic “master trope” dictates the shape of its Others contradicts one of the most important lessons of recent political theory and cultural criticism: master tropes, no less than master races, gain coherence as

---

72 Burnham, Beethoven Hero, 167.
much by identifying and excluding foreign elements as by any inward-looking method of self-definition. Burnham endeavours to provide precisely such a definition with his “phenomenology”—an explanation of the mastery of the heroic style inferred with minimal mediation from anything outside of the style itself. Given the inherent circularity of this task, it is not surprising that Burnham should generate his self-grounding image of the heroic master trope from an exceedingly narrow selection of an already small collection of works—short samples even of the music that critics have traditionally associated with the heroic style. Lewis Lockwood has observed that Burnham’s book is “primarily an analytical study of the Eroica and the Fifth Symphonies”—and one might add that Burnham, like many of his critical predecessors, focuses almost exclusively on the Eroica’s first movement. Besides these two symphonies, Burnham devotes extended discussion only to the Egmont and Coriolanus Overtures. Despite this narrowness of focus, however, Burnham never actually defines the heroic style. To be sure, by his own reckoning he has no

73 Lawrence Kramer has called this the “logic of alterity”; see Classical Music and Postmodern Knowledge (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 34.
75 At the very opening, Burnham writes of “two symphonies, two piano sonatas, several overtures, [and] a piano concerto” that can “lay unequivocal claim” to the heroic style (Beethoven Hero, xiii). This formulation seems to refer directly to the Eroica and the Fifth; the “Waldstein” and the “Appassionata”; the Fifth Piano Concerto; and the Coriolanus, Egmont, and Leonore Overtures Nos. 2 and 3. Burnham adds in a footnote that one might also include “earlier or later” works—thus implicitly acknowledging that the heroic style was largely confined to the first decade of the nineteenth century. His additional examples are the Pathétique Sonata; the “Hammerklavier”; the Piano Sonata Op. 111; and the Ninth Symphony (Beethoven Hero, 169n1).
need to: it is surely unnecessary to define something that has come to define all of music—something that is omnipresent in our language about music. Nevertheless, given the supposed omnipresence of the Beethovenian master trope, it is perhaps revealing that Burnham must remove almost all of Beethoven’s oeuvre in order to talk about it with any assurance.

Granted, Burnham recognizes that Beethoven’s own music is often resistant to the Beethoven paradigm: “although the heroic style quickly became a master trope, it is only one of the stories that Beethoven tells,” he observes, illustrating his claim with a brief discussion of the Pastoral Symphony, the languid Other of the dramatic Fifth.\textsuperscript{[76]} Nonetheless, this recognition yet again reinforces existing distinctions between Beethoven and his Others—only in this case Beethoven is his own Other. Moreover, a composer’s voice cannot be so easily compartmentalized; indeed, a closer look at the idea of the heroic style as it has persisted in Beethoven criticism since Rolland reveals a critical category that is itself ambiguous and divided—a concept that is shaped by a constant awareness of its Others.

\textbf{The Absent Heroic Style}

The greatest obstacle to any secure definition of the heroic style is its position in an unappetizing critical smorgasbord of Beethovenian styles, periodizations, and historiographical narratives—the traditional

\textsuperscript{[76]} Ibid., 153. The comments on the Pastoral continue on 154–155. Burnham’s subsequent discussion leads to the most radical subversions of his own earlier account of the heroic paradigm, which are crucial to the third chapter of the present study.
tripartite conception of Beethoven’s creative life foremost among them. Both William Kinderman and Solomon treat the heroic style as the emblematic musical manner of Beethoven’s middle period. Solomon gives Beethoven a heroic period and a heroic decade—a slightly more formal version of the heroic phase conjectured by Alan Tyson. Nevertheless, all critics assume that Beethoven’s heroic music is foremost defined by a style—a style that is foreshadowed in some early works such as the Funeral Cantata for Joseph II and recalled in some later ones such as the Ninth. Most assume a broad continuity between the heroic style and Beethoven’s “symphonic” musical thought: Solomon has the heroic style congealing in the genre of the symphony in the aftermath of a big bang created by the epic emotional scale of heroic subjects colliding with sonata principles. Dahlhaus only loosely distinguishes the heroic style from what he calls the “symphonic style”—the thematically propulsive, developmentally dense, dramatic yet monumental manner typified by the first movement of the Eroica. To this extent, the heroic style provides a label for a traditionally selective conception of Beethoven’s symphonic writing. Dahlhaus himself observes that music historians have habitually taken the Eroica and the Fifth as symbolic of Beethoven’s symphonic procedure rather than the Fourth, the Pastoral, or the

77 See Kinderman, Beethoven, chapters 4 and 5; Solomon, Beethoven, chapters 12 and 14.
78 Part III of Solomon’s Beethoven is called “The Heroic Period” while chapters 12 and 14 are called “The Heroic Decade” I and II respectively.
80 Solomon, Beethoven, particularly 251–252.
81 See Dahlhaus, Ludwig van Beethoven: Approaches to His Music, particularly 29–30; see also chapter 4 for his full discussion of the “symphonic style.”
Eighth.\textsuperscript{82} The even-numbered symphonies “are not in the main line of Beethoven’s spiritual development,” concluded J. W. N. Sullivan.\textsuperscript{83} One might add that even within the privileged odd-numbered symphonies the critical emphasis has tended to fall on sonata-type movements with dramatic and teleological patterns of thematic development—a tendency that has led to the relative critical neglect of the variation finale of the \textit{Eroica}.\textsuperscript{84} Moreover, to complete the circle of classification, this bias intersects with traditional Beethoven periodization: most critics have treated only certain edited symphonic highlights as emblematic of Beethoven’s entire middle period.

The farther one gets from the first movements of Beethoven’s odd-numbered symphonies, therefore, the more problematic it becomes to talk of the heroic style. The invocation of the term in connection with chamber works such as the first “Razumovsky” Quartet Op. 59 or the Piano Sonatas Opp. 53 and 57 stems in part from a widespread perception of their seriousness, compositional ambition, and quasi-symphonic scope.\textsuperscript{85} Meanwhile, the widespread discussion of the Fifth Piano Concerto with reference to the idea of the heroic style appears to issue from the same impulse that has led many

\textsuperscript{82} Dahlhaus, \textit{Nineteenth-Century Music}, 76.
\textsuperscript{84} This neglect has been partially redressed in recent years with studies such as Elaine Sisman’s “ Tradition and Transformation in the Alternating Variations of Haydn and Beethoven,” \textit{Acta Musicologica} 62, 2/3, 152–182.
critics to regard the piece as a kind of honorary symphony. Most of Beethoven’s overtures are considered examples of the heroic style, of course, because they combine a monumental and dramatic manner with unambiguously heroic literary subjects. More serious problems arise in the case of vocal music and stage works, however, where heroic subjects might abound, but instances of “symphonic” writing tend to require special pleading. Even though most Beethoven scholars recognize the importance of Leonore–Fidelio to any conception of the heroic style, the discussion of its music in this connection (aside from its multiple overtures) is scanty. Searching for the heroic style in Beethoven’s opera, a critic has little more to go on than the heroic rescue story and the monumentality of much of the music in the last scene. The oratorio Christus am Ölberg presents even more of a problem. Few have argued that its music contributed substantially to the emergence of the heroic style, even though its earliest version and later revision practically frame the heroic decade—and Tyson points out that its suffering Christ–hero is consistent with the themes of heroism that run through Beethoven’s heroic phase. And yet, as Lockwood has since observed, even the portrayal of heroism itself in Beethoven’s heroic phase is irreducibly diverse—from the quiet endurance of Florestan to the public sacrifice of Egmont and the triumphant inner will of Leonore.

---

86 “In Beethoven’s ‘Emperor,’ concerto and symphony virtually merge,” writes Lockwood in his Beethoven, 249.
87 Tyson, “Beethoven’s Heroic Phase.”
Every critical doubt or outright exclusion implies yet more doubts and exclusions on a larger scale. The uncertain status of Christus am Ölberg and Leonore–Fidelio within the heroic style surely reflects the idea, widespread even during the composer’s lifetime, that Beethoven is in essence a writer of instrumental music; certainly, the cantatas and all of the songs (with the possible exception of An die ferne Geliebte) also appear inessential to most critical definitions of his musical voice. Likewise, the Pastoral Symphony points to an entire marginalized repertoire of tuneful and expansive sonata-type works that nonetheless eschew dramatic and teleological thematic development. Some critics have described what they take to be a neglected lyrical episode in Beethoven’s creative life—the period of six years or so from around 1809 that produced the Piano Sonatas Opp. 78 and 90 as well as the op. 74 String Quartet and the op. 97 Piano Trio. That these compositions—in particular the cantabile rondo of Op. 90—have often been described as “Schubertian” is symptomatic of their marginal status. Solomon questions whether the musical features of these pieces “are hallmarks of a distinct style” and implies instead that their supposedly untypical style is evidence of a composer in the midst of a transition. In other words, Beethoven is not his authentic self in these pieces, even though tuneful sonata

---

89 It also raises a nexus of problems surrounding Beethoven’s “characteristic” and pictorial music, of course, which chapters 2 and 3 of the present study discuss in greater detail.
91 See, for example, Kinderman on Op. 90 in his Beethoven, 182.
movements—not least rondo finales—are common in his oeuvre; one only need consider the Piano Sonatas Op. 7, Op. 22, and Op. 31 No. 1.

Moreover, one could argue that, even within Beethoven’s canonical works, critically marginalized moments of Otherness point to broader patterns of critical exclusion. There is no clearer case than the Janissary march in the finale of the Ninth. The wind and percussion share their critical exile with other examples of Beethoven’s Turkish exoticism—entire pieces that lie far from the heroic canon. At the farthest remove is surely the chorus of dervishes from the incidental music for August von Kotzebue’s play Die Ruinen von Athen (The Ruins of Athens)—a short drama that, along with König Stephan (King Stephen), was part of the opening ceremony of Pest’s Imperial Theater on Kaiser Franz’s birthday (12 February) in 1812. This chorus has been expurgated from critical constructions of Beethoven’s oeuvre just as the Turkish music has been critically expurgated from the Ninth. It incorporates almost every obvious kind of musical exoticism: the score calls for “all available noise-making instruments, such as castanets, bells, etc.”; the harmony is dominated by primitivist open fifths and octaves; violins and violas shadow the vocal line with triplets that oscillate between the principal note and its lower chromatic neighbor, creating the impression of an exotically wavering pitch. Kotzebue’s text, meanwhile, indulges in the sort of image-rich bosh often reserved for the depiction of magical rites, prominently incorporating a pair of Islamic signifiers: “Du hast in deines Ärmels

93 The opening had been planned for the Kaiser’s name day (4 October) the previous year, and is still sometimes mistakenly cited as having been performed on this date; the project suffered several delays, however.
Falten/ Den Mond getragen, ihn gespalten,/ Kaaba! Mahomet!” (Thou hast taken the moon into the folds of thy sleeve and split it. Kaaba! Mahomet!). The dervish chorus led to yet another musical representation of the Islamic Other, which Beethoven arranged from the theme of his Piano Variations Op. 76—a Janissary march that appears almost domesticated after the whirling dervishes, and somewhat closer in style to the Turkish music in the Ninth.⁹⁴

One is hardly inclined to hear Beethoven’s overbearing presence in his dervish chorus, of course, or even in the subsequent march, although one might perhaps echo Kanne’s defense of the Turkish music in the Ninth: despite a superficial foreignness, Beethoven’s imagination is always in charge. Beethoven merely puts on a mask; the complete concealment of his voice is crucial to the scene, after all, which at once titillates and horrifies with its vision of an irrational, fanatical Other trampling on the very origin of enlightened European culture. And yet, it is unclear when the mask comes off. To be sure, the musical exoticism leaves the stage with the Turks, but Beethoven’s voice does not obviously reassert itself in the remaining movements of the score. The sacred march to the altar that opens the final scene perhaps aims to set to rights the grotesque march of the Turkish Janissaries, just as the final oath chorus in praise of the Kaiser seeks to counterbalance the horror of Islamic ruination, emphasizing the continuation of enlightened values in the city of Pest. But most critics have been reluctant to identify Beethoven’s voice with this concluding

⁹⁴ Lawrence Kramer comments on the dervish chorus in Die Ruinen in the context of his discussion of the finale of the Ninth in “The Harem Threshold,” 86–88.
musical propagandizing, which ostensibly supplants a more authentic mode of authorial expression—and perhaps even, given the succession of blandly affirmative tonics and dominants in the choral finale, encourages a musical language almost as crude and generic as the Islamic exoticism to which it is opposed. As early as 1829, a critic from Vienna’s Allgemeiner musikalischer Anzeiger formulated a dismissal of Die Ruinen that has since become commonplace: the piece is worthless because it did not arise from the composer’s “inner urge” (aus innerem Drang).95 “Beethoven did not have his heart in these compositions,” asserts Solomon.96 Once again, in such pieces, critics insinuate that Beethoven is not his authentic self.

Thus, one might get the impression that the dervish chorus, for all the staginess of its exoticism, is actually an Other at the heart of an Other—merely the most palpable moment of foreignness in a composition in which Beethoven consistently speaks a language that is foreign to him. Indeed, the score of Die Ruinen belongs to a yet broader category of Otherness: a group of compositions written in the years of the Befreiungskriege and the Congress of Vienna—pieces crucial to the present study, which most critics have hitherto marginalized, largely because of Beethoven’s overt propagandizing: in 1811, the incidental music for Die Ruinen and König Stephan; in 1813, the notorious battle piece Wellingtons Sieg oder die Schlacht bei Vittoria (Wellington’s Victory or the Battle of Vittoria); in 1814, the closing chorus “Germania” for a patriotic drama by Georg Friedrich

96 Solomon, Beethoven, 273.
Treitschke, a chorus to mark the entry of the allied princes into Vienna (though there is no evidence that it was ever performed), “Ihr weisen Gründer glücklicher Staaten” (Ye Wise Founders of Happy States), and a cantata for the Congress of Vienna Der glorreiche Augenblick; in 1815, yet another chorus for the conclusion of a Treitschke drama, “Es ist vollbracht!” (It Is Accomplished!). Several equally obscure compositions from the period also hover on the fringes of this festive and bellicose group: the incidental music to Johann Friedrich Leopold Duncker’s Leonora Prohaska (which was never performed with the drama); a triumphal march and introductory music to the second act of Christoph Kuffner’s Tarpeja; the op. 115 Overture in C Major known as “Zur Namensfeier” (Name Day), which was performed on Kaiser Franz’s name day (4 October) in 1815; one or two marches and simple songs on patriotic texts; and perhaps even the op. 112 cantata Meeresstille und glückliche Fahrt (Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage), a setting of two Goethe poems for chorus and orchestra.

The consciously public, patriotic, and often bellicose tenor of many of these pieces frequently prompts grand musical rhetoric,

---

97 Following Kinderman, I will refer to this group of compositions as originating in the “Congress period,” even though the political event of the Congress (though by no means its associated festivities) ran only from 1 November 1814 until 11 June 1815. The principal studies of these compositions as a more or less coherent group or period are: Cook, “The Other Beethoven”; Ingrid Fuchs, “The Glorious Moment: Beethoven and the Congress of Vienna,” in Denmark and the Dancing Congress of Vienna: Playing for Denmark’s Future (Exhibition Catalog: Christiansborg Palace, Copenhagen, 2002), 182–197; and Kinderman, Beethoven, chapter 7. The entire “problematic” period around 1809–1817 is given particular attention in the book of essays Beethoven zwischen Revolution und Restauration, with the implication of transition clearly maintained in the “zwischen” of its title. Michael Ladenburger’s essay in the collection deals with Beethoven’s Congress compositions and their context; see “Der Wiener Kongreß im Spiegel der Musik,” particularly 293–306. Esteban Buch deals with the Congress period as a context for the aesthetic and political background to the Ninth in Beethoven’s Ninth: A Political History, trans. Richard Miller (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), chapter 4.
massive orchestral and choral sonorities, and showy or bizarre musical effects. Beethoven himself remarked that the dervish chorus was a “good signboard to attract a mixed public” when he made Die Ruinen von Athen available to the organizers of a charity concert in Graz.\footnote{Letter to Joseph von Varena, March 1813. Anderson I, no. 411; Briefwechsel II, no. 630. Unless otherwise stated, all translations from the letters are Anderson’s.} It is worth noting that the Janissary instruments crop up in a number of compositions from the period—not only the Turkish sections of Die Ruinen but also the chorus of warriors in the last movement of Der glorreiche Augenblick and, of course, the greater part of Wellingtons Sieg.\footnote{Cook calls the Turkish percussion the “implicit” Other of Wellingtons Sieg; see “The Other Beethoven,” 18.} Like most mechanical curiosities of the time, Johann Nepomuk Mälzel’s Panharmonicon, for which Beethoven initially composed his battle piece, would have consisted primarily of mechanical winds and Turkish percussion; around two years after the premiere of Wellingtons Sieg, Steiner commissioned an arrangement by Diabelli entirely for wind and percussion—“the Schlacht which has been translated into the purest Turkish,” as Beethoven described it.\footnote{Beethoven’s emphasis. Letter to Steiner of 1815. Anderson II, no. 578; Briefwechsel III, no. 837. On contemporary orchestra machines, see Emily Dolan, “The Origins of the Orchestra Machine,” Current Musicology (Fall 2003), 7–23.}

While Wellingtons Sieg brought Beethoven to the peak of his living fame, later generations of historians have habitually described the years of the Congress of Vienna as a period of decline, bringing the heroic decade to an undistinguished close. Again and again, they have diagnosed a loss of creative energy during the years of the Congress—a weakening or exhaustion of the composer’s voice itself as much as a quantitative decline in productivity. Metaphors of aridity and
liminality accordingly dominate critical writing about the period. Rolland proposes that Beethoven temporarily lost his voice during these years, which he characterizes with the Napoleonic metaphor of exile.\(^{101}\) Wellingtons Sieg is evidence of this exile—Beethoven’s most un-Beethovenian work, “the only one of his works that is unworthy of him,” as Rolland puts it.\(^{102}\) Sullivan, framing the last years of the heroic decade entirely in the language of decay, likewise maintains that Beethoven was “singularly unproductive” in the decade from 1809—a questionable contention, surely projecting an ingrained critical indifference to Beethoven’s output from this period onto historical fact.\(^{103}\) Solomon writes of the “dissolution of the heroic style”—the waning of Beethoven’s most distinctive and lasting musical voice, until its recrudescence in the Ninth.\(^{104}\) Dahlhaus also sees Wellingtons Sieg as the end of the heroic style; “it has been described as the unhappy outcome of a creative block,” he adds.\(^{105}\) Lockwood dubs the period from 1813 to 1817 “the fallow years”—a “twilight zone” between the middle period and the late music.\(^{106}\) Even Kinderman, one of the few Beethoven biographers to give these works sustained and serious consideration, defines them by the drastically weakened presence of the composer’s voice: “Beethoven may have felt it appropriate to dilute much of the strength of his musical style in order

---

\(^{101}\) Rolland, Beethoven the Creator, 2.
\(^{102}\) Ibid., 184.
\(^{103}\) Sullivan, Beethoven, 85; chapter 5 of his study is entitled “The End of a Period.”
\(^{104}\) Solomon, Beethoven, chapter 17.
\(^{105}\) Dahlhaus, Beethoven, xxiii.
\(^{106}\) Lockwood, Beethoven, 333; chapter 16 is entitled “The Fallow Years.” Incidentally, Lockwood calls the middle and late periods Beethoven’s second and final “maturities.”
to please and flatter his listeners without really demanding their attention,” he suggests.\(^\text{107}\) The implication is usually that these pieces can be removed from Beethoven’s oeuvre, as they are not truly Beethovenian. Solomon questions whether the “patriotic potboilers” even belong “within the boundaries of any of Beethoven’s authentic style periods”—which is to imply that the years from 1813 onwards comprise inauthentic Beethoven.\(^\text{108}\) “They should be set aside as negligible byproducts, not as works in the main line,” recommends Lockwood.\(^\text{109}\)

But such injunctions remain constitutive of the critical construction of Beethoven’s oeuvre: like the 1805 reviewer of Op. 52, critics tend to construct the composer’s voice in the very gesture of rejecting what it is not. Indeed, the compositions of the Congress appear in many studies of Beethoven’s music only in order to be rhetorically expunged: not only are Wellingtons Sieg and Der glorreiche Augenblick now notorious, but they have come to symbolize the waning of Beethoven’s defining heroic voice; indeed, they are the sound of the silence of the heroic style. Some studies consequently accord these pieces surprising prominence: Kinderman’s biography mentions Wellingtons Sieg and Der glorreiche Augenblick before any other composition; by the third page of his study, one has encountered Wellingtons Sieg three times, Eroica only once.\(^\text{110}\) Wellingtons Sieg is

\(^{107}\) Kinderman, Beethoven, 177. The only other Beethoven biography to tackle the patriotic and occasional pieces as directly is David Wyn Jones’s The Life of Beethoven (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); see particularly chapter 5.
\(^{109}\) Lockwood, Beethoven, 347.
\(^{110}\) Kinderman, Beethoven, 2.
also the first piece to be mentioned in Lockwood’s Beethoven study, immediately before his thoughts turn to the heroic decade.\textsuperscript{111} Given that, as we have seen, Beethoven criticism tends to present us with a heroic style that is either awkwardly plural or—as in Burnham’s study—narrow almost to the point of absence, one might say that the singular and dominating presence of the heroic style, much like the presence of the composer’s voice in the Ninth, is sustained in part by the dynamic of difference: \textit{nicht diese Töne}.

In fact, the wise warning that concludes Solomon’s essay on Beethoven’s creative periods implies as much:

\begin{quote}
In a sense, all of Beethoven’s work is transitional, in process, constantly pressing toward new metamorphoses. And his oeuvre is a single oeuvre, which we segment out of a penchant for classification, a need to clarify—and at our peril.\textsuperscript{112}
\end{quote}

In other words, Solomon leaves us with the choice between a Beethovenian oeuvre whose unity and coherence are shored up with exemptions—the supposedly inauthentic music of the Congress of Vienna foremost among them—or an oeuvre that becomes singular only when one conceives of it as a kind of perpetual motion, a total development as processive as Beethoven’s heroic music itself.

Solomon almost suggests that, within Beethoven’s complete works, if we are not to hear the composer’s voice as irreducibly plural, then we must conclude that it manifests itself almost entirely as transition—

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{111} Lockwood, \textit{Beethoven}, xix.  Lockwood mentions the op. 69 Cello Sonata earlier (p. xvii), but in an autobiographical rather than critical context.
\textsuperscript{112} Solomon, “The Creative Periods,” 125.
\end{flushright}
the dynamic of difference that defers the moment of authentically Beethovenian plenitude until the composer’s silence.

**Resistance and Collaboration**

Even during his own career, Beethoven was portrayed as a composer in transition: Tia DeNora has shown how Beethoven and his aristocratic supporters helped to popularize early narratives of his transition from novice into Great Composer—an heir and rival to Haydn. The posthumous organization of Beethoven’s work into its traditional three stages retains this symbolic moment of transition within its plateaus: the moment in which the composer throws off the shackles of apprenticeship and takes a “new path” into his heroic period. This moment guarantees the idea of an “early period” a marginal yet essential position in Beethoven historiography, insofar as it represents what Beethoven must leave behind in search of his own voice. Beethoven’s emerging authorial identity is bound up with this increasing capacity to reject: as Beethoven matures, he must discount voices that are alien to his nature, and subsume or supersede musical

---


114 Czerny reports that Beethoven used the phrase “new path” to describe the Piano Sonatas Op. 31. Most commentators substantiate Czerny’s report with a letter from Beethoven to Breitkopf (dated 18 October 1802) about the Variations Opp. 34 and 35, which promises pieces “worked out in quite a new manner.” See Anderson I, no. 62; Briefwechsel I, no. 108. Dahlhaus in particular endorses the idea of a “new path” beginning around 1802—although he is more cautious about the idea of a “heroic” or “middle” period; see his *Beethoven*, chapter 9, particularly 167. See also Hans-Werner Küthen, “Beethovens ‘wirklich ganz neue Manier’—Eine Persiflage,” in *Beiträge zu Beethovens Kammermusik*, ed. Sieghard Brandenburg and Helmut Loos (Munich: Henle, 1987), 216–224 and Peter Schleuning, “Beethoven in alter Deutung: Der ‘neue Weg’ mit der ‘Sinfonia Eroica’,” *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 44/3 (1987), 165–194.
voices that would drown out his own. Until he has found his voice, he is reliant on models and mentors, and incapable of absolute sincerity. Thus Sullivan alleges that “stock poetic situations” mar Beethoven’s early works, citing the Largo from the Piano Sonata Op. 10 No. 3. Rolland is likewise critical of the Pathétique Sonata, whose solemn rhetoric he considers too theatrical.

But, even with the onset of maturity, the struggle has no end. For when Beethoven has found his voice, he must fight to keep hold of it, wresting it from forebears and contemporaries, influence and fashion, cooption and coercion. In many biographies, it appears that the composer’s voice becomes his own partly in the act of forcibly reclaiming it: the critical construction of Beethoven’s overweening authorship is sustained by a constant note of polemic—anecdotes in which Beethoven reasserts his ownership of his works. The author’s power is ultimately one of veto: “I don’t write for the galleries!” said the composer as he withdrew the revised 1806 Leonore, “I want my score

---

115 On the value judgments embedded in Beethoven periodization, in particular with reference to the idea of “earliness,” see James Webster, “The Concept of Beethoven’s ‘Early’ Period in the Context of Periodization in General,” Beethoven Forum 3 (1994), 1–27. It is worth noting that, until its twentieth-century, modernist-led rehabilitation as the pinnacle of Beethoven’s achievement, perhaps also inspired by Wagner’s view of late Beethoven, the late music was routinely disparaged as a descent into eccentricity and obscurism, with the heroic music thus becoming the central peak of Beethoven’s career; see K. M. Knittel, “Wagner, Deafness, and the Reception of Beethoven’s Late Style,” Journal of the American Musicological Society (Spring 1998), 49–82. Lockwood prefers to write of Beethoven’s first, second, and final “maturities,” surely an attempt to make the periodization of Beethoven’s mature music value-neutral (although it retains, and even reinforces, the distinction between “mature” and “immature” works, which here comprise—with adequate justification, it must be said—everything pre-dating Beethoven’s arrival in Vienna). See Lockwood, Beethoven.

116 Sullivan, Beethoven, 69.

117 Rolland, Beethoven the Creator, 102.
back” (at least, these were the words that the singer Joseph August Röckel claimed to recall).\footnote{Thayer–Forbes, 398.}

If most critics are to be believed, this struggle for ownership takes place even on the page: Beethoven’s copious sketches and revisions are its traces; each work is a fresh triumph. In the minds of many scholars, Beethoven remains the Great Expurgator—the composer who rewrites and rejects until the perfected work, and the Complete Works in their turn, stand before us. Leonard Bernstein, examining the sketches of the Fifth Symphony, paints a picture of Beethoven as a kind of sublime editor:

Imagine a whole lifetime of this struggle, movement after movement, symphony after symphony, sonata after quartet after concerto. Always probing and rejecting in his dedication to perfection.\footnote{Leonard Bernstein, “Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony,” in The Joy of Music (London: White Lion, 1974), 93.}

The completed works and the Complete Works, Bernstein seems to be saying, achieve their completeness through an unceasing process of excision. Again, the Beethovenian author resists: \textit{nicht diese Töne}. And, as we have seen, it is this kind of authorial voice that many heroic works portray in their musical rhetoric—not least the finale of the Fifth, with its vast C–major purification after the reprise of the minor Scherzo.

If resistance sustains the Beethovenian model of authorship, then its opposite is collaboration—the knowing collusion with Other voices: Beethoven falls silent when he fails to resist. It is hardly
surprising that critics should have all but excised Beethoven’s Congress music from his oeuvre: such collaborations are not merely out of character, but also in a sense not even by Beethoven. Writers have seized on any suggestion that this is literally so: Ignaz Moscheles’s recollection that Wellingtons Sieg was conceived and even in large part composed by the inventor Mälzel has been reiterated by critics from Thayer to Charles Rosen, although an examination of the manuscript sources has since shown that Mälzel’s musical input was most likely confined to the more generic fanfares and trumpet flourishes. Even so, critics continue to insinuate that Wellingtons Sieg is not entirely Beethoven’s work: “Beethoven gave in to Mälzel’s blandishments and concocted his piece in two parts,” writes Lockwood. Rather than resisting, Beethoven was “giving the audience what they wanted,” concludes Kinderman. To be sure, such critics have one undeniable fact on their side: much of the musical material in Wellingtons Sieg derives from elsewhere—the French and English marches with which it opens, and the variations and fugato on “God Save the King” with which it ends. Such intertextuality signals the erosion of the very authority that defines an

---

120 Moscheles made this claim in his 1841 annotated English translation of Schindler’s Beethoven biography. For a reprint and affirmation of Moscheles’s comment, see Thayer–Forbes, 561; Thayer remarks that Beethoven “for once consented to work out the ideas of another.” For an echo of this claim as received wisdom, see Charles Rosen, The Classical Style (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972), 401.
121 See Hans-Werner Küthen, “Wellingtons Sieg oder die Schlacht bei Vittoria”: Beethoven und das Epochenproblem Napoleon,” in Beethoven zwischen Revolution und Restauration, 262–263; see also Cook’s summary of the idea and the reasons behind its propagation in “The Other Beethoven,” 6.
122 Lockwood, Beethoven, 338.
123 Kinderman, Beethoven, 180.
author, and is only the most noticeable symptom of a more fundamental compromise that conditions Beethoven’s Congress compositions: the subordination of the composer’s voice to Others—to his audiences, to his contemporaries, and, above all, to political ideologies.

This is nowhere clearer than in “Es ist vollbracht,” the strophic song for bass and chorus that Beethoven composed as the finale of Treitschke’s patriotic drama Die Ehrenpforten (The Triumphant Gates). The generic character of the piece, with its direct harmonies, festive dotted rhythms, and boisterous alternation of soloist and chorus, perhaps already weakens any sense of a guiding authorial voice; but in the short coda this voice is almost submerged altogether. The orchestral interlude after the last strophe unexpectedly moves to a portentous pause on the dominant (m. 130), and, breaking the pregnant silence, a delicate passage of woodwinds introduces a direct melodic quotation from Haydn’s 1797 song of Habsburg loyalty “Gott erhalte Franz den Kaiser” (God Save Kaiser Franz). The bass soloist soon joins them, singing the entire last eight-measure period of Haydn’s melody on the words “Gott sei Dank und unserm Kaiser” (Praise be to God and to our Kaiser). Finally, the chorus adds its voice in a series of overlapping entries, bringing the song to yet another dramatic pause on IV (m. 143), after which it ends with a more urgent Presto. The quotation—in part a rather obvious musical gimmick, in part a citation that makes the message of the chorus unmistakable—thus breaks the already fragile impression of authorial control: it is as if the composer yields to existing musical orthodoxies in the
recognition that he has little to say that “Gott erhalte Franz” could not say for him.

It is this apparent multiplicity of voices in Beethoven’s Congress pieces that leads Nicholas Cook, in an essay on Der glorreiche Augenblick and Wellingtons Sieg, to draw on Bakhtinian literary criticism to distinguish the “monological” discourse of Beethoven’s canonical heroic works from the “dialogical” collaborations of the Congress of Vienna.\textsuperscript{124} Cook argues that, when critics such as Kinderman bemoan the lack of a subtle unifying principle in Wellingtons Sieg and other Congress pieces, they fail to understand that such compositions function something like musical collages, and thus inevitably resist the unifying impulses of most critical methods.\textsuperscript{125} Moreover, consistent with some of his arguments in his earlier study of the Ninth, Cook condemns what he considers the domestication of Beethoven’s dialogical music by a monological critical outlook, arguing that the Romantic–Modernist, organicist aesthetics of A. B. Marx and his critical heirs is less appropriate to many of Beethoven’s compositions than Enlightenment notions of musical rhetoric, such as one finds in the writings of Koch.\textsuperscript{126} On this basis, Cook suggests that the Ninth and Wellingtons Sieg are more similar than most critics would like to think.\textsuperscript{127}


\textsuperscript{125} Cook, “The Other Beethoven,” 17; see also Kinderman, Beethoven, 172.

\textsuperscript{126} Cook, “The Other Beethoven,” 13.

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., 13–14.
Nevertheless, this claim appears to contradict a line of argument that Cook has pursued earlier, in which he distinguishes the voice of Beethoven’s heroic works from the weakened voice of the Congress of Vienna: the music of the Congress period, argues Cook, has been marginalized because it is not internally diverse and complicated enough. If one is to hear Beethoven’s music as “a mode of subjective presence,” he contends, the music must be sufficiently complex to elicit varying interpretations—to permit listeners to make the music their own. The sense of a singular authorial presence in Beethoven’s monological heroic works is actually produced by unrestrained musical diversity. He thus concludes:

In terms of the paradigm of Beethovenian subjectivity, then, the meaning of works like op. 91 and op. 136 was too obvious to be taken seriously.

In this way, Cook makes the supposedly dialogical Congress compositions sound decidedly univalent.

In short, although Cook is correct that Beethoven’s Congress collaborations sit uncomfortably with the unifying impulses of most analytical strategies, his explanation of the source of this discomfort is incomplete. Reflecting on Kinderman’s short account of Wellingtons Sieg, Cook allows that broadly analytical observations are both possible and valid, but queries their relevance to what he calls the “central aesthetic qualities” of the repertoire in question; such analysis does not lead to “a convincing reading” of the music, he writes. I

---

128 Ibid., 11–12.
129 Ibid., 12.
130 Ibid., 17.
would add that Beethoven’s Congress collaborations often make analysis appear redundant not because they are resistant to it but because they accommodate it with excessive ease: as Kinderman and Cook show, while one can elucidate the tonal plan of Wellingtons Sieg—the opening clash of the marches in E–flat major and C major, say, which much of the ensuing Schlacht appears to negotiate through the mediating key of C minor—it is harder to make this plan perform any meaningful hermeneutic work.\footnote{Cook writes of the tonal plan of Wellingtons Sieg; ibid., 16–17.} One cannot make such analysis “speak,” as it were. The point becomes clearer still when one focuses on shorter compositions such as Beethoven’s strophic Schlußchöre from Treitschke’s Congress dramas of 1814–1815 or his contributions to Kotzebue’s patriotic dramas of 1811–1812. Conventional methods of analysis are unkind to such genres, of course—not because they necessarily reveal them to be badly constructed or incoherent, however, but because they appear unable to advance from mere description to explanation, as Leonard Meyer and Alan Walker once put it.\footnote{Cited in Nicholas Cook, A Guide to Musical Analysis (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1987), 230.} Faced with a piece as simple as Beethoven’s closing chorus from Treitschke’s 1814 Die gute Nachricht (The Happy Message), one struggles to imagine what analysis might even seek to explain. (Table 1, below, parses the movement.)
Table 1.

“Germania,” WoO 94, from Treitschke’s *Die Gute Nachricht*.  
B-flat major; 61 measures.

Main Strophe:

**Feurig, jedoch nicht zu geschwind** [fiery, but not too fast];  C meter.

Mm. 1: Fortissimo triadic fanfare in the winds, with string tremolo.

Mm. 2–5: Baritone soloist and strings. Phrase of four measures (A) based on stepwise motion within the first three scale degrees until concluding fall of a perfect fifth to the fifth scale degree. Limited melodic compass and intervallic range reminiscent of trumpet voluntary.

Mm. 5–9: Phrase A echoed by homophonic chorus, with full orchestra, on same lines of text.

Mm. 9–13: Baritone soloist and strings. Legato phrase of four measures (B) on next two lines of text. A pair of identical stepwise ascents to the supertonic (one for each rhyming line) each describe a move to the dominant from \( V/V \).

Mm. 13–15: Baritone soloist and wind. Phrase of two measures (C) resolves to the tonic, descending stepwise through the first three scale degrees.

Mm. 15–17: Phrase C echoed by homophonic chorus, with full orchestra, on same lines of text.

Mm. 17–22: The refrain that concludes each verse (R): “Preis ihm! Heil dir, Germania!” (Praise him! Hail to you, Germania!). All voices and instruments. Phrase of four measures, the melody rising to the sixth scale degree and a cadence with 6/4 preparation.

Mm. 22–28: Orchestral tutti with concluding fanfare refrain.

Final strophe:

Mm. 28–38: See main strophe.

Mm. 38–40: Baritone soloist, strings, and woodwind. Second half of phrase B rescored with woodwind and an embellished pause on the dominant/leading tone in melody.

**Più Allegro; alla breve.**


Mm. 45–48: Previous phrase and words echoed by homophonic chorus, with fuller orchestration and timpani roll.

Mm. 48–53: Chorus and full orchestra. Return to R as in mm. 17–22, but without the baritone soloist and with a metrical displacement of the melodic line; an extension of the line by two quarter notes in mm. 51–52 allows the cadence to resolve on downbeat.

Mm. 53–58: Orchestral tutti.

Mm. 58–61: All voices and instruments. Fortissimo in voices; fortississimo in orchestra. Concluding “Germania” on a tonic chord with a timpani roll.
Here, unity is to all intents and purposes the same as uniformity: a reductive harmonic perspective on the movement shows only that, within a structure whose most adventurous maneuver is the secondary dominant first heard in mm. 10–11, Beethoven organizes the four principal phrases that make up his song in such a way that the first pair (A and B in table 1) end on the dominant and the second pair (C and R) on the tonic. It is hard to escape the impression, therefore, that reductive kinds of analysis are paradoxically an appropriate means of engaging only those compositions that resist it. By contrast, music that yields more easily provides no secure hermeneutic footholds.

Besides, most of Beethoven’s Congress music originated in the diverse and mutable context of dramatic works and festive events—in other words, this music is collaborative in conception, sustained by the interaction with the voices that surrounded it. Such collaborative music, as Cook implies, can sound hollow or meaningless when one listens to it with the intention of picking out a singular authorial voice. Indeed, reductive critical methods encourage such univalent listening when they excise any remnants of the voices with which this music collaborated—much as Kanne encouraged his readers to ignore the Turkish exoticism in the Ninth and concentrate instead on the governing Beethovenian Besonnenheit. Thus, it would perhaps be more consistent with the “open” aesthetic stance of Beethoven’s Congress collaborations if critics, rather than eliminating unwanted voices, augmented them instead—which is to say, turned their attention to historical context. Some music histories, not least those
of a contextual bent, might give one the impression that context merely comprises everything separate from the music under consideration that one nonetheless invokes to explain it. But context is in many respects woven into the very fabric of Beethoven’s Congress music: the closing chorus of Die Ehrenpforten,¹³³ to take one example, clearly embraces the voices of Beethoven, Treitschke, and Haydn—and perhaps even the voice of political orthodoxy itself. But one can also point to other proximate musical voices: the chorus was but one part of a musical drama with an overture by Hummel, and a mixture of choruses, ensembles, and arias by Bernhard Anselm Weber, Joseph Weigl, Ignaz von Seyfried, Adalbert Gyrowetz, and even Handel—not to mention numbers adapted from popular tunes of the day. Many voices likewise mingle in Die gute Nachricht: after Hummel’s overture (actually the same as the overture to the later Die Ehrenpforten) came numbers by Mozart, Gyrowetz, Weigl, Hummel again, and—nowadays more famous as a Beethoven exegete—Kanne (table 2, below, gives a complete account of the numbers and their composers in both of Treitschke’s dramas).¹³⁴

¹³³ One should note that Die Ehrenpforten, first performed on 15 July 1815 after the second capitulation of Paris, was revived for Kaiser Franz’s name day later that year on 3 and 4 October, when, among other changes, Beethoven’s “Germania” was used in place of “Es ist vollbracht” (see table 2, below).

¹³⁴ Manuscript scores of both Die gute Nachricht and Die Ehrenpforten survive in the Austrian National Library—although as late as the mid-1980s, Willy Hess believed the music to be lost; see his Das Fidelio-Buch: Beethovens Oper Fidelio, ihre Geschichte und ihre drei Fassungen (Winterthur: Amadeus, 1986), 33n28. Accordingly, there has been a little confusion over the authorship of the music in Treitschke’s Congress dramas, and most literature on the subject is untrustworthy. Hess’s important work on Treitschke’s dramas relies on Thayer’s imperfect testimony to establish the authorship of the music; see Willy Hess, “Zwei patriotische Singspiele von Friedrich Treitschke,” Beethoven Jahrbuch (1969), 269–319. Kinsky–Halm seems to have derived the names of the collaborating musicians in Die gute Nachricht and Die Ehrenpforten from AMZ reports—see AMZ 21 (25 May 1814), col. 351 and AMZ 34 (23 August 1815), col. 566—but mistakenly identifies the “Seyfried”
Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: Friedrich Treitschke’s Die gute Nachricht—first performance in the Kärntnertortheater on 11 April 1814.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overture by Johann Nepomuk Hummel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B: Friedrich Treitschke’s Die Ehrenpforten—first performance in the Kärntnertortheater on 15 July 1815.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overture by Hummel (same as overture to Die gute Nachricht).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chorus: “Ihr Brüder, ihr Schwestern,” by Bernhard Anselm Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Duet (Walter, Horst): “Was wir fröhlich angefangen,” based on the “Alexander” March, one of the most popular tunes of the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chorus: “Fall ward sein Loos,” based on “Fall’n is the foe” from Act II of Handel’s Judas Maccabeus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performances on 3 and 4 October 1815:**
| 8. Chorus: “Allmächtiger Gott,” based on “Fall’n is the foe” from Act II of Handel’s Judas Maccabeus. |

of Die Ehrenpforten with the brother of Ignaz, Joseph von Seyfried, who was primarily a writer and librettist rather than a musician; see Kinsky–Halm, 555.
To be sure, Beethoven’s contributions were the culminating numbers; nonetheless, Mozart and Handel aside, these numbers mingle with a veritable chorus of somewhat marginal contemporaries—figures who nonetheless crop up regularly on the periphery of Beethoven studies (and will crop up continually in the course of the present study). This is not to claim that Beethoven was directly influenced by these contemporaries, of course; rather, these composers represent the generic musical and ideological background that Beethoven’s own Congress music makes no effort to escape.

Thus, it is not merely that Beethoven’s Congress compositions have many voices while his heroic works have one, as Cook would have it, but that the Congress music appears to welcome in Other voices, while the heroic works gesture towards driving them out. Collaboration opposes resistance. These opposed aesthetic stances condition how relevant or useful reductive critical approaches strike us. On the one hand, the critical expurgation of the Other voices in

---

135 The Capellmeister of the Berlin Court Opera, B. A. Weber, was responsible for bringing Fidelio to Berlin in 1815 (see his letter to Treitschke of 8 April 1815. Albrecht II, no. 204; Briefwechsel III, no. 802a). I. von Seyfried was a close acquaintance of the Beethoven circle, and conducted the premieres of a number of Beethoven’s compositions, including the Fifth and Sixth Symphonies and the 1805 Leonore (see Clive, 335–336). Kanne, of course, was also close to the Beethoven circle. His relationship with Beethoven, considered separately from his well-known reviews, is summarized in Clive, 181–182; Owen Jander, “Beethoven’s “Orpheus in Hades”: the Andante con moto of the Fourth Piano Concerto,” Nineteenth-Century Music (Spring 1985), 199–202; and Hermann Ulrich, “Beethoven Freund Friedrich August Kanne,” Österreichische Musik Zeitung 29 (1974), 75–80. Hummel and Beethoven were periodically friendly. Hummel lead the percussion at the first performance of Wellingtons Sieg (see Thayer–Forbes, 567). It seems that Beethoven considered Court Capellmeister (and godson of Haydn) Joseph Weigl an esteemed acquaintance, though the two men were not friends. Neither was Beethoven friendly with Gyrowetz—conductor and composer at the court theater—although in this case Beethoven openly disdained Gyrowetz’s music, as some acerbic commentary in his correspondence shows (see his letter to Treitschke of 27 February 1814. Anderson I, no. 467; Briefwechsel III, no. 699). Seyfried, Weigl, Gyrowetz, and Hummel were all pallbearers at Beethoven’s funeral.
Beethoven’s Congress compositions appears unable to leave behind any voice at all. On the other hand, in the case of a work such as the Ninth, one might almost say that a reductive critical approach—indeed, the activity of reducing itself—embodies an aesthetic tension that is constitutive of the composer’s voice: the critical recognition and rejection of Others traces the dynamic of difference that many heroic works appear to dramatize. To the extent that criticism must labor to explain away Other voices, it reenacts the struggle through which Beethoven’s voice becomes audible.

**Beethoven’s Many Voices**
Just as the expurgating rhetoric of the Ninth appears to encourage critics and analysts who would reenact and exaggerate it, so one could argue that Beethoven himself was in some ways complicit with the construction of his voice as a kind of resistance. His correspondence is riddled with rhetorical assertions of independence that seem to sanction the later constructions of the Beethoven myth: “I refuse to allow another, whoever he may be, to alter my compositions,” he warned Treitschke in 1814. One could even argue that, just as Beethoven’s control over each of his completed works manifests itself as the rejection of compromise, so Beethoven attempted to exert an analogous control over his Complete Works, suppressing endeavors that were collaborative or occasional by denying them opus numbers, as if to exclude them from his own musical mainstream. Many of the pieces in which Beethoven’s own voice seems to be threatened by

---

collaboration have no opus numbers—the Schlußchöre for Treitschke’s Congress dramas, for example, even though they were published in separate performing editions. Even the monumental Der glorreiche Augenblick became Op. 136 only posthumously.

There are notable exceptions, however. It has long been a cause of consternation that Beethoven granted Wellingtons Sieg an opus number of its own; after all, critics have habitually insinuated that Beethoven considered Wellingtons Sieg, along with all his other Congress collaborations, a worthless piece of ephemera—an idea that originated with Schindler and Moscheles, and found its way into the scholarship of the twentieth century via Thayer. Cook has since shown that Beethoven’s view of these pieces is by no means so easily established; Beethoven’s correspondence—as well as other documents, such as his public notice of thanks to the performers after the premiere of Wellingtons Sieg—certainly do not reveal a composer disdaining his own creations. Given the absence of any substantial evidence that Beethoven thought badly of Wellingtons Sieg, critics are given to ruminating on Beethoven’s mental condition, as if to suggest that he was momentarily incapable of making a reasoned judgment of the piece; Lockwood, like many others, blames an unhealthy desire for popularity:

To write and produce [Wellingtons Sieg] at one or two major public concerts was to indulge in sincere patriotic celebration. But then to go further and publish the work, moreover to give it

---

137 Cook summarizes the history of critical apologetics and subjects it to critique in “The Other Beethoven,” 4–11; see also chapter 2 of the present study. For the public notice of thanks, intended for the Wiener Zeitung after the premiere of Wellingtons Sieg, see Thayer–Forbes, 567 and chapter 2 of this study.
an opus number and place it in the series of his important compositions, showed that his deep yearning for public recognition and financial security had gone beyond any earlier limits.138

Other critics have suggested that Beethoven was unable to concur with the political message of his Congress collaborations, and that consequently his music could not be truly authentic; a widespread belief in Beethoven’s Enlightenment radicalism and even republicanism is responsible here, prompting most critics to regard the patriotic Congress compositions—as well as earlier pieces such as the anti-French war songs on poems by Joseph Friedelberg from the 1790s—as unwelcome or perhaps merely judicious ideological compromises for the composer.139 Indeed, there is an implicit contradiction between Beethoven’s desire to name a symphony after Napoleon in 1804 and his musical celebrations of the French leader’s defeat only a decade or so later—a contradiction that has led Stephen Rumph to diagnose a growing conservatism in Beethoven’s political outlook from around the French occupation of 1809.140 One requires such an explanation, however, only if one considers it necessary for a composer to share the politics of his patrons; in fact, Beethoven’s Viennese contemporaries were accustomed to rapid changes of allegiance during the first decade of the nineteenth century. Hummel, for example, who composed an enormous quantity of music in

138 Lockwood, Beethoven, 339.
139 The most influential portrait of Beethoven as an Enlightenment radical can be found in Solomon’s Beethoven, particularly chapters 4 and 13. Martin Geck and Peter Schleuning have proposed that Beethoven was a kind of crypto-Jacobin in their “Geschieben auf Bonaparte”: Beethovens “Eroica”—Revolution, Reaktion, Rezeption. (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1989).
140 Stephen Rumph, Beethoven After Napoleon, particularly chapter 4.
celebration of Bonaparte’s defeat, had produced a grand cantata on 1 April 1810 for the wedding of Napoleon and Marie Louise. In any event, against a background of peace treatises, renewed fighting, and the hardship of occupation—as well as a public sphere that was policed by the state—one cannot do justice to the complications of Viennese political culture during the Napoleonic Wars by a simplistic distinction between revolutionaries and reactionaries.141

For all that, most of Beethoven’s biographers search for a single political philosophy to match the composer’s single voice. When they fail to find one, they tend to project the ambiguous reality of Viennese political culture onto Beethoven’s mental state: “the weaker works of this time—Wellingtons Sieg and the Congress cantata—were products of Beethoven’s own ambivalence,” writes Lockwood.142 Dahlhaus even distinguishes two Beethovens, a politically idealistic one and a pragmatic one, equivalent to the heroic works and the Congress collaborations respectively:

If we attempt a general definition of the relationship between his republicanism and his patriotism […], it emerges that the decisive factor in the former was idealistic, and in the latter it was pragmatic.143

Dahlhaus even tries to portray Beethoven as a consciously dialectical thinker, his political inconsistencies grounded in the interplay of the idea and its realization:

142 Lockwood, Beethoven, 347.
143 Dahlhaus, Beethoven, 20.
Beethoven was of one mind with Hegel: the realized idea, though enmeshed in the dialectics of its realization, is more substantial than the “pure” idea that remains untouched by reality. And for that reason, like Hegel, he was able to be both for and against Napoleon.\textsuperscript{144}

Such contortions are surely a way of coping with an awkward fact: Beethoven’s voice is unavoidably plural. Indeed, one is tempted to reverse Solomon’s aphorism: Beethoven’s oeuvre is many oeuvres, which we edit out of a penchant for unity.

This is not to say that among Beethoven’s voices, musical and political, one cannot decide which is the dominant one—or, indeed, which one Beethoven would have wanted his public or posterity to hear. Dialectical language aside, Dahlhaus evidently chooses which voice he considers representative when he divides Beethoven into The Idealist and The Pragmatist. Likewise, as we have seen, one can point to instances in the correspondence in which Beethoven rejects the constraints of collaboration with all the associated rhetoric of the Great Composer, and one might reasonably surmise that these passages represent his core aesthetic values—and perhaps also the public image that he wished to create. Nevertheless, if critics want their Beethoven to speak with a single voice, they must choose which one is representative—an activity that necessarily involves expurgating the Others. As Dahlhaus himself has remarked with respect to the small group of heroic works:

\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., 26.
It is not a fact in support of the Beethoven myth that these works are “representative,” but rather one of the claims that makes up the myth.\footnote{Dahlhaus, \textit{Nineteenth-Century Music}, 76.}

Further, even if Beethoven himself assisted in the creation of this myth, we do not have to believe him. We can choose instead to hear the Other Beethoven, even within the canonical heroic works themselves, whose rejection is constitutive of the heroic master trope. In fact, this presents no special challenge: as we have seen in the finale of the Ninth, Beethoven’s heroic presence is often the gesture of rejection itself; one need only dwell, therefore, on the multiple, unsynthesized voices that critics often reject, such as the jangling B–flat Turkish music. To be sure, I would not advocate this kind of listening “against the grain” as an end in itself. Neither would I claim that it revives an older, rhetorical kind of musical engagement, as Cook suggests. Rather, attending to the many registers in the finale of the Ninth reveals to us how the voice of the composer is, to use Judith Butler’s expression, “borrowed from elsewhere”—how the Beethovenian subject is constructed only within the language that he uses.\footnote{Judith Butler, \textit{The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection} (Stanford; Stanford University Press, 1997), 198.} Despite the rhetoric of resistance that characterizes both his music and his professed aesthetic views, Beethoven is in one sense an unwitting collaborator; an active expunger of Other voices, he is also a passive recipient of them. While such a revelation could be couched in deconstructive terms—as the “decentering of the musical subject,” perhaps—it is nonetheless grounded in some of the more prosaic facts of music history. Composers have always adapted their voices to the
circumstances in which they speak, and the diversity of their musical registers can appear problematic in consequence. Moreover, the disempowerment of the author is surely the very premise of traditional histories of musical style: musical language exists before the composer, who is always to some extent powerless in the face of his or her inheritance. Just as composers use musical language, so musical language uses them.

Moreover, by listening to the Other voices in the finale of the Ninth, and accepting them all as Beethovenian voices, one can reach an accommodation with disjunctions that seem aberrant against the background of the heroic master trope, and trace new connections in Beethoven’s life and works. For instance, rather than view the Turkish music as the eruption of an Oriental Other, sharing only in the untamable Otherness of a number of ignored compositions, one might regard it instead as yet another strain of the Orientalism that fascinated Beethoven throughout his life—the Herderian takes on Indian philosophy that fill much of the Tagebuch and the Egyptian mysticism that prompted him to copy out the ancient inscriptions from Schiller’s “Die Sendung Moses” (The Mission of Moses).\textsuperscript{147} The noted Austrian orientalist Joseph Hammer, having heard that Beethoven intended to compose a chorus on an Indian text, contacted the composer with the offer of an Indian pastoral drama and what he

\textsuperscript{147} For Beethoven’s Herderian Orientalism, see Tagebuch, no. 61, with Solomon’s notes. For the context of such thought in German Romanticism, see A. Leslie Willson, \textit{A Mythical Image: The Ideal of India in German Romanticism} (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1964). The Egyptian inscriptions that Beethoven copied from Schiller’s “Die Sendung Moses” (The Mission of Moses) and a facsimile of them in Beethoven’s hand can be found in Solomon, \textit{Beethoven}, 204–206.
described as a Persian Singspiel. One can perhaps hear something
of the mystical tone of this kind of Orientalism, so important in the
development of German Romantic thought, transmuted into the
numinous deism of the Andante maestoso of the finale of the Ninth,
shortly after the warlike Turkish music.

Of course, one consequence of such a critical approach is that
the synthesizing aspirations of the Ninth fail. No longer held together
by the force of Beethovenian authorial resistance, the many voices of
the finale of the Ninth separate. In consequence, the liberal vision of
synthesis that the end of the Ninth celebrates appears ideological;
rather than produced within the work itself, the sound of synthesis—
as the continued jangling of the Turkish instruments in the last
Prestissimo of the Ninth lets slip, perhaps—is yet another voice
borrowed from elsewhere, imposing itself on the others. And to this
extent, as Solomon also observes, it sounds distinctly like the voice of
orthodoxy audible in Beethoven’s collaborative compositions:

Doubtless this is an “ideological” solution—one that brooks no
opposition and admits no nuances of opinion. In this sense, the
finale of the Ninth belongs in the line of compositions that
extends from the “Joseph” Cantata of 1790 to Der glorreiche
Augenblick of 1814.149

Thus, what Solomon has called the “crowning work of the heroic style”
is also the crowning work of its opposite.

148 Albrecht II, no. 199; Briefwechsel IV, no. 1290. The year of the letter (dated
merely “Ash Wednesday”) is disputed, but it seems most likely to be from 1815.
Details on Joseph Hammer, who later inherited the title Joseph von Hammer-
Purgstall, can be found in Solomon’s article “A Beethoven acquaintance: Josef von
149 Solomon, Beethoven, 408.
Now, this contradiction is no reason to “resist” the Ninth, as Richard Taruskin has put it.\textsuperscript{150} Indeed, to the extent that the symphony fails to live up to its own ideals, it can sidestep what Terry Eagleton has called “the contradiction of all utopianism”: artistic images of harmony are so compelling that they risk reversing the very radicalism that they are intended to promote.\textsuperscript{151} By contrast, the utopian vision of the Ninth is perhaps undermined by a more realistic pluralism, which is uneasy, fragmentary, and hierarchical. We must recognize this utopian vision if we are to understand the piece, of course. But we do not have to believe it.

One might say the same of the “strong” conception of the musical work—the conceptual precondition for the hermetic vision of synthesis that the Ninth strives vainly to create. While one can recognize the gestures of resistance by which works separate themselves from their historical and musical surroundings, one can also understand how works themselves are constructed by these very surroundings. The work concept, much like the heroic style that instantiated it, is crucial to any understanding of much of Beethoven’s music, of course; yet the musical work, also like the heroic style, can never be truly present to the critic, because it is not a coherent set of stylistic markers or aesthetic ideals as much as a discursive tension within the music and its reception.

\textsuperscript{151} Terry Eagleton, \textit{The Ideology of the Aesthetic} (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 371.
James Webster has charted the tensions that arise within the finale of the Ninth as a consequence of what he calls multivalence. I would suggest by extension that one could invoke the concept of multivalence in order to describe the voice of the composer across his oeuvre—the polyphony of registers and genres. But multivalent criticism or analysis should not become a means of reinscribing the ideal of the completed work or the Complete Works simply with the commonplace revelation that they are internally diverse. We should remember, perhaps, that the many intersecting levels of the Ninth extend “outwards,” beyond the individual work and into musical culture more generally. The sound of the Turkish instruments in the last measure is the sound of history itself permeating the symphony. Rather than colonize the more distant corners of the work with analysis, therefore, a multivalent approach shows that a supplement is always possible: whatever narrative we choose to describe this music, there will always be something residual, something Other—an outcast who steals weeping from the circle.

---

152 See James Webster, “The Form of the Finale of Beethoven’s Ninth,” particularly 25–28 for multivalence.
What does a philosopher demand of himself first and last? To overcome his time in himself, to become “timeless.” With what must he therefore engage in the hardest combat? With whatever marks him as the child of his time.

Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Case of Wagner*.

The Monument

One can still visit what was formerly the Lobkowitz palace in Vienna and wander through what is now known as the *Eroicasaal*—the surprisingly small room in which Beethoven’s Third Symphony saw its earliest performances in 1804. Every year, thousands of people pay homage to what is no longer there: the music itself, which one can only imagine while standing in the bare, silent space. It is hard to think of a better illustration of the metaphor underlying Lydia Goehr’s 1992 study of the musical canon, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*.

The *Eroicasaal* has become a monument—an embodiment of the enduring ideal that is Beethoven’s symphonic masterwork; Lobkowitz’s room has borrowed the lastingness of the *Eroica* along with its name. The *Eroicasaal* commemorates a transient historical event but, in so doing, transforms it into something more lasting—

---

something more like myth. It thus seems fitting that the rest of Lobkowitz’s handsome residence should now house Vienna’s Theater Museum as well as the Theatersammlung of the Austrian National Library. Monuments, museums, and books: the most potent symbols of modern cultural memory.

The Eroicaaal almost makes literal one of the commonest metaphors in Western musical culture: the idea of musical architecture. Goethe’s bon mot that architecture is “petrified music” testifies to a relatively newfound sense of music’s quasi-architectural permanence—the formalist concomitant of the emergence of the musical canon.\footnote{Goethe quoted himself, though from an unknown source, to Eckermann on 23 March 1829. The similar remark that architecture is frozen music can also be found in Schelling’s Philosophie der Kunst. See Conversations of Goethe with Eckermann, trans. John Oxenford, ed. J. K. Moorhead (New York: J. M. Dent, 1930), 303.} A musical work is a self-sufficient structure, built to last. It took the Romantic imagination of Schopenhauer to add, a few years later, that, if architecture were petrified music, then a ruin is a petrified cadenza.\footnote{Arthur Schopenhauer, The World as Will and Representation, vol. 2, trans. E. F. J. Payne (Indian Hills: Placon’s Wing Press, 1958), 454.} An improvised cadenza does not conceal its origins in a particular performance—does not congeal into the textual and quasi-architectural forms that supposedly defy historical change. Likewise, a ruin is architecture that time and chance have made mutable and haphazard.

Music critics seem unable to discuss the Eroica without recourse to the metaphor of architecture; in one of many extended architectural images, Rolland rhapsodizes:
We find ourselves faced with one of the most stupendous problems of construction that has ever been posed and triumphantly resolved in music,—an ars nova as involved, as condensed, at once vertiginous and sure, as a Gothic vault.\footnote{Rolland, \textit{Beethoven the Creator}, 45–46.}

“Four monumental pillars create the whole,” comments Lockwood, surveying each of the symphony’s movements.\footnote{Lockwood, \textit{Beethoven}, 206. Lockwood seems to echo Rolland here, who writes that the opening notes of the bass line underpinning the final movement are “four mighty pillars,” adding: “And the great builder sees what vast spaces he can cover with [them].” See \textit{Beethoven the Creator}, 69.} There is no doubt that the first movement of the \textit{Eroica} is well suited to formalist explanations of its musical architecture. Some of the most influential music analyses have focused on it: the essay that Riezler appended to his Beethoven study; Schenker’s sophisticated graphic analysis; and Tovey’s account of the first movement in his “Sonata Forms” article for the \textit{Encyclopedia Britannica}.\footnote{See Riezler, \textit{Beethoven}, 247–281; Schenker, “Beethovens Dritte Sinfonie, in ihrem wahren Inhalt zum erstenmal dargestellt,” \textit{Das Meisterwerk in der Musik}, vol. 3 (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1930), 29–101; Sir Donald Francis Tovey, “Sonata Forms,” in \textit{Musical Articles from the Encyclopaedia Britannica}, ed. Hugo Foss (London: Oxford University Press, 1944), 221–228.} The C–sharp harmonic wrinkle in the opening E–flat triadic motif of the first movement, which is eventually ironed out in the coda, is the subject of one of the most famous stories in music analysis.\footnote{“One could write a brief history of the idea of motivic interconnection from ‘Eroica’ commentaries alone, so pervasive is the concept in writings on the Symphony’s first movement,” writes Lockwood. See Lewis Lockwood, “‘Eroica’ Perspectives: Strategy and Design in the First Movement,” in \textit{Beethoven Studies}, vol. 3, ed. Alan Tyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 88.} But, whereas the passage of time can reduce even the grandest building to ruins, the architecture of the \textit{Eroica} has so far remained impervious to it. When Dahlhaus describes the aesthetic background to Beethoven’s instrumental music as a “metaphysic,” one might understand him literally: Beethoven’s
Symphonic masterworks have a means of persisting that is beyond the physical.\textsuperscript{160}

It remains widely accepted that the aesthetic and social changes that brought instrumental music this new dignity in permanence took place more or less during Beethoven’s lifetime; Goehr has argued that Beethoven’s symphonic music in particular provided the paradigm for music’s new status.\textsuperscript{161} The thrust of the argument is simple: the progressive emancipation of composers from the spheres of court and church and their release into the commercial world of late eighteenth-century civil society produced an attendant conception of the radically autonomous musical work. This idea of the work pitted individual authorial control against that of established social institutions, internally generated formal coherence against the manipulations of social context, and, ultimately, all music against history itself.\textsuperscript{162} The autonomy of art was the concomitant of creative and institutional freedom; the architecture of free-standing musical works no longer required social buttresses: “Musical form was no longer to be thought of as following the text or the shape of some ‘extra-musical’ occasion, but as independently designed and independently coherent.”\textsuperscript{163} The aesthetic and ethic of compositions such as the \textit{Eroica} thus produced the distinction between “works” and “occasional works” that persists in music historiography to this day. On the one hand are the great mass of \textit{pièces d’occasion} that remain shackled to the time and place

\textsuperscript{160} Dahllhaus, \textit{Nineteenth-Century Music}, 88–96.
\textsuperscript{161} See Goehr, \textit{Imaginary Museum}, chapter 8.
\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 148–175.
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid., 164.
of their production, growing ever more distant; on the other hand, the
timeless masterworks whose formal autonomy allows them to travel
into the future.

Most critics manage to suggest that the Eroica belongs both
within and without history, obtruding from it like a sort of musical
monument.164 “It is at once clear that with it a new epoch of classical
music is indeed about to open,” proclaims Riezler.165 “We know that
we have irrevocably crossed a major boundary in Beethoven’s
development and in music history as well,” is Solomon’s identical
verdict, written over four decades later.166 Such language places the
Eroica in a lineage that Nietzsche approvingly called “monumental
history”: a history of great deeds that defy their own time—which is to
say, a history that is in one sense almost anti-historical.167 Indeed,
the most frequently cited incident associated with the Eroica—perhaps
the most famous episode in Beethoven lore, and the definitive parable
of the heroic style—seems to symbolize the way in which the
symphony resists its historical context. Ries reports that the
symphony was to be named the “Bonaparte”—that is, until Beethoven
learned of Napoleon’s decision to crown himself emperor. Beethoven
“went to the table, took hold of the title page by the top, tore it in two,
and threw it on the floor”—almost a ritual act of authenticity, as well

164 Daniel Chua discusses the Eroica as a monument in his Absolute Music and the
Construction of Meaning (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 235–244.
165 Riezler, Beethoven, 138.
166 Solomon, Beethoven, 250.
167 See Friedrich Nietzsche, “On the Utility and Liability of History for Life,” in
Press, 1995), 97.
as a striking image of the composer forcibly reclaiming his music, ripping his masterwork from its coercive historical surroundings.\footnote{Thayer–Forbes, 349.}

Yet the fable of the dramatic renaming of the symphony smoothes over much contradictory historical evidence. Ries had reported to the publisher Simrock in October 1803 that Beethoven “is very much inclined to dedicate it to Bonaparte”—and in late August 1804, three months after Napoleon had taken his imperial title, Beethoven informed Breitkopf and Härtel that the symphony was “really” called \textit{Bonaparte}.\footnote{Ries’s letter dates from 22 October 1803. Albrecht I, no. 71; Briefwechsel I, no. 165. Beethoven’s letter dates from 26 August 1804. Anderson I, no. 96; Briefwechsel I, no. 188.} The surviving title page of Beethoven’s copy of the full score show that the words “Intitulata Bonaparte,” written by a copyist, were indeed erased at some time; yet at the bottom stands a pencil addition in Beethoven’s hand: “geschrieben auf Bonaparte” (written on the subject of Bonaparte). There is no further evidence of Beethoven’s intentions with regard to the title or dedication until the publication of the work in parts in October of 1806, bearing a dedication to Prince Lobkowitz and the ambiguous title, “Sinfonia eroica... composta per festeggiare il sovenire di un grand Uomo...” (Heroic Symphony, written to celebrate the memory of a great man).\footnote{For a brief summary of the historical evidence relating to the symphony’s title, see Lockwood, \textit{Beethoven}, 210–211; for a more detailed investigation, see Sipe, \textit{Beethoven: “Eroica” Symphony}, chapter 3.}

The history of the \textit{Eroica} thus mingles uncomfortably with its mythic aesthetic: the sources of the symphony and the copious criticism that the \textit{Eroica} has generated present a scrawl of erasures and rewritings, assertions and retractions, open secrets and encrypted
public pronouncements. The figure of Napoleon has hovered on the fringes of the debate about the symphony ever since the early nineteenth century—a connection that critics, like Beethoven himself, seem to assert and then retract, write about and then cross out. One can only read the history of the Eroica under erasure.\(^\text{171}\) Even as Ries’s story introduced the Napoleonic connotations of the Eroica to a wider public, it has given generations of critics the opportunity to reprise one of the most pervasive motifs in the symphony’s copious reception history: the true hero of the Eroica is Beethoven himself. “He may have thought Napoleon a hero, but his conception of the heroic he had earned for himself,” is Sullivan’s familiar pronouncement.\(^\text{172}\)

The Hero in Music and War

It is tempting to dismiss Sullivan’s verdict as a fanciful Romantic cliché—the concomitant of a familiar reluctance to sully musical heroes with historical vulgarities. Nevertheless, one should remember that the myth of Beethoven Hero is fused to the idea of the historically impervious musical work; and both ideas belong to history even as they stand in opposition to it.\(^\text{173}\) Around the time of the Eroica’s

\(^{171}\) My use of the concept of “under erasure,” a coinage of Jacques Derrida, is similar, though not identical, to Derrida’s use of the term. I am using it here simply to denote a kind of rhetorical device wherein a claim or a piece of information is revealed only by being manifestly advanced then retracted—as if erasing a written word in such a way that it is still legible. Derrida uses the figure of “under erasure” to refer to the epistemological contortion in which one knowingly employs (and thus simultaneously calls into question) dubious, impossible, or metaphysical concepts in order to be able to say anything at all. See Jacques Derrida, Of Grammatology, trans. Gayatri Spivak (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1976), chapter 2.

\(^{172}\) Sullivan, Beethoven, 70.

\(^{173}\) A point made by Dahlhaus in Nineteenth-Century Music, 75.
earliest performances, Johann Friedrich Reichardt dubbed Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven “heroes of art”: “their genuine, perfected works will remain valid whatever thousand upon thousand merriments time and fashion and their slaves revel in,” he wrote.\textsuperscript{174} This sort of talk seems to have followed Beethoven’s \textit{Eroica} Symphony around; one critic gave this sardonic summary of the position of the work’s admirers:

if it does not please now, it is because the public is not sufficiently cultivated in the arts to comprehend these higher spheres of beauty; but after a couple of thousand years its effect will not be lessened.\textsuperscript{175}

It appears that Beethoven’s supporters, like the generations of critics who followed them, regarded the \textit{Eroica}’s fraught critical reception as a mark of honor: their hero wrote not for his own time, but for all time.\textsuperscript{176} “Oh, they are not for you but for a later age!” Beethoven is said to have remarked to Radicati of the three 1806 Razumovsky Quartets—a quotation that critics have loved to repeat.\textsuperscript{177}

Around the time of the \textit{Eroica}, public images of Beethoven began to reinforce the composer’s emerging status as a musical hero—a figure as lasting as his heroic music. The most iconic example is undoubtedly the 1804 portrait by Joseph Mähler—a friend of Beethoven’s who went on to produce three further images of the

\textsuperscript{174} \textit{Berliner Musikzeitung} I (1805); \textit{Contemporaries} I, 35.
\textsuperscript{176} Tia DeNora also gives the \textit{Eroica} a role in the emergence of the musical canon in Vienna—what she calls “serious music culture”; see Beethoven and the Construction of Genius, particularly 160–161.
\textsuperscript{177} Thayer–Forbes, 409.
composer some ten years later (see figure 1). “The left hand rests upon a lyre, the right is extended, as if, in a moment of musical enthusiasm, he was beating time; in the background is a temple of Apollo,” wrote Mähler.\textsuperscript{178} The portrait’s otherwise conventional iconography perhaps captures something new: a moment of secularization—the cultural displacement through which Beethoven achieved an almost mythic status. The composer’s outstretched hand, sweeping through an empty sky, hovers over the distant temple as if taking up its divinity in a rhythmic gesture of inspiration. The Romantic individual and his creative inner life have become the new location of a divine ideal—an ideal that the temple embodies in an architectural form.

The public evidently had an appetite for such hero worship: a note from Beethoven to Mähler reveals that the composer lent the portrait to a visiting lady in order that “she may hang it in her room during her stay” in Vienna.\textsuperscript{179} Moreover, as Beethoven’s fame grew, an increasing awareness of his position in an emergent musical canon sparked his own interest in portraiture: “Portraits of Handel, Bach, Gluck, Mozart, and Haydn in my room. They can promote my capacity for endurance,” he wrote in his Tagebuch.\textsuperscript{180} Indeed, portraiture was to prove a valuable tool in the creation and perpetuation of a Viennese musical canon: Mähler alone was to paint almost all the leading musicians of his day while residing in Vienna, including Hummel, Salieri, Joseph Weigl, and Gyrowetz. Joseph Sonnleithner later

\textsuperscript{178} Ibid., 337. Mähler was an amateur painter, but had studied with the well-known Dresden portraitist Anton Graff, who had himself painted a number of leading literary and philosophical figures, including Herder and Schiller; see Clive, 219–220.

\textsuperscript{179} Thayer–Forbes, 337.

\textsuperscript{180} Tagebuch, para. 43.
bequeathed a collection of Mähler’s portraits to the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde—the self-appointed guardians of Viennese musical culture, formed officially in 1814.\footnote{Clive, 219–220.}

![Joseph Mähler’s Beethoven, c. 1804.](image)

Mähler’s 1804 portrait and others like it ushered into the realm of the arts the heroic imagery that had developed around the military leaders of the Napoleonic era, and it brought with it a visual language
that delicately interweaved history and myth. Mähler’s depiction of Beethoven, if technically a little crude, bears comparison with the contemporary iconography of Napoleon himself, who was regularly portrayed with imagery from Homeric or Ossianic myth. Jacques-Louis David’s 1801 painting of Napoleon crossing the St. Bernard pass is a well-known example, portraying a historical event even as it confirms Bonaparte’s lofty position in a pantheon of heroes who had attempted the perilous Alpine crossing before him (see figure 2). David transforms the mountains themselves into a monument: Bonaparte’s name is inscribed into the rocks, alongside the names of Hannibal and “Karolus Magnus” (Charlemagne). “We saw the soul of Hannibal applaud his young rival while leaning on a cloud,” runs Creuze de Lesser’s description of Napoleon’s traversal of the St Bernard in the fawning Vers sur le mythologie d’Ossian, which de Lesser read aloud at a gathering in honor of the First Consul in the same year that David’s painting was completed.

---

182 Homer and Ossian were Beethoven’s great literary favorites besides Goethe and Schiller. See the letter of 8 August 1809 to Breitkopf and Härtel. Anderson I, no. 224; Briefwechsel II, no. 395. Three useful studies of Napoleonic iconography are Albert Boime, Art in an Age of Bonapartism, 1800–1815 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), particularly chapter 2; Christopher Pendergast, Napoleon and History Painting (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997); and Werner Telesko, Napoleon Bonaparte: Der “moderne” Held und die bildende Kunst 1799-1815 (Vienna: Böhlau, 1998).

In David’s painting, however, Napoleon’s mythic achievement remains identifiably a part of contemporary history: in the background, beneath the hooves of Bonaparte’s horse, a more realistic column of soldiers trudges up the mountainside. Much like Mähler’s portrait of Beethoven, David’s famous image produces a peculiar
tension out of its secularizing displacement of myth onto a heroic individual.\textsuperscript{184}

By the late 1830s, Thomas Carlyle would identify secularization as the basic historical principle of modern hero worship. His Hegelian ruminations on hero worship construct a historical narrative beginning with the ostensibly primitive worship of demigods and prophets, and culminating in the arts and Napoleonic statecraft. “All sorts of heroes are intrinsically of the same material,” he concluded—himself an admirer of Napoleon and Mohammed, as well as a biographer of Schiller.\textsuperscript{185} This seems to be the message that generations of critics have taken from Beethoven’s contemporaneous mythmakers: Beethoven did not write music about Napoleon; rather, the two heroes are of the same mythic substance. In the same year that Carlyle’s reflections on hero worship appeared in print, Wagner was to argue, through a character in his short story “Ein glücklicher Abend,” that the Eroica does not depict the deeds of any particular hero, but is itself an act of heroism: Beethoven had accomplished “the same thing that Bonaparte had achieved on the fields of Italy,” he wrote.\textsuperscript{186}

\textsuperscript{184} See Boime, Art in an Age of Bonapartism, 39–44; see also Eric Hobsbawm on Napoleon’s rise to power as the world’s first “secular myth” in The Age of Revolution (New York: Mentor, 1962), 98.


\textsuperscript{186} Richard Wagner, Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen, vol. 1 (Leipzig: E. W. Fritzsch, 1871), 182. Cited and translated in Burnham, Beethoven Hero, xv. It was also in the mid nineteenth century that Alois Fuchs famously (if dubiously) recalled that Beethoven responded to news of Napoleon’s victory at Jena in October 1806 with the words: “It’s a pity that I do not understand the art of war as well as I do the art of music; I would conquer him!” (See Thayer–Forbes, 403.) Nevertheless, this
Thus have critics at once accepted and rejected the connection between the *Eroica* and Napoleon, as if imitating Beethoven’s own inaugural gesture of assertion and retraction. Despite his protestations that Beethoven himself is the hero of the *Eroica*, Rolland cannot resist comparing Beethoven’s musical accomplishments with Napoleon’s empire building; indeed, the analogy between music and warfare is constitutive of his entire conception of the heroic style:

> Conquerors abuse their power: they are hungry for possession: each of these free Egos wishes to command. If he cannot do this in the world of facts, he wills it in the world of art; everything becomes for him a field on which to deploy the battalions of his thoughts, his desires, his regrets, his furies, his melancholies. He imposes them on the world.\(^{187}\)

And, in the context of a more sober analysis of the Third Symphony, even Riezler allows himself a similar metaphorical flourish:

> It is in truth “heroic” music, and at the same time that Beethoven paid homage with it to Napoleon, he took his own place side by side with him, though as a “hero” of a very different caliber—the creator of a more lasting empire.\(^{188}\)

Like Rolland, Riezler accords the two heroes a kind of spiritual affinity, even as he reminds us that the musical work has long outlasted its Napoleonic parallel in the material world.

> Nor is this brand of *Geistesgeschichte* confined to pre-war criticism. Here is Lockwood in 2003, introducing the parallel between Beethoven and Napoleon with this affecting simile:

---

\(^{187}\) Rolland, *Beethoven the Creator*, 2.

Launching one major artistic achievement after another, something like contemporary Napoleonic victories, he took command of the musical world and aroused an immense response.\textsuperscript{189}

A few chapters later, however, this arresting image has taken on more than its fair share of interpretive labor:

It is [...] almost as if Beethoven’s conquering and heroic works of the second period might in some way have been unconsciously and symbiotically linked to the military conquests that marked Napoleon’s career during these same years.\textsuperscript{190}

Only Lockwood’s subjunctive mood prevents his rhetorical device from becoming a bizarre speculation about the submerged place of Napoleonic victories in Beethoven’s psyche.

**The Historical Death of the Heroic Style**

Moreover, strange as it may seem, critics have continually invoked the spiritual affinity of Beethoven and Napoleon as a surreptitious method of historical explanation. Indeed, they have tended to invoke the spiritual kinship of the two heroes as a way of explaining what Solomon witheringly calls the “dissolution of the heroic style”—its supposed exhaustion around a decade after the composition of the *Eroica*.\textsuperscript{191} This remains a central conceit of Beethoven periodization: when Napoleon falters, so does the heroic style; when the French Emperor finally falls, the heroic style falls with him. In almost all Beethoven biographies, the composer faces his own Waterloo in the

\textsuperscript{189} Lockwood, *Beethoven*, 203.
\textsuperscript{190} Ibid., 335–336.
\textsuperscript{191} Solomon, *Beethoven*, chapter 17.
years leading up to the Congress of Vienna—the years that witnessed the height of his living fame.

Here is Rolland, still running with his extended Napoleonic metaphor:

when the man of Waterloo has fallen, Beethoven imperator also abdicates; he, too, like the eagle on his rock, goes into exile on an island lost in the expanse of the seas.\textsuperscript{192}

And here is Lockwood, three quarters of a century later:

Although [Beethoven’s] decline in productivity had strong inner motivations, it is curious that it coincided with the collapse of Napoleon’s dreams of empire.\textsuperscript{193}

And what proves to be the enemy of the mythic musical style that Beethoven had created? Nothing other than history itself. For marking the first major defeat of the heroic style—the style that generated one timeless masterwork after another—is another single composition, one that critics have long dismissed as one of Beethoven’s most worthless “occasional works”: Wellingtons Sieg. Wellington’s victory in 1813 marks Beethoven’s defeat.

This composition, which Lockwood calls a “shameless concession to the political wave of the moment,” stands in direct opposition to the autonomous masterworks of Beethoven’s heroic decade—and in particular the \textit{Eroica}.\textsuperscript{194} Not only does Wellingtons \textit{Sieg} name the protagonist and his accomplishment on its title page, but it spells out the hero’s triumphant narrative in the most blatant

\textsuperscript{192} Rolland, \textit{Beethoven the Creator}, 2.
\textsuperscript{193} Lockwood, \textit{Beethoven}, 335.
\textsuperscript{194} Ibid., 338.
generic terms of contemporary battle music, with marches and trumpet signals depicting the English and French armies, a clattering depiction of the cannon and rifle fire of the battle, and a final joyous Siegessinfonie complete with variations and fugato on “God Save the King.” Indeed, Lockwood sums up the position of Wellington's Sieg within Beethoven scholarship when he inverts Beethoven’s reported sentiment about the Razumovsky Quartets:

About Wellingtons Sieg he could have said the opposite of what he had told Radicati about the Opus 59 Quartets, namely that they were not for a later age but only to be patriotic, to capitalize on current national feeling, and to make money.

Beethoven “could have” said the opposite of what he could have said to Radicati. With this questionable sanction, Lockwood neatly arranges the heroic style and its Others in opposition to one another. Just as initial public skepticism signals the timelessness of a true work, so immediate public enthusiasm indicates the ephemeral nature of an occasional work. “Nothing could be more evanescent than such excessive adulation,” writes Solomon, in much the same spirit.

The Eroica and its musical Other, Wellingtons Sieg, are thus the bookends of the heroic decade: Beethoven’s heroic style begins on the pure plane of myth and ends in the tangle of history. Biographers who

---

195 On the genre of battle music, see Karin Schulin, Musikalische Schlachtengemälde in der Zeit von 1756 bis 1815 (Tutzing: H. Schneider, 1986) and Will, The Characteristic Symphony, chapter 5.
196 Lockwood, Beethoven, 339.
197 Solomon, Beethoven, 290. This trope is prominent also in Rolland’s biography: “At the end of 1813 Beethoven suddenly came in for a noisy temporary popularity, which he owed not to music but to politics. The only one of his works that is unworthy of him, that complete nullity The Battle of Vittoria, that celebrates the victory of Wellington, is admired by everyone: even the cabal renders homage, for this time he has come down to its level!” See Rolland, Beethoven the Creator, 184.
are music critics when it comes to Beethoven’s heroic style accordingly become historians when they reach 1813. Even Kinderman, one of the few Beethoven biographers to give the Congress compositions serious and sustained consideration, turns at once to the “historical, sociological, and even psychological” issues that they raise. To be sure, he is sensible of the danger of domesticating them as examples of successful Gebrauchsmusik: “we should resist the temptation simply to collapse [Wellingtons Sieg] into its historical context,” he warns. But it is not long before he concludes that Beethoven’s occasional work is “a fascinating historical artefact, but a dubious work of art”—a formulation that performs precisely the historicizing move that he warns against.

Indeed, in all of Beethoven’s major biographies, historical and political contexts seem suddenly to intervene at the close of the first decade of the nineteenth century even if they have rarely done so before—a kind of historical deus ex machina that alters the nature and direction of Beethoven’s musical style. Solomon portrays Beethoven’s creative life in the years 1811–1815 almost as a series of challenges from the forces of history. The first hint that all is not well comes with the incidental music for Kotzebue’s Die Ruinen von Athen and König Stephan—the patriotic occasional dramas written to celebrate the opening of the Pest theater. Solomon claims that these pieces presage the “topical works” of the Congress of Vienna. Then, of course,
comes Wellingtons Sieg in 1813: Beethoven is now down, but not out—it was premiered alongside the Seventh Symphony, after all. But having lost the battle, Beethoven finally loses the war in 1814–1815: Der glorreiche Augenblick; the closing choruses for Treitschke’s two festive dramas; the celebratory chorus for the allied princes; the C–major Overture, Op. 115, composed for the name day of the Kaiser in 1815—these works mark the complete sacrifice of music to the occasion. The heroic style dies a historical death.

“Historical circumstances play their role here,” explains Solomon, as if they had hitherto exerted little influence over Beethoven’s music; his ensuing excursus is worth quoting at length:

> The heroic, exhortatory style had itself lost its historical raison d’être with the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the disintegration of the old connoisseur nobility, and the beginning of a new phase in Austrian national existence. After twenty years of war, many Viennese, returning to a torpid life of peace, stability, and conservatism, began to utilize music not as a stimulant to consciousness, but as a narcotic, perhaps to mask the humdrum reality of post-Napoleonic and post-Enlightenment society.

His core assumptions allude to the familiar distinctions of structural Marxism: historically situated music, he suggests, is inevitably ideological in the sense that it functions as obfuscating escapism, while true masterworks stimulate awareness precisely because they reject their own context. Likewise, Kinderman’s version of this idea (with terms borrowed from Wolfgang Welsch) distinguishes the “aesthetic” aims of the heroic style from the “anaesthetic” purpose of

\[202\] Ibid., 293.
its musical Others. The heroic style thus vanishes as music begins to collude with the material base of Viennese society: Solomon reproaches its “hedonistic trends”—its turn to “Biedermeier comforts” and its increasing love of dance to the exclusion of all else. In almost every Beethoven biography, the elaborate celebrations of the Congress of Vienna come to stand for the trivialization of Viennese musical culture; as the Prince de Lignes was said to have punned shortly before his death in 1815: “le congrès danse, mais il ne marche pas” (the congress is dancing, but it isn’t working/walking). The Viennese “demanded nothing more serious than dance tunes, which formed the almost uninterrupted background to the congress,” explains Martin Cooper.

In fact, almost every element that biographers regard as contributing to the end of the heroic style—even the most hermetically musical or speculatively psychic—can be construed as an agent of history. Thus, even when Solomon seems to be practicing style criticism, his terminology betrays an underlying historiography. The musical styles that ostensibly flourished on the corpse of Beethoven’s heroic manner after the Congress of Vienna are a “bourgeois-Biedermeier mixture”—in other words, styles defined primarily in terms of social history. And, of course, the most suitable genre for Vienna’s newly hedonistic age was opera—the “new Italian style exemplified by the meteorically popular Rossini” (Rossini’s L’inganno

---

203 Kinderman, Beethoven, 170–172
204 Solomon, Beethoven, 294.
205 Cooper, Beethoven: The Last Decade, 16.
206 This is from the first (1977) edition of Solomon’s Beethoven, 229; it was excised from the second edition.
felice came to Vienna in November 1816). In the Beethovenian context, to be Italian means to be in thrall to history. Martin Cooper approvingly repeats the conclusion of the German diplomat and Beethoven acquaintance Varnhagen von Ense that the public at the Congress of Vienna “preferred Italian grace and lightness to German seriousness”—a taste that, Cooper goes on to add, “was to find ideal satisfaction” in Rossini’s operas. One might almost say that Rossini personifies the historical deus ex machina of Beethoven biography, intervening to destroy the heroic style—the “composer of the hour,” as Kinderman calls him.

No wonder that Dahlhaus should follow Kiesewetter and arrange early nineteenth-century music around the “twin musical cultures” of Rossini and Beethoven. The string of national, generic, formal, and aesthetic oppositions that Rossini and Beethoven represent—Italian versus German; opera versus symphonic music; tunes versus thematic process; changeable recipes for performance versus inviolable works—ground themselves in the more general opposition of the real and the ideal, or history and myth. Beethoven biographies represent Rossini as the master of a genre that, unlike German instrumental music, eschews any claim to mythic universality and instead shapes itself to the circumstances of its composition, performance, and even reception—a genre that is comfortable with its malleability in the
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208 Cooper, *Beethoven: The Last Decade*, 16. It is important to note that Varnhagen von Ense published his most informative memories about Beethoven some decades after the Congress.
209 Kinderman, *Beethoven*, 188.
hands of the occasion. As Dahlhaus remarks, one tends to consider this operatic aesthetic the more “realistic,” because it apparently does not deny the historical and social conditions that impinge upon it and instead embraces a collaborative view of the creative process.\textsuperscript{211} From one perspective, therefore, Rossini is almost wholly a symbolic figure in Beethoven biography—an Italianate name for the violation of Goehr’s Beethoven paradigm, the personification of the occasional work.\textsuperscript{212} His brand of transient populism triumphs with the historical erosion of the heroic style at the Congress of Vienna.\textsuperscript{213}

**The Other Heroic Style**

Beethoven’s principal biographers thus portray the end of the heroic style as a temporary usurpation of the ideal by the real, of the work concept by the occasional work. Moreover, Beethoven’s overt celebration of Wellington in 1813 seems to invert and even distort his covert allusions to Napoleon in 1804. And this is emblematic of a wider aesthetic inversion brought about by Beethoven’s occasional works. If these critics are to be believed, these compositions are

\textsuperscript{211} Ibid., 10.
\textsuperscript{212} Goehr, *Imaginary Museum*, chapter 8.
\textsuperscript{213} Almost all biographers have treated Beethoven’s temporary susceptibility to historical circumstances in the years 1811–1815 as a crisis that precipitated the subsequent withdrawal of the late music. Only recently have scholars begun to question the idea, propagated by writers such as Rolland and Sullivan, that Beethoven had retreated from society altogether by the time that Rossini arrived to mine Vienna’s new vein of Biedermeier frivolity. (See, for example, Rumph’s *Beethoven After Napoleon*, particularly 92–245.) For Solomon, the intense isolation of Beethoven’s late music amounts to a resurgence of the work concept—a rearguard action against history. He even claims that, in a manner never seen before in music, Beethoven’s late style is “created out of the composer’s imagination and intellect rather than through a combination and amplification of existent musical trends”: music with barely any prehistory. See Solomon, *Beethoven*, 296.
actually a debased version of the heroic style itself. Solomon spells it out clearly when he dubs the 1811–1815 occasional works “mock-heroic”: their identity is parasitic on their heroic precursors.214

Solomon explains the descent of the heroic style into the “mock-heroic” as follows:

[Beethoven’s] heroic style is revived, but as parody and farce. Rather than moving forward to his late style, he here regressed to a pastiche of his heroic manner.215

He thus touches on most of the interpretive buzzwords of Beethoven’s Congress compositions: pastiche; farce; parody.216 Kinderman simply quotes Solomon, before translating the theory into his preferred critical terms: “In this instance, identifiable aspects of Beethoven’s aesthetic enterprise dissipate into the realm of the anaesthetic.”217 Briefly touching on Der glorreiche Augenblick, Lockwood takes Beethoven to task for “a grotesque parody of his serious style.”218 Dahlhaus is most explicit in linking the corruption of the heroic style to the betrayal of the heroic ideals represented by Napoleon:

In 1814 the ideal itself was abandoned, at least for the time being, and the epoch came to an end. Wellington’s Victory is only a petrifact, a parody of the heroic style established in the “Eroica.”219

214 Solomon, Beethoven, 287.
215 Ibid.
216 For another brief literature review of this critical strategy, see Cook, “The Other Beethoven,” 5.
217 Kinderman, Beethoven, 173.
218 Lockwood, Beethoven, 340.
219 Dahlhaus, Beethoven, 17.
Yet the same scholars rarely explain how the heroic style descends into farce; adjectives tend to substitute for more concerted investigations of style or aesthetics. The word “bombastic” is a particular favorite: Kinsky and Halm describe Der glorreiche Augenblick as schwülstig in their thematic catalogue, and it has since cropped up in almost every Beethoven biography.220

Perhaps only Kinderman has attempted a more detailed investigation. Although he presents a smorgasbord of opposing pairs when he distinguishes the heroic style from its later debasement—including art versus kitsch and the aesthetic versus the anaesthetic—his discussion depends most crucially on Suzanne Langer’s Romantic–modernist conception of music as an “unconsummated” symbol.221 Langer argues that “music at its highest,” while inviting our interpretation of its expressive intent, nevertheless evades any definitive or reductive account of its meaning; it can only be imperfectly consummated by whatever program or event is at hand.222 Great music is in this respect like myth—a symbolic form that permits reflection about the world without requiring a more concrete purchase on it.223
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220 Kinsky–Halm, 413. The gloss in the catalogue actually refers only to Weissenbach’s text as schwülstig (for which “turgid” might be a better translation in the literary context), although this has not stopped more recent scholars widening its application. For a brief tour of alleged Beethovenian bombast, see Kinderman, Beethoven, 172; Lockwood, Beethoven, 340; Solomon, Beethoven, 287.

221 See Kinderman, Beethoven, 170; Solomon also makes use of Langer’s theories in his account of the heroic style; see Solomon, Beethoven, 253.

222 Suzanne Langer, Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art (New York: Mentor, 1951), 204.

223 For Langer on music and myth, see Philosophy in a New Key, 207–208. Her approach might bring to mind the musically influenced structural theories of myth advanced by Claude Lévi–Strauss; see The Raw and the Cooked: Introduction to a Science of Mythology, trans. Anon (London: Pimlico, 1994), 14–18. Demonstrating
Now, as we have seen, most modern critics have portrayed Wellingtons Sieg as the moment when vulgar historical reality violates the mythic purity of the heroic style. So it should come as no surprise that Kinderman, improvising with Langer's terms, concludes that Wellingtons Sieg is “a ‘consummated,’ not an ‘unconsummated’ symbol”; it is, so to speak, the sound of the heroic style when historical events have managed to consummate it before we can hear it for ourselves. While Kinderman marvels at the unconsummated “symbolic or mythic qualities” of the Eroica, he dismisses Wellingtons Sieg and other Congress compositions as “all too explicit or unmediated in their symbolic content”: an ideological reading, verbal narrative, or musical analysis will tell us everything there is to know.

Langer’s notion of unconsummated symbolism thus shores up the more general distinction between works and occasional works. Kinderman implies that, while the meanings of the Eroica emerge through its repeated consummation in historical occasions or

---

just how little her philosophy owes to Enlightenment music theory, Langer even remarks that “music that is invented while the composer’s mind is fixed on what is to be expressed is apt not to be music.” See Philosophy in a New Key, 204. Precisely the opposite sentiment (i.e. that true music can only be composed if the composer’s mind is fixed on what is to be expressed) can be found in innumerable Enlightenment music treatises—for example, Johann Mattheson: “One should seek out one or another good, really good, poetic work, in which nature is vividly depicted, and should endeavor accurately to distinguish the passions contained in it. For the stuff of many a composer [Setzer] and music critic [Klang-Richter] would without doubt be deemed better if he himself only knew from time to time what he actually wanted.” (Mattheson, Der vollkommene Capellmeister (Hamburg, 1739; facs. repr. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1969), 19 –20.)

Kinderman, Beethoven, 172. For a critique of Kinderman’s aesthetic and a discussion of the barely concealed relationship between the idea of “consummation” and questions of eroticism and gender, see Rumph, Beethoven After Napoleon, 166–167.

Kinderman, Beethoven, 86.

Ibid., 2.
contingent interpretations, the symphony nevertheless retains its independence—just as the concept of the musical work is separate from any of its performances.\footnote{Kinderman makes this comparison himself, citing Schnabel’s comment that a musical work is “better than any single performance.” See Kinderman, \textit{Beethoven}, 3.} By contrast, \textit{Wellingtons Sieg} has only a feeble symbolic life outside of a single occasion—reducible to “an unequivocal verbal interpretation,” it is Wellington’s victory and nothing more.\footnote{Ibid., 170.} Even though Kinderman is adamant that he does not sanction the idea of historically indifferent structural abstraction, therefore, he nevertheless endorses his own definition of the “absolute music” aesthetic—the kind of musical autonomy in which “the work seemed to follow not convention or external models but its own inner laws,” as he puts it.\footnote{Ibid., 3.} The metaphor of inside and outside proves crucial here: while the battle narrative is external to the musical progress of \textit{Wellingtons Sieg}, the \textit{Eroica} is driven by its own internal compulsion:

What the bundle of processional anthems and cannonades in \textit{Wellingtons Victory} lacks is a compelling internal artistic context. In this work a literal, external program assumes priority, whereas in the \textit{Eroica} Symphony [...] symbolic elements are absorbed into new and original musical designs.\footnote{Ibid., 2.}

Or, as he writes in his later discussion of the \textit{Eroica}:

But what really counts here is not the imposition of associations from outside the work, but rather the recognition that the music itself embodies these associations in its structure, rhythmic movement, orchestration, and character. For want of a better
formulation, we may refer to this phenomenon as an intrinsically musical narrative.\textsuperscript{231}

In his introduction, Kinderman authenticates his views with the critical precedent of E. T. A. Hoffmann’s Beethoven writings—and it is certainly the case that the 1810 review of the Fifth Symphony starts not only with its famous assertion of music’s complete independence, but also with a condemnation of the rash of contemporary battle symphonies.\textsuperscript{232}

For all that, Kinderman never maintains that Wellingtons Sieg and the true heroic style actually sound very different. “Some of the same rhetorical figures appear [in Wellingtons Sieg] as in Beethoven’s important compositions,” he admits—although he does not name the figures he means.\textsuperscript{233} One can only assume that he (and perhaps all the other critics who likewise consider the Congress compositions as in some way parodistic) is thinking of musical topics. It is, after all, agreed that a certain militarism pervades Beethoven’s heroic style; the marches, fanfares, and processional hymns that make up Wellingtons Sieg are also present in the heroic symphonies and overtures—one only need consider the march finale of the Fifth or the Siegessinfonie that concludes the Egmont Overture.\textsuperscript{234} The often fanfare-like triadic material in the first movement of the Eroica and, of course, its Funeral

\textsuperscript{231} Ibid., 86–87.
\textsuperscript{233} Kinderman, Beethoven, 172.
March have, albeit with the prompting of the symphony’s title, guaranteed a reception history that emphasizes its military character. Kinderman’s fundamental aesthetic distinction between the *Eroica* and *Wellingtons Sieg* is predicated not on the presence of fanfares or marches but their arrangement: while the fanfares of the *Eroica* are organized according to internal musical principles, the arrangement of *Wellingtons Sieg* is borrowed from history. The British and French marches and trumpet signals follow one another in *Wellingtons Sieg* only because the corresponding armies faced one another on the battlefield—“the narrative design is extrinsic rather than intrinsic.”

According to this view, such a distinction applies to all of Beethoven’s occasional works: their narrative designs belong properly to history rather than music. One need look no further than the third movement of *Der glorreiche Augenblick* to find the purest example of martial topics arranged according to an extrinsic scheme: the soprano personification of Vienna greets each of the monarchs in attendance at the Congress, and each ruler in turn receives a grand orchestral fanfare. Even the order in which the monarchs were honored, as well
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235 See Burnham’s account of the reception of the *Eroica’s* first movement in *Beethoven Hero*, 3–28. One should also note Stephen Rumph’s objection that the militarism of the *Eroica* is an invention of its later reception; taking his interpretive lead from the opening triadic theme, he argues that the *Eroica* is actually a pastoral symphony—although of a somewhat sublimated sort. This fits with his larger argument that the *Eroica* represents the fundamental Enlightenment narrative structure of the *Universalgeschichte*. See Rumph, *Beethoven After Napoleon*, chapter 3, particularly 73–76. A reading that deftly takes into account the presence of both pastoral and military topics in the first movement of the *Eroica* (and the ease with which the opening triadic motif adapts to both) is offered by Richard Will in *The Characteristic Symphony*, 212.

as the relative grandeur of their fanfares, was as much a political matter as a musical or literary one, as the rather diplomatic solution shows: first, Tsar Alexander, followed by Friedrich Wilhelm of Prussia, the kings of Denmark and Bavaria, and finally Kaiser Franz—first among equals. Many critics have thus assumed that the apparent derivation of such narrative designs from outside the work accounts for the transience of occasional pieces: once the occasion recedes into history, so does its narrative logic. The occasion is a kind of historical scaffolding, in the absence of which the musical architecture falls into ruin.

But Kinderman’s distinction between the heroic style and its parodistic Other is not based on architecture alone. The metaphor of inside and outside conditions a more obvious distinction: there may well be fanfares in the *Eroica*, but there are no volleys of cannon or rifle fire; neither are there national songs or preexisting march tunes. Not content with being shaped by history, *Wellingtons Sieg* quotes history itself—entire stretches of music and noise, reproduced wholesale. This surely warrants Kinderman’s word “unmediated.” The *Schlacht* scarcely takes the trouble to convert its raw material into something “symbolic,” its clattering sound effects imitating even the randomness of rifle fire and cannon blasts—particularly as it draws to its sputtering close. On either side of the battle, much of the music is made from other music—a musical narrative created from a patchwork of familiar tunes: “Rule, Britannia!” squares up to the Marlborough March, which is reduced to a pathetic limp by the end of the battle—
and, of course, the victory celebrations soon elide with “God Save the King.”

Like the extrinsic derivation of the musical narrative, quoted melodies and noises are a feature of much occasional music—and not only battle symphonies. Carl Maria von Weber’s cantata Kampf und Sieg (Battle and Victory)—an allegorical piece written after Waterloo—echoes the vivid tone painting of Wellingtons Sieg, as well as its concluding turn to “God Save the King.” Melodic quotations often served to emphasize and shore up the immediate political function of an occasional piece—as with the surprise appearance of a fragment of Haydn’s “Gott erhalte” in the final strophe of Beethoven’s Schlußchor for Treitschke’s Die Ehrenpforten, and indeed the inclusion of the whole of Haydn’s tune just before the recapitulation of Hummel’s hearty D–major overture for the same drama.237

If such quotations narrowed the distance between musical content and political function, their inclusion alongside other diegetic sound in descriptive pieces threatened to collapse the distinction between music and the history it celebrated. The avalanche of piano pieces depicting the street processions and public events of the Congress are often little more than sonic collages. Beethoven’s colleague Anton Diabelli made several contributions to this genre, including a musical account of the entry of the allied monarchs into Paris on 15 April 1814, a depiction of the festival commemorating the Battle of Leipzig in the Prater on 18 October 1814, and, along with many others, a musical portrait of Kaiser Franz’s triumphant entry

237 The same overture that had opened Treitschke’s earlier Die gute Nachricht.
into Vienna on 16 June 1814. The latter piece—whose decidedly “extrinsic” narrative follows the progress of the royal procession through Vienna—alongside the marches, hymns, and fanfares, an organ prelude and Te Deum as the procession reaches St. Stephen’s cathedral, as well as the ringing of church bells, each event carefully noted in the score. This diegetic music mingles with diegetic noise: along with marching bands and liturgical singing, Diabelli depicts the festive firing of cannons.

Kinderman dismisses all such imitation as “crude realism”—and he can certainly draw support from contemporary opinion.\textsuperscript{238} Despite the prevalence of this type of music in the popular publishing market, the critics in specialist publications such as the \textit{Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung} were decidedly suspicious of tone painting and imitative musical effects.\textsuperscript{239} It was this critical climate that in part conditioned Beethoven’s somewhat defensive subtitle to the \textit{Pastoral}—“more an expression of feeling than painting”—even though the printed parts openly drew attention to the nightingale, cuckoo, and quail that alight beside his musical brook. Doubts about the value of tone painting even found their way into the otherwise effusive \textit{Wiener allgemeine musikalische Zeitung} review of the premiere of the Seventh Symphony and \textit{Wellingtons Sieg}, which made this bold defense of Beethoven’s aesthetic views:

\begin{quote}
Herr van Beethoven is as convinced as everyone else, if not more so, that tone painting that makes natural events or human actions sensible [\textit{Malerei durch Töne zur Versinnlichung von}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{238} Kinderman, \textit{Beethoven}, 171.
\textsuperscript{239} For an account of contemporary critical responses to musical imitation, see Will, \textit{The Characteristic Symphony}, chapter 3.
Naturereignissen, oder menschlichen Handlungen] is a trifling object for music.\textsuperscript{240}

The Leipzig Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung was rather guarded in its praise of Beethoven’s tone painting:

> Once one accepts the idea, one is pleasurably surprised at the result, and especially at the ingenious and artistic way it is achieved.\textsuperscript{241}

It was more than a decade, however, before these critical misgivings about Beethoven’s imitative music prompted a fully argued polemic against Wellingtons Sieg. The polemicist in question was the Darmstadt theorist Gottfried Weber, who published an 1825 article on Tonmalerei or tone painting in his journal Cäcilia, comparing Wellingtons Sieg unfavorably with Beethoven’s earlier masterworks.\textsuperscript{242} Weber starts from first principles—with a Herderian claim about the origins of language: human speech has progressed from a coarse collection of imitative gestures to a purer condition of cultivated abstraction and reflection; the fine arts, he claims, allow language to relinquish altogether the primitive duty of physical imitation.\textsuperscript{243} The fine arts “mitigate the unmediated impression of reality and throw a

\textsuperscript{240} “Große musikalische Akademie,” Wiener allgemeine musikalische Zeitung 48 (15 December 1813), 749.
\textsuperscript{241} Quoted and translated in Cook “The Other Beethoven,” 11. Cook’s interpretation of this passage, and of the reception history of Wellingtons Sieg more generally, places great emphasis on the phrase “once one accepts the idea” in this review. He argues that it signals the coexistence of two generic “registers” in contemporary orchestral music.
\textsuperscript{242} Although it should be noted that Weber himself claims in a footnote to his essay that his critique of Wellingtons Sieg had been formulated as early as 1816.
poetic veil over it—the veil of the imagination [der Schleier der Phantasie],” writes Weber:

The objects [of fine art] should not seem real to us but should come to light as the result of a specific position, as the outlook of a feeling soul, which itself adds another purpose, the purpose of beauty, the imprint [Gepräge] of spirit.\(^{244}\)

It is this poetic mediation that Weber misses in Wellingtons Sieg—in its depiction of “the fighting masses, the rattle of weapons and cannon bursts”:

These are not musical colors that Beethoven uses here, not the materials of a composer [nicht tonkünstlerische Mittel], but the trickeries [Trugkunststücke] of scenic acoustics.\(^{245}\)

Weber is particularly struck by the contrast between the final Siegessinfonie of Wellingtons Sieg and the short Siegessinfonie from the incidental music to Goethe’s Egmont (1809–1810)—the joyous F–major fanfare that brings the overture to its rousing conclusion. Weber pours scorn on Beethoven’s variations on “God Save the King” in Wellingtons Sieg,\(^{246}\) arguing that, even without recourse to an existing tune, Egmont is the more truthful tone painting—a purely musical symbol for the noble death of Goethe’s hero:

The lofty triumph of [Egmont’s] death, before which all lamentations fall silent, and the loftier glory and transfiguration of the unbowed fallen ones—what a contrast from such glory to the much praised “exuberant celebration of the people”!\(^{247}\)

\(^{244}\) Ibid., 135.
\(^{245}\) Ibid., 166–167.
\(^{246}\) See ibid., 169–170.
\(^{247}\) Ibid., 171.
And Weber draws the same conclusion about the triumphant conclusion to the Fifth—yet another implicit Siegessinfonie:

Finally, after a long, increasingly tense pedal point, with the entry of the broad 4/4 meter its full power unfolds in such a masterful transfiguration, strides forth on its proud course with all the riches of the most splendid instrumentation like a triumphal procession [Triumph-Zug], achieves the highest degree of the sublime, and with a broad, powerful cadence, leaves the greatest uplift in the souls of the listeners.—That is great, that joy and triumph and transfiguration! and—how base by comparison seems the battle and official pomp [Schlacht- und Prunk-Stück] that lies before us now!248

While the tunes and sound effects in Wellingtons Sieg slavishly adhere to the real, Beethoven’s earlier triumphs throw off these constraints in pursuit of the ideal, mediating their coarse realism through Beethoven’s poetic vision—throwing the “veil of the imagination” over the explicit battle and celebration. The issue of tone painting thus led Weber to the view that has dominated Beethoven scholarship ever since: Wellingtons Sieg is a debased, unmediated, and externalized version of Beethoven’s heroic style.

“Nothing but an Occasional Piece”

Beethoven’s annoyance with Weber survives, much like the withdrawn Eroica dedication, as a scrawl on a text. Once Cäcilia had made it past the Viennese censors and into the composer’s hands, he set about the journal with a pencil. And where the article ridicules his orchestral sound effects, the modern scholar can still read Beethoven’s pithy response at the foot of the page: “Oh you pitiful scoundrel, my

248 Ibid., 171–172.
shit is better than anything you have ever thought” (Ach du erbärmlicher Schuft, was ich scheisse, ist besser, als wie du je gedacht). Before this, moreover, he has written the words: “nothing but an occasional piece” (nichts als Gelegenheitsstück). Even though Beethoven evidently disagreed with Weber, he nevertheless seems to have invoked in his defense the familiar distinction between works and occasional works (as well as the even more familiar distinction between art and shit)—in other words, unless his remark was intended to be ironic, Beethoven appears to have sanctioned the critical language that has since denigrated Wellingtons Sieg.

Now, assuming that Beethoven did not mean his annotation ironically, it could be argued that, in the decade since the Congress of Vienna, his status as a classic had become more firmly cemented in the critical imagination as well as his own mind, and this might have encouraged a more distanced, even retrospective view of his oeuvre; his works had become increasingly classifiable—susceptible to critical taxonomies. The basis of an emerging orchestral repertory, his symphonic works had perhaps come to seem even more fixed and timeless, and his occasional works even more ephemeral. Even so, it seems unlikely that so dramatic an aesthetic transformation had taken place during the ten years since Beethoven had composed Wellingtons Sieg—the kind of change that suddenly made possible

---

249 The original copy is held in the Beethovenhaus, Bonn. Kinderman reproduces the relevant page as plate 13 in his Beethoven.
250 Kinderman puts Beethoven’s words down to “a streak of defensiveness”—but does not question his terminology; see Beethoven, 177. Cook passes over Beethoven’s terminology rather quickly—perhaps because it might be seen to mar his otherwise convincing argument that Wellingtons Sieg was by no means an embarrassment to the composer or his public; see “The Other Beethoven,” 9.
Beethoven’s invocation of the word *Gelegenheitsstück* in defense of *Wellingtons Sieg*. To be sure, the notional divide between works and occasional works might have broadened in the decade since the Congress of Vienna and Rossini’s arrival in Vienna, but the early nineteenth century already made ample use of the term *Gelegenheitsstück* and its cognates (*Gelegenheitswerk* or *Gelegenheitsmusik*). *Wellingtons Sieg* did not become an occasional work, it was composed as one.

For precisely this reason, however, one need not understand Beethoven’s use of the term as sanction for the later critical denigration of *Wellingtons Sieg*—because in the early nineteenth century the word had yet to carry the pejorative connotations that later music historiography would bring to it. Granted, the social and conceptual preconditions for the modern distinction between works and occasional works were in place, as we will see; but nothing suggests that Beethoven thought of the *Gelegenheitswerk* primarily as the historically contaminated Other of the *Werk*. Rather, Beethoven’s marginal scribble in *Cäcilia* manages tersely to imply that occasional works belonged to a distinct genre of their own. Such a genre presumably included successful and lasting pieces as well as worthless and ephemeral ones; this much is implicit in the review of *Die gute Nachricht* in the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, which, although conceding that any rigorous critique of the music would appear petty in such a joyful climate, calls Treitschke’s drama
undoubtedly the most successful occasional piece [Gelegenheitsstück] that has appeared on our stage in this remarkable epoch.  

Likewise, shortly before the premiere of Wellingtons Sieg, a theater critic in the Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung complained about the great many worthless Gelegenheitsstücke on the Viennese stage, but made an exception for a vaterländisches Schauspiel by Deinhardtstein and Kanne called Deutscher Sinn (The German Sense).

In any event, Wellingtons Sieg in particular remained among Beethoven’s most celebrated compositions long after the end of the Napoleonic Wars. Even the self-consciously highbrow group of musicians and music lovers who wrote to Beethoven in 1824 to request a concert from the reclusive composer, ostensibly to counter the rise of debased and populist Italian opera, mentioned only one of Beethoven’s compositions by name:

For years, ever since the thunders of the Victory at Vittoria ceased to reverberate, we have waited and hoped to see you distribute new gifts from the fullness of your riches to the circle of your friends.

This is not to ignore the obvious topicality of a piece such as Wellingtons Sieg, nor even Beethoven’s astuteness in exploiting this topicality—the celebration of current events is the defining feature of occasional pieces, after all. Beethoven was aggressive in his pursuit of the Prince Regent’s official acknowledgement of the dedication, fully aware that with each passing day the piece would seem less

---

251 AMZ 21 (25 May 1814), col. 351.
252 AMZ 57 (24 November 1813), col. 771.
253 Albrecht III, no. 344; Briefwechsel V, no. 1784.
relevant. But there is no evidence that Beethoven also expected his occasional pieces to vanish along with the historical events that they celebrated. The notice that Beethoven had planned to publish in the Wiener Zeitung thanking the organizers and participants in the concerts of the 8 and 12 December 1813 in the University Hall shows considerable pride in Wellingtons Sieg. After pointedly drawing attention to his lack of financial reward, as well as the funds that the concerts had raised for soldiers wounded at the battle of Hanau, Beethoven’s notice concludes:

I must also thank [Mälzel] in particular, because by the projection of this concert, he gave me the opportunity, long and ardently desired, by means of the composition especially written for this philanthropic purpose and delivered to him without pay, to lay a work of magnitude upon the altar of the fatherland under the existing conditions.

A work of magnitude, no less. Of course, this was intended as a public announcement—moreover, in a newspaper that was an organ of court opinion. There is nothing to suggest, however, that Beethoven was insincere, as all of his most recent biographers admit, even as they

---

254 Beethoven remarks in a note to the Archduke Rudolph from early 1814 that “such things have their fixed time-limits.” See Anderson I, no. 475; Briefwechsel III, no. 692. Although he attempted to court the highest British plenipotentiaries at the Congress of Vienna, the Prince Regent never acknowledged the dedication. See the letter to Count Lichnowsky, 21 September 1814. Anderson I, no. 498; Briefwechsel III, no. 740. See also Beethoven’s later attempts to get a response from the Prince Regent with the letters to Johann Peter Salomon of 1 June 1815 and (most probably) to Count Razumovsky in the same month. Anderson II, no. 544 and no. 546; Briefwechsel III, no. 809 and 810. It seems that Beethoven was also planning a trip to London (possibly with Mälzel and the Panharmonicon) to capitalize on the topicality of Wellingtons Sieg. He wrote to Zmeskall in a letter of 11 January 1814: “I must be off to London soon, if I am to make anything out of Wellingtons Sieg.” See Anderson I, no. 459; Briefwechsel III, no. 691.

255 Beethoven actually withdrew the notice once he became embroiled in a legal dispute over the rights to Wellingtons Sieg with Mälzel; Schindler preserved it. 256 Thayer–Forbes, 567.
hear parody and farce in Wellingtons Sieg.\textsuperscript{257} Beethoven even granted his battle piece an opus number—something that he often withheld from compositions that he considered inferior. Moreover, he did not repudiate or suppress his occasional compositions in the years following the Congress of Vienna. Indeed, at around the time that he defended Wellingtons Sieg in the margins of Cäcilia, Beethoven corresponded with his friend and publisher Tobias Haslinger about a number of his older occasional compositions—and even expressed his intention to compose a new overture to Der glorreiche Augenblick, some eleven years after he began work on it.\textsuperscript{258}

In short, the discursive context and critical function of the word Gelegenheitsstück must have changed since the early nineteenth century. Definitions of the words Gelegenheitswerk, Gelegenheitsstück, or Gelegenheitsmusik are not offered in any of the most popular eighteenth- or early nineteenth-century music dictionaries or encyclopedias—perhaps because the concept of the occasional work entered into the vocabulary of music critics from the sphere of literature, where terms such as Gelegenheitsgedicht (occasional poem) had long been in use to denote established genres of celebratory verse such as the Pindaric Ode.\textsuperscript{259} The Gelegenheitsgedicht was by no means a lesser poetic genre, destined

\begin{footnotes}
\item[257] See Kinderman, Beethoven, 177; Lockwood, Beethoven, 339; and Solomon, Beethoven, 287. Older critics, notably Thayer, have tended to argue that Beethoven was not wholly serious about Wellingtons Sieg; see Nicholas Cook’s brief account of such critics in “The Other Beethoven,” 7–9.
\item[259] Only the word Gelegenheitsgedicht is included in Adelung’s dictionary. See J. C. Adelung, Grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuch der Hochdeutschen Mundart, vol. 2 (Vienna, 1811), col. 529.
\end{footnotes}
for the oblivion of history—quite the opposite. Indeed, in his substantial Briefe über Gelegenheitsgedichte (1794) the Wittenberg Kantian Johann Christian Adolf Grohmann compares the successful occasional poem to a monument, which subsumes historical particulars under more lasting general truths and transforms history into myth.260

Thus, when Ruth E. Müller begins her recent discussion of Die Ruinen von Athen with the bare assertion that it is “ein typisches Gelegenheitswerk” (a typical occasional work), she is employing the term in a specific, pejorative sense that reduces it almost entirely to its absent historical context and implicitly contrasts it with the unforgotten canon.261 This sort of occasional work is merely an artistic analog for the transience of history itself—a musical ruin that proves a past moment of plenitude to be unrecoverable. But when Joseph Rossi’s Denkbuch für Fürst und Vaterland—one of myriad commemorative volumes providing detailed accounts of the festivities relating to the Congress of Vienna—proudly lists all of its “patriotische Gelegenheitsschriften, poetische Aufsätze, und musikalische Werke” (patriotic occasional writings, poetic compositions, and musical works), it implies a completely different vision of occasional works: they make a historical moment permanent.262 In recent criticism, the occasional work represents music’s Faustian pact with the real:

---

260 J. C. A. Grohmann, “Briefe über Gelegenheitsgedichte,” Der neue Teutsche Merkur 6 (1794), 105–141. Grohmann compares the occasional poem to a monument at several points; see, for example, 109.
topicality creates temporary popularity, but leads to oblivion. In Rossi’s list, they are more like Grohmann’s monuments: forms of commemoration that make history mythic. The occasional works of the Congress period were “monuments of a historical consciousness,” to borrow Walter Benjamin’s suggestive phrase: they mark a point of reflection at which history tells stories about itself—a point at which historical particulars strive to become transhistorical generalities. One suspects, therefore, that the relationship between history and myth in Beethoven’s occasional works is more complex than their critics would have us believe.

**Writing Myth Over History**

The occasional works of the Congress period are bursting with heroes—mythic heroes who mingle with their historical counterparts and historical heroes who aspire to mythic permanence. The Congress of Vienna was in many ways the high point of a modern form of hero worship that had awakened in the first decade of the nineteenth century. Innumerable pamphlets and publications from this decade concerned themselves with pan–German and Austrian national heroes: in 1808–1809 the *Vaterländische Blätter* published a series of sketches about Austrian heroes, and at around the same time Josef von Hormayr, with the enthusiastic sponsorship of the state, published his vast compendium of national heroes, the

---

It was from this tome that Kotzebue drew the story of Königs Stephan, performed alongside Die Ruinen von Athen at the opening of the new Pest theater on the Kaiser’s birthday, 10 February 1812. The link between ancient and modern heroes was by no means merely implicit. Königs Stephan concludes with the eponymous king envisioning the glory of his descendents, followed by Beethoven’s rousing Schlußchor “Heil unsern Enkeln!” (Hail to our descendents!):

Wohltaten spendend, täglich neue, / Vergilt der König in ferner Zeit / Die unwandelbare Treue, / Die sein Volk ihm dankbar weiht! (Daily bestowing new favors, / In a distant age the king will repay / the unwavering loyalty / that his people gratefully dedicate to him!)

In other words, a heroic lineage culminates in Franz himself.

The assembled monarchs at the Congress of Vienna were certainly feted as heroes. The personified Vienna greets them as such in the third part of Der glorreiche Augenblick—first addressing Tsar Alexander as “der Heros, der den Fuß aufstellt auf den Wolkenschemel, den alten Kaukasus” (the hero who puts his feet up on the footstool of the clouds, the ancient Caucasus). Kaiser Franz, however—the recipient of Beethoven’s grandest orchestral fanfare in this sequence—was the greatest hero of the Congress. The “oratorio” Der große Tag des Vaterlandes (The Great Day of the Fatherland) by Ignaz Sauer, the choirmaster at the imperial orphanage, addresses the Kaiser in its final chorus: “Dies ist Dein Werk, du Held der Helden!/

See Walter Langsam, The Napoleonic Wars and German Nationalism in Austria (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), 82–86; also Rumph, Beethoven After Napoleon, 93–94.
Als Titus edler und Trajan!” (This is thy work, thou hero of heroes!/ Nobler than Titus and Trajan!). The text draws widely on heroic images from classical antiquity and Teutonic legend—earlier conflating Franz with Hermann, the Prince of the Cheruscans who supposedly unified German tribes against the Roman occupation in the first century AD. “Kaiser Franz! Du Friedensbringer!” (Kaiser Franz! You Bringer of Peace!), one of Kanne’s many simple Congress songs, likewise addresses the Kaiser as a “hero of heroes,” and concludes with the dramatic line: “Sieh! Dein Nahme steht geschrieben/ In dem Buch der Ewigkeit” (Lo! Your name is written/ In the book of eternity). One might take this textual metaphor—this injunction to see the Kaiser’s name made permanent as text—as a performative moment nicely encompassing the aspirations of all contemporary occasional pieces. Singers of Kanne’s song were reading Franz’s name in the score in front of them: it was art that made heroes of leaders and myths of historical events; the book of eternity lay open on the music stand.

265 Sauer’s composition proclaims itself as an oratorio, and most other sources and reports follow suit, but it is really a short cantata—moreover, scored only for wind instruments. Part of the ceremonies that marked the Kaiser’s return to Vienna, the “oratorio” was performed in the Imperial Orphanage on 21 June 1814; Rossi provides a fulsome description in his Denkbuch, 11–13, where he also reprints the text.

266 Hermann (or Arminius, to use his Latin name), whose legend, transmitted in Tacitus’s Germania, became something of a cult during the later nineteenth century, had been the subject of many epics, dramas, and operas—most famously Klopstock’s trilogy of Hermann plays from the 1760s and Kleist’s Die Hermannsschlacht (1808–1809), written shortly before his arrival in Vienna; see Gesa von Essen, Hermannsschlachten: Germanen- und Römerbilder in der Literatur des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts (Göttingen: Wallstein, 1998); Richard Kuehnemund, Arminius; or, The Rise of a National Symbol in Literature (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953); Langsam, German Nationalism in Austria, 77–81; and Simon Schama, Landscape and Memory (London: HarperCollins, 1995), chapter 2, particularly 100–120.
The heroic Kaiser was not only made permanent as text, however—he was also petrified into marble or bronze. When the portraitist Friedrich Heinrich Füger depicted the Kaiser in 1814 in one of his rich neoclassical oil paintings, Franz was literally monumentalized as a stone idol, receiving the blessings of angels of peace (see figure 3); an allegorical image of an image, this painting redoubles the idealizing force of art.

Figure 3. Heinrich Füger’s doubly petrified Kaiser, 1814.
Likewise, in more than one of Beethoven’s compositions from the period, the Kaiser appears already as an image—the effigy of his ideal self. The earliest composition to feature the Kaiser as a statue is *Die Ruinen von Athen*—a drama precisely about the persistence of ideals in the face of the ruination of time. Minerva awakes from two thousand years of slumber—a punishment by Zeus for her failure to prevent the death of Socrates—and returns to her native Athens only to find the once flourishing center of learning overrun by savage infidels.\(^{267}\) Shocked, Minerva sets out to discover where the ideals of ancient Athens might continue to thrive—a search that concludes when she reaches the city of Pest. Kotzebue’s drama thus blatantly performed its own message, celebrating the persistence of noble Athenian ideals in the form of the new Pest theater. And just as ruins symbolized decline, so more solid forms symbolized the continuation of noble ideals—not only the theater building itself, but also a bust of the Kaiser, guarantor and personification of all that is noble and good.

In the final scene, the unseen Minerva looks on with approval as the high priest and the pious inhabitants of Pest deck their two altars and offer up praise to the gods. Three main musical numbers articulate the action: a solemn march to the altars; a large *scena*, incorporating recitatives, a Sarastro-like bass aria for the priest with two obbligato horns, and a short choral conclusion; and a final triumphant chorus. The climax of the drama turns on a rather artificial device: towards the end of his aria, the high priest prays on behalf of the people for a third altar bearing an image of the city’s

\(^{267}\) Kotzebue evidently takes Minerva to be equivalent to Athena.
“guardian angel” (Schutzgeist) and the listening Minerva, over tremolo strings, instantly requests that Zeus grant his wish. With a thunderclap, a sudden switch to Presto, and a fortissimo dominant chord, over which violins and flute ecstatically rush upwards through three octaves, a sumptuous altar appears, adorned with a bust of the Kaiser. As the cast kneels before the image, the priest launches a frenetic closing stretta in C major, which the chorus joins: “Er ist’s! Wir sind erhört!” (It is he! We have been heard!). The action ends with a chorus pledging allegiance to Hungary and the Kaiser, “Heil unserm König, Heil!” (Hail to our king, Hail!).

In the first production, the Kaiser’s image appeared from a trapdoor in the floor. But for Beethoven’s Akademie on 2 January 1814, which coupled the three final numbers from Die Ruinen von Athen with Wellingtons Sieg, it seems that the composer improvised, using the statue of the Kaiser that already stood in the großer Redoutensaal; a panicky letter written the day before the concert shows Beethoven attempting to arrange a rudimentary curtain—“even though it be a bed curtain or some kind of screen”—that could be removed at the decisive moment: “without a curtain or something of the kind, its whole significance will be lost.” One can understand his concern. The Kaiser’s image and the sudden musical transformation work together in the scena: the music imbues the statue with its immediacy while the statue petrifies the fleeting

---

message of the music into a single startling image; the statue borrows
the music’s aura and the music borrows the statue’s fixity.

Despite Kotzebue’s misgivings about the universal appeal of a
drama that he considered “somewhat localized,” he nevertheless
suggested that Beethoven’s “masterful music”—the universalizing half
of the collaboration—might find Die Ruinen wider favor.270 Over the
short term, Kotzebue’s instincts were proven right: the score of Die
Ruinen became one of Beethoven’s most popular occasional pieces
before the composition of Wellingtons Sieg, receiving numerous
performance in and around Vienna between 1812 and the end of the
Congress.271

That Die Ruinen at first seemed made to last is entirely
appropriate for a piece that takes permanence as its subject. The
ruins of Die Ruinen von Athen have little to do with the grotesque
stone fragments of the Romantic imagination; they are far from the
gothic silhouettes of a Caspar David Friedrich. Rather, these ruins are
rubble, waiting to be rebuilt; appropriately for a time of war and
reconstruction, these poetic fragments yearn to be reconstituted as a

270 Letter of 20 April 1812. Albrecht I, no. 161; Briefwechsel II, no. 573.
271 The final scena from Die Ruinen von Athen was performed in several concerts
between 1812 and the end of the Congress, including Franz Clement’s Akademie of
22 March 1812, the Society of Gratz charity concert on Easter Sunday of the same
month, and, of course, Beethoven’s own Akademie of 2 January 1814 in the großer
Redoutensaal. Moreover, the entire score of Die Ruinen was revived for the opening
of the Theater an der Josephstadt in 1824, for which Beethoven supplied only one
wholly new number and a new overture, Die Weihe des Hauses. Only after the
composer’s death did critics, equipped with a newer conception of the occasional
piece, begin to question the lasting value of Die Ruinen. One of the earliest examples
is the critic from Vienna’s Allgemeiner musikalischer Anzeiger, who remarked in
1829 that Beethoven’s piece “actually belongs in the category of occasional products”
because Beethoven’s decision to compose it did not come “from an inner urge” (aus
whole. Indeed, the metaphor of the rebuilt ruin, the ideal that survives the decay of time, crops up across Beethoven’s 1811–1815 collaborations. The Kriegerchor from Duncker’s Leonore Prohaska—an unaccompanied male chorus similar in many respects Weber’s almost contemporaneous settings of patriotic Theodor Körner songs entitled Leyer und Schwert (Lyre and Sword)—begins:

Wir bauen und sterben; aus Trümmern ersteht—/ Ist längst unsere Asche vom Winde verweht—/ Der Tempel der Freiheit und Liebe (We build and die; from the ruins—/ Our ashes have long been blown away by the wind—/ Rises the temple of freedom and love).

Once again, the ephemeral real world is contrasted with everlasting ideals. And music takes the side of the ideal, emphasizing the warriors’ collective commitment in the simplest possible ways—not least with the loud repetition of the opening line of each stanza, its dense homophonic texture articulating a basic antecedent–consequent that moves from tonic to dominant and back again.

Aside from the two occasional pieces of 1814–1815, Beethoven’s most significant collaboration with Treitschke in the Congress period was the revision of Fidelio—a composition that bears the scars of its encounters with history despite its aspirations to myth. Beethoven was intent on creating a lasting work from the fragments of the earlier versions of the opera, which had barely survived beyond a few performances in 1805 and 1806. Indeed, he himself called on the metaphor of ruination and rebuilding to describe the exercise: “now I feel more firmly resolved to rebuild the desolate ruins of an old castle,”
he wrote, upon seeing Treitschke’s revisions.\footnote{Letter of March 1814. Anderson I, no. 469; Briefwechsel III, no. 705.}
The 1814 opera is the site of immense tension between history and myth, the real and the ideal, the occasion and the work. Even in its earliest incarnations, Leonore–Fidelio had an ambivalent relationship with recent history. The French “rescue operas” that made their way into Viennese theaters early in the nineteenth century often claimed to present characters and events that were historically authentic, even as it transformed them into myths of heroism and emancipation.\footnote{For the premium on “realism” in French opera see David Charlton, “The French Theatrical Origins of Fidelio,” in Ludwig van Beethoven: Fidelio, ed. Paul Robinson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 56–57. Winton Dean writes of the forced union of “idealism and realism” in French opéra comique; see “French Opera,” in The New Oxford History of Music: The Age of Beethoven 1790–1830, ed. Gerald Abraham (Oxford University Press: London, 1982), 30.} Jean-Nicolas Bouilly’s Léonore, from which Sonnleithner derived Beethoven’s German libretto, claimed to be a true story of tyranny under the Terror—a potentially subversive vision of recent political oppression that required Sonnleithner to backdate the action to sixteenth-century Spain in order to pass the censors.\footnote{Indeed, in his strenuous efforts to convince the dubious Viennese censors to pass his libretto, Sonnleithner constantly reminded them of the revised setting of the action. See his letters of 2 and 3 October 1805. Albrecht I, no. 109 and no. 110; Briefwechsel I, no. 237 and no. 238.} For all that, Beethoven’s opera ruthlessly subordinates its plot and its characters to a more abstract narrative of emancipation—“something approaching a myth of universal liberation,” as Paul Robinson puts it.\footnote{Indeed, it struck Adorno that the opera transformed recent history into a quasi-liturgical ceremony—though Adorno’s imagination extended no further.} Indeed, it
than the French Revolution: “Fidelio has a cultic, hieratic quality. In it, the Revolution is not depicted but reenacted as ritual,” he remarked.\textsuperscript{276}

This ritualistic quality is particularly pronounced in the 1814 Fidelio, which compresses the 1805–1806 versions into a leaner two acts, and concentrates foremost on the fundamental dramatic contrast between the reigning atmosphere of oppression and the final exuberant paean to freedom. Treitschke introduced a scene change to emphasize the transformation: whereas the earlier versions conclude underground, the 1814 finale takes the characters from the claustrophobic space of the dungeon into the exterior world of the prison parade ground.\textsuperscript{277} The domestic intrigues with which the opera begins, which had always been to some degree marginal compared to the central tale of rescue, are among the prominent casualties of the 1814 revisions. The jailer’s daughter Marzelline, upon learning during the finale that her husband to be is in fact the noble Florestan’s wife, is allowed only a brief lament—“O weh mir, was vernimmt mein Ohr” (Alas! What do I hear!)—before the ensuing celebrations obliterate


rather than resolve the issue: “the actual figures with whom the opera begins have become almost invisible,” remarks Robinson.278

Yet this turn to mythic abstraction can also be understood as precisely the most “occasional” aspect of the opera. Against the background of the Kaiser’s victorious return to Vienna on 16 June 1814—within a month of Fidelio’s premiere on 23 May—Beethoven’s opera was readily interpretable as a metaphor for the emancipation of Europe from Napoleon. That Florestan’s freedom is ultimately achieved through the timely intervention of a good prince can only have made Fidelio seem all the more attractive to Europe’s assembled rulers.279 Indeed, the 1814 revisions, particularly two revisions of detail, suggest that current historical events “consummate” Fidelio’s myth of emancipation. One of the performances of the opera during the festivities preceding the Congress took place on the Kaiser’s name day (4 October)—always a cause for celebration in Vienna’s theaters. There are references to both the name day and the Kaiser himself in the finales of Acts I and II. When the enraged prison governor Pizarro surprises Rocco during the first finale, demanding to know why the prisoners are out of their cells, the downtrodden jailer uses the excuse that their temporary release is a traditional way of celebrating the Kaiser’s name day: “Des Königs Namensfest ist heute, das feiern wir auf solche Art” (today is the King’s name day, which we celebrate in this way). Rocco’s words, which begin with an assertive diatonic line but grow ever more timid, follow a pair of fortissimo flourishes in D—a

279 See Solomon, Beethoven, 257 and 288.
fanfare with dotted rhythms, which seems to hint at the musical celebration to come. And when it does, in the finale of Act II, with a massive opening blast of C major and yet more festive dotted rhythms in the chorus “Heil sei dem Tag” (Praise be the day), the connection between the Kaiser and the prisoners’ freedom is firmly established. A new stage direction provides a key detail about the scene: “Paradeplatz des Schlosses, mit der Statue des Königs” (Parade ground of the castle, with a statue of the king). The heroic Kaiser intrudes, as if to consummate the opera’s idealistic message. And yet, much like his appearance in Die Ruinen von Athen, our hero is a statue, already well on his way to idealized fixity.

Such tension between historical particularity and mythic universality—between the demands of the occasion and of the work—evidently played on Beethoven’s mind during the Congress, not least as he rebuilt the ruin of his only opera. On 13 July this remarkable notice appeared in Vienna’s Friedensblätter:

A Word to His Admirers.
How often, in your anger that his depth was not sufficiently appreciated, have you said that van Beethoven composes only for posterity! You have, no doubt, now retracted your error, even if only since the general enthusiasm aroused by his immortal opera Fidelio, in the conviction that what is truly great and beautiful finds kindred souls and sympathetic hearts in the present without withholding in the slightest the just privileges of posterity.²⁸⁰

The message of this bizarrely gloating announcement is clear:
Beethoven, particularly through his opera, has successfully negotiated

²⁸⁰ Reproduced and translated in Lockwood, Beethoven, 341.
the divergent demands of the occasion and the work, the present age and future ages. This became something of a critical topos among Beethoven’s supporters at the time of the Congress; in May 1814, the Wiener Theaterzeitung wrote:

We were amazed at Beethoven in his entire greatness, and, what was more, we were amazed at the master along with an abundance of admirers who, before the Battle of Vittoria, had belonged to his antagonists. At last, the great genius has for once prevailed and is able to rejoice in his works within his own lifetime. A great rarity!  

The anonymous reviewer coupled Wellingtons Sieg and Fidelio with some justification; the battle piece articulates a more complex relationship with recent history than many critics have recognized. While most recent writers have characterized Wellingtons Sieg as a work of unmediated realism, fated to disappear with the history it commemorates, Beethoven’s musical monument to the Englishman is as idealizing as most of the music written around the time of the Congress. Wellington was the most vaunted allied war hero, after all, whose arrival in Vienna on 1 February 1815 prompted a flurry of publications and musical compositions, each striving to inscribe Wellington’s name in the book of eternity. Kanne was among the most prolific of those praising Wellington in music and song. He had already contributed an extended strophic song in E–flat, interspersed with dialogue and choral refrains, to Treitschke’s Die gute Nachricht, in which Ruthe the schoolmaster reports on the allied entry into Paris:

---

281 Wiener Theaterzeitung I (28 May 1814); Contemporaries II, 180.
Europas Sterne glänzen hier,/ viel Helden im Vereine./ Ein Held—ein Stern nur fehlet mir,/ wohl weiß man, wen ich meine. [...] Gruß ihm, dem Held von Albion,/ dem löwengleichen Wellington. (Europe’s stars are gleaming here,/ many heroes banded together./ I am missing but one hero, one star,/ you know well whom I mean. [...] Salute him, the hero of Albion,/ the lionlike Wellington.)\textsuperscript{283}

When Wellington arrived in Vienna, Kanne added to his corpus of musical hero worship when Cappi published the simple Tempo di Marcia “Wellington! Willkommen uns!” whose English translation and dedication took pride of place on the title page, despite the rather clumsy rendering of its title (scansion clearly taking precedence over grammar): “Wellington! Welcome to us! A song composed and set in music for the solemn entry of the unconquer’d hero in Vienna.” The same publisher also issued six Triumphmärsche (triumphal marches) entitled Wellington in Wien as Kanne’s op. 99. But Kanne’s most unusual contribution to the Viennese Wellington craze was a titanic melodrama for piano and voice written after Waterloo, a bizarre confluence of Teutonic legend and musical reportage called “Die Schlacht von Belle-Alliance; oder Hermanns Herabkunft aus Walhalla” (The Battle of Belle-Alliance; or Hermann’s Descent from Valhalla).\textsuperscript{284}

The piece was dedicated to “den unsterblichen Helden und Siegern Wellington und Blücher” (the immortal heroes and victors, Wellington and Blücher) and describes the recent conflict in the most inflated mythic terms, raising Wellington and the victorious Prussian General to godhead with a mixture of poetic fragments, bursts of triumphant

\textsuperscript{283} Text in Willy Hess, “Zwei patriotische Singspiele,” 290.

\textsuperscript{284} It should be mentioned that German speakers often refer to the Battle of Waterloo as the Battle of Belle-Alliance, after a nearby Belgian village.
song, and a smattering of tremolos, fanfares, and imitative sound
effects:

Unsterblich strahlet Ihr am Himmelszelte/ Verklärt im Bilde
zweier schönen Sterne/ Der Preußen Blücher, Englands
Wellington! (In the firmament you shine eternally/ Transfigured
in the image of two beautiful stars/ The Prussian Blücher,
England’s Wellington!)

Beethoven’s Wellingtons Sieg was undoubtedly the grandest of
all such compositions, projecting the idealizing impulses of these
smaller occasional pieces onto a vast musical canvas and bringing a
larger musical and mythic form to Wellington’s military achievement.
It is remarkable, especially since Kinderman and others insist that
Wellingtons Sieg is slavish in its adherence to the historically real,
quite how far from the mundane and messy realities of battle
Beethoven actually takes us. As Richard Will writes, most battle
pieces “give so little weight to historical accuracy”—indeed, their
charged performance contexts ironically encouraged a kind of mythic
distancing.285 Indeed, it only confirms the idealized abstraction of
Wellingtons Sieg when Weber complains that it could serve as a
depiction of any military conflict.286 Likewise, it is largely the title of
Wellingtons Sieg that prescribes that one hear the music as a
depiction of a specific hero rather than the “universal aspects of

285 Will, Characteristic Symphony, 191.
286 Weber, “Über Tonmalerei,” 163. As Thomas Röder observes, many battle
symphonies—particularly the anonymous but hugely successful “Battle of Prague”—
appeared in editions commemorating a number of different battles; see “Beethovens
Sieg über die Schlachtenmusik: Opus 91 und die Tradition der Battaglia,” in
Beethoven zwischen Revolution und Restauration, 230–231 and his schema for all
battle symphonies, 233–234.
“heroism” that Kinderman (along with generations of others) hears in the Eroica Symphony.287

To distinguish Wellingtons Sieg from Beethoven’s heroic masterworks on the basis of realism versus idealism, or history versus myth, is thus harder than it might appear. When Burnham explains the fundamental mythic structure of the Eroica—the underlying narrative that unifies its otherwise disparate critical reception—he could just as well have been describing Wellingtons Sieg:

Something (someone) not fully formed but full of potential ventures out into complexity and ramification (adversity), reaches a ne plus ultra (crisis), and then returns renewed and completed (triumphant).288

Despite the obvious generic differences between the Eroica and Wellingtons Sieg, the latter clearly follows this structure: the approaching rumble of the side drum and the subsequent trumpet signals announce the adversity to come, as if in miniature; the crisis point is reached towards the end of the Presto section of the Sturmmarsch—perhaps with the fortississimo and chromatic descent in m. 302, which gradually dwindles to the F–sharp minor Andante of the limping French march; and one hardly need point out the concluding triumph of the Siegessinfonie.

The monumental culmination of Wellingtons Sieg is no more imposed “from without” than the equivalent culmination of the Eroica. Indeed, one might call the Siegessinfonie an Eroica finale in miniature: a modified variation set infused with fanfares and flourishes, as well as

---

287 Kinderman, Beethoven, 90.
288 Burnham, Beethoven Hero, 3.
monumentalizing counterpoint. “God Save the King” alternates with the opening D-major victory music—first in a surprise B flat, then remaining in D—each time, however, avoiding a full conclusion by snagging itself on the stepwise rise of a third that precedes its final cadence. The hesitant repetition of this melodic fragment in the first D-major rendering of “God Save the King” leads to a culminating fugato variation in 3/8, in which the violins and woodwind also tarry on the stepwise rising third (m. 638)—a method of intensification that sets up the breathless rush to the end.

Indeed, given Beethoven’s attention-seeking interruptions during his variations on “God Save the King,” as well as the considerable contrapuntal energy that he expends on the tune, it is curious that Richard Will should distinguish between the Eroica and Wellingtons Sieg on the basis of “authorial presence,” which, he argues, the latter conspicuously lacks. After all, some commentators have heard too much of the composer’s voice in Wellingtons Sieg, arguing that Beethoven’s approach to “God Save the King” is intended to be humorous or even irreverent. But Will insists that the sense of collective celebration effaces Beethoven’s individual compositional identity—that no heroic bard mediates or interprets the historical event. For all of Will’s insight into Wellingtons Sieg and its generic forerunners, his conception of the piece ultimately resembles Kinderman’s view that Wellingtons Sieg is “unmediated” or, indeed,

289 Will, Characteristic Symphony, 215.
290 See Cook, “The Other Beethoven,” 8; also Will, Characteristic Symphony, 231.
291 For Will on the figure of the bard, see Characteristic Symphony, 209 and 215.
Weber’s charge that Beethoven failed to cast the “veil of the imagination” over his raw materials.  

Will points out how Beethoven the bard soon came to occupy the position of the grand Uomo of the Eroica—how the mediator came to occupy the position of what he mediated. He does not mention, however, that such an interpretive displacement came sooner and more pervasively in the case of the supposedly unmediated Wellingtons Sieg. Shortly after attending the Akademie on 2 January 1814 while in Vienna, the Romantic poet and Beethoven fanatic Clemens Brentano, brother of Beethoven’s friend and correspondent Bettina, sent his hero the “Vier Lieder von Beethoven an sich selbst” (Four Beethoven Songs to the Composer Himself) and an effusive, barely coherent covering letter. The third poem resounds with a confluence of archaic musical and military imagery, taking the transposition of Beethoven and Wellington, Leyer und Schwert, as its central conceit. “Du hast die Schlacht geschlagen,/ Ich habe die Schlacht getönt” (You have fought the battle,/ I have set the battle to music), it begins, eventually reaching this exhortative finale:


(I slacken my steeds from the chariot/ Triumph! Carried upon

---

292 Will discusses Weber’s polemic in Characteristic Symphony, see particularly 239.
293 Ibid., 215.
294 The letter must date from between 3 January (after the Akademie) and before the poems were published in the Dramatischer Beobachter on 7 January. See Albrecht II, no. 179; Briefwechsel III, no. 689. A scholarly edition of the poems, incorporating variant versions from the MSS and published versions, is in Alfred Christlieb Kalischer, Beethoven und seine Zeitgenossen, vol. 4 (Berlin: Schuster and Loeffler, 1908), 237–240.
295 Kalischer, Zeitgenossen, 238–239.
tones,/ my hero moves into the Gates of Eternity/ Summoned in my chords,/ Wellington, Victoria!/ Beethoven! Gloria!

Meanwhile, the fourth poem explicitly celebrates Beethoven as an archaic bard:

Meine Lyra ist umkränzet/ Und ich sing in hohem Ton,/ Daß es klinget, daß es glänzet/ Für den hohen Wellington! (My lyre is enwreathéd/ and I sing in lofty tones,/ that it tinkles, that it sparkles/ For the lofty Wellington)\(^{296}\)

“David’s harp and Gideon’s trumpet belong to you,” rambled Brentano in his accompanying letter.\(^{297}\)

Such conceits were by no means the exclusive preserve of Romantic poets. Getting in touch with Beethoven after several years’ silence, the composer’s old friend Carl Amenda alluded to the paired fame of Beethoven and Wellington, which had evidently reached him in distant Latvia: “Are you otherwise well though? You must be: the fame that you most recently shared with Wellington indicates it,” he wrote in 1815.\(^{298}\) Neither was the analogy lost on the composer himself: “no doubt you are delighted about all the victories—and mine also,” wrote Beethoven to Count Franz Brunsvik on 13 February 1814.\(^{299}\) Here, Beethoven contradicts those later critics who would portray the battle symphony as a moment of defeat. Wellington and his historical achievement are almost secondary considerations; like so many critics when faced with the \textit{Eroica}, Beethoven identifies Beethoven as the true hero of his work.

---

\(^{296}\) Ibid., 239.
\(^{297}\) Albrecht II, no. 179; Briefwechsel III, no. 689.
\(^{298}\) Letter of 20 March 1815. Albrecht II, no. 200; Briefwechsel III, no. 791.
\(^{299}\) Anderson II, no. 462; Briefwechsel III, no. 696.
Reading History Under Erasure

Nothing can fully erase the topicality of Wellingtons Sieg, of course; like all of Beethoven’s occasional pieces, it is pulled in opposite directions by the forces of history and myth. Perhaps only a dialectical way of thinking can provide an adequate account of the relationship between this occasional piece and Beethoven’s supposedly timeless masterpieces. It is noteworthy, therefore, that Beethoven’s spontaneous defense of Wellingtons Sieg in the margins of Cäcilia was scribbled shortly after he had read a series of Hegelian reflections on his own symphonic development (including passing observations on Wellingtons Sieg) by the Berlin critic A. B. Marx. Beethoven was an admirer of Marx’s writing, and had read his latest article in the inaugural issue of the Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung at least a month before Weber’s polemic appeared in print. A letter of thanks to the publisher Adolf Schlesinger shows Beethoven in much better humor than he was to be after his perusal of Cäcilia:

I have received with great pleasure your communication of June 24 together with the Allgemeine Berliner Musikalische Zeitung. Please arrange for it to be sent to me regularly in future. When leafing though its pages I noticed a few articles which I immediately recognized as the products of that gifted Herr Marx. I hope that he will continue to reveal more and more what is noble and true in the sphere of art.

300 Berliner allgemeine musikalische Zeitung I (12 May 1824); A. B. Marx, “A Few Words on the Symphony and Beethoven’s Achievements in this Field,” in Contemporaries I, 59–77.

Although Marx’s opinion of Wellingtons Sieg is similar in many respects to the critical tradition that has since denigrated it—particularly in his dependence on the metaphor of inside and outside—his dialectical mode of thought nevertheless gives Wellingtons Sieg unusually sophisticated critical sanction. Notably, Marx articulates an intimate connection between Beethoven’s symphonic masterpieces and Wellingtons Sieg that does not also represent the latter as farcical or parodistic. Indeed, he gives Wellingtons Sieg a central role in Beethoven’s symphonic development, invoking it as a kind of explanatory principle for Beethoven’s oeuvre as a whole.

Like many later critics, Marx draws comparisons between the Eroica and Wellingtons Sieg (as well as the Fifth Symphony and the Pastoral) and concludes that the difference between them is a question of inside and outside: Wellingtons Sieg is the particularization of the Eroica’s abstraction—the transformation of an intrinsic musical narrative striving to be heard into something extrinsic. This is the first stage of the dialectic. Marx is accordingly an eager defender of the pictorialism of both the Pastoral and Wellingtons Sieg:

Is not the area of musical allegory productive and is not many an enduring musical form in its generally recognized meaning useful in making completely comprehensible extrinsic references that are not grounded in nature or music?302

The logic of Marx’s dialectical argument requires him to claim that the implicit narrative of the Eroica, although clearly concerning a heroic warrior of some kind, remains somewhat indistinct: “a gratifying

comprehension and clear understanding of the meaning is not easy,” he concludes.\textsuperscript{303} The \textit{Eroica} represents the “struggle of melodies and instruments to attain definite form”—and this form is finally attained in the extrinsic narrative of \textit{Wellingtons Sieg}.\textsuperscript{304}

Everything now was united: psychological development, connected to a series of extrinsic circumstances represented in a thoroughly dramatic action of those instruments that form the orchestra.\textsuperscript{305}

Having established this dialectic between the internal and the external, the \textit{Eroica} and \textit{Wellingtons Sieg}, Marx turns to the Seventh Symphony as the synthesis of both:

Without any externally derived designation (as e.g. that of the nations in the Battle at Vittoria), the meaning of this symphony develops with such victorious precision that one need simply surrender oneself to the effect of the notes in order to visualize such an individual portrait—or perhaps it is better to call it a drama—as never before has been produced in music.\textsuperscript{306}

The drama of \textit{Wellingtons Sieg}, which brings external narrative definition to an earlier internal struggle, becomes internal once again in the Seventh Symphony—but without relinquishing the clarity that it has gained.

Now, on the one hand, Marx’s argument is merely a dialectical version of what has since become received wisdom: \textit{Wellingtons Sieg} transplants the heroic style into the real world. But, on the other hand, the dialectical context reveals something that almost all later

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{303} Ibid., 69.
\textsuperscript{304} Ibid., 71.
\textsuperscript{305} Ibid., 67.
\textsuperscript{306} Ibid., 71.
\end{flushright}
discussions have ignored or suppressed: Wellingtons Sieg—with its fanfares and marches, its battle, its realism, its extrinsic historical derivation, its sheer explicitness—offers a perspective on the poetic content of the Eroica. By turning the Eroica towards the world—by providing a concrete realization of its guiding poetic idea, as Marx would have it—Wellingtons Sieg becomes a hermeneutic key, a kind of musical exegesis. To put it another way, Marx’s argument implicitly deconstructs the hierarchical opposition of the Eroica and Wellingtons Sieg that would become a commonplace of Beethoven criticism: instead of being a debased version of the Eroica, Wellingtons Sieg tells us what it really means.

It is worth noting what happens to this argument in Marx’s much later Ludwig van Beethoven: Leben und Schaffen, when he no longer gave Wellingtons Sieg so prominent a hermeneutic role. Recasting his dialectic as a static descriptive device rather than a sequential narrative about Beethoven’s compositional development, Marx simply opposes the Eroica (first movement) and Wellingtons Sieg as ideal and real musical conflicts, much as more recent critics have done.307 If this allows Marx to dispense with his dubious claim that the Eroica presents an indistinct version of Wellingtons Sieg, it also involves suppressing just how important Wellingtons Sieg is to his entire interpretive strategy. After all, without his dialectical argument, Marx can no longer explain how he is privy to the poetic content of the

Eroica, which has now expanded into a complete Napoleonic Heldenleben. The first movement portrays

the battle,—not one or another specific one (like Beethoven’s Battle of Vittoria and others, for instance Jadin’s Battles of Austerlitz and Jena) but the battle as an ideal image [Idealbild].\textsuperscript{308}

Perhaps sensing that this distinction between real and ideal musical battles appears flimsy, Marx appends a long, defensive footnote:

This is no arbitrary distinction, still less a snooty [vornehmthuende] art-philosophical catchphrase, but demonstrable, factual truth.\textsuperscript{309}

But the ensuing explanation merely repeats his earlier formulation in more leisurely terms, adding that Wellingtons Sieg, unlike the Eroica, is filled with the “entire plunder” of military sound effects.\textsuperscript{310} Given that Marx goes on to give a detailed account of the first movement of the Eroica as a battle—even naming the protagonist as Napoleon himself—his distinction between real and ideal musical conflicts seems barely more than a rhetorical device. The only hint that Wellingtons Sieg had formerly validated Marx’s militaristic interpretation of the Eroica is now literally marginalized in a footnote.

Marx’s small act of suppression has been repeated in generations of scholarship. For it is hard to escape the impression that Wellingtons Sieg continues to give critics a pretext to associate the Eroica and the heroic style more generally with militarism even

\textsuperscript{308} Ibid., 237.
\textsuperscript{309} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{310} Ibid., 238.
when, like the later Marx, they refer to Wellingtons Sieg as an example of what the Eroica is not. One might ask, for example, how Kinderman knows that Wellingtons Sieg consummates the unconsummated symbolism of the heroic style, unless the military heroes, the marches, the fanfares, and perhaps even the cannon shots had implicitly been there all along.

Kinderman’s unconsummated symbolism; Marx’s Ideal musical drama; Weber’s veil of the imagination: such formulations proliferate whenever critics discuss the heroic style. They are rhetorical devices, all of which permit critics to advance a claim about the content of Beethoven’s music even as they retract it. It is once again a reenactment of Beethoven’s own gesture of assertion and retraction on the title page of the Eroica: critics write down who or what the music is about and then erase it, disavowing their own critical language in the moment that they use it. After all his qualifications, Marx describes a musical battle in the first movement of the Eroica anyway. Weber contrasts the Fifth Symphony with the pompous celebration that is the Siegessinfonie in Wellingtons Sieg—then describes the finale of the Fifth as a “Triumph-Zug” (triumphal procession).\footnote{This image has actually cropped up in a good deal of critical writing since; Tovey describes the finale of the Fifth as a procession in his Beethoven, 17.} And when discussing Wellingtons Sieg, Kinderman has no trouble recognizing that the supposedly inexpressible meaning of the heroic style has been expressed.

One cannot deny the militarism of Wellingtons Sieg and many other Congress compositions. By contrast, the militarism of the heroic
style has become a kind of open secret—even though, as Thomas Röder has observed, Kampf und Sieg remains perhaps its defining narrative structure, from the Eroica to the Fifth and Ninth.\textsuperscript{312} Granted, Wellingtons Sieg, with its tone painting and national marches, wears its militarism rather differently from the Eroica. But given how many critics seem to hear in the Congress compositions the very musical gestures and topics that help to define Beethoven’s heroic masterpieces, it is tempting to suggest that the difference between the musical language of Wellingtons Sieg and the Eroica is a question of degree rather than kind. Or, to be more precise, the difference might lie in how Beethoven employs his musical language, rather than the structure and topics of the language itself. After all, the premise upon which one identifies musical topics is that certain gestures, instrumental combinations, and melodic types carry particular associations; it would seem peculiar to argue that only some topics are truly topical. To be sure, one might maintain that the finale of the Fifth is somehow less explicitly a march than the Marlborough March, or that the fanfares in the Eroica first movement or the Siegessinfonie from Egmont are somehow less explicit than the Intrada to the Siegessinfonie from Wellingtons Sieg; but explicitness in this context is in large part a matter of our sensitivities.

Even the distinction between music that is not imitative at all and the kind of musical imitation that Beethoven uses throughout the Schlacht of Wellingtons Sieg might also be a question of degree. Critics have employed the language of warfare to describe Beethoven’s

\textsuperscript{312} Röder, “Beethovens Sieg über die Schlachtenmusik,” 244.
heroic masterpieces not only as a response to their marches and
fanfares, but also to their extreme musical physicality. Will writes of
“viscerally engaging moments of violence” in the first movement of the
Eroica—the bangs, shocks, and sudden musical outbursts that
overwhelm any thematic or structural identity with sheer gestural and
sonic force.\textsuperscript{313} One might almost say that these moments border on a
kind of musical imitation—demanding to be interpreted in
representational or narrative terms rather than only as elements in a
thematic and harmonic design. The most famous moment like this is,
of course, the catastrophic passage of dissonance in the development
from around m. 272 with its syncopated tussle between strings and
woodwind. A. B. Marx’s Ideal battle seems anything but ideal here:

\begin{quote}
At last, like two men fighting chest to chest, all the winds and all
the strings […] stand immovable—choir against choir—on an evil
chord.\textsuperscript{314}
\end{quote}

Will relates this shocking passage and other comparably violent
moments to the cannon bursts of Wellingtons Sieg.\textsuperscript{315} Such critical
responses are almost as old as the Eroica itself; as early as 1811, one
writer heard in the first movement

\begin{quote}
the picture of a battle […] the courageous assaults, the wild
rage, the unremitting attacks and confused anger.\textsuperscript{316}
\end{quote}

While nineteenth-century critics such as A. B. Marx already
sought to keep the violence of the Eroica at an idealized arm’s length,
the militarism of the heroic style became a serious problem only in the twentieth century—especially for those critics who were intent on securing the universality of Beethoven’s music in a polarized and bellicose Europe. Einstein is one such example. Yet again asserting and retracting the meaning of the heroic style, he traced the military sound through most of Beethoven’s heroic compositions even as he argued that “the military element is a purely musical category for Beethoven”; this is an oddly neutered militarism—a musical topic somehow scrubbed of its meaning.\(^\text{317}\) Of course, Einstein claims no such cleansing powers for *Wellingtons Sieg*—although his reasoning is plainly circular:

> It is not because of its occasional nature that the Battle of Vittoria did not take its place as a Tenth Symphony. Rather it is because it remains merely naturalistic, patriotic, and occasional.\(^\text{318}\)

Einstein evidently believes that the *Eroica* or the Fifth somehow allow listeners to subtract the contingent associations that their military sound carries. He almost seems to suggest that Beethoven’s heroic symphonies encourage a kind of Kantian disinterested contemplation: behind the layers of militarism lies pure, dehistoricized musical form—musical meaning reduced to musical architecture. But Einstein was no formalist, and remained committed to the idea that Beethoven’s music embodies a universal ethos. Rather than expurgate certain kinds of musical meaning altogether, Einstein converts Beethoven’s potentially localizing militarism into something more universal and

\(^{317}\) Einstein, “Beethoven’s Military Style,” 245.  
\(^{318}\) Ibid., 244.
idealized: “In Beethoven the military concept in its particular sense is exaltation, the highest exaltation of a heroic soul.”319

Of course, critical strategies like these only became possible once Beethoven’s music had achieved a certain neutralizing distance from its culture of origin. By the same token, such criticism assists in the process of neutralizing and naturalizing Beethoven’s military sound. In any case, over the last hundred years or so, militarism has become merely one of the more familiar features of Great Music; Beethoven’s “consummated” symbols now strike many listeners and critics as chaste. It is a troubling thought, perhaps, that critics might have willingly made themselves deaf to the militarism inherent in some of the most vaunted statements in Western music—or, indeed, that what has come to represent the highest exaltation in music should have a military accent.

That said, Einstein perhaps only responds to an irresolvable tension between the Beethovenian work concept and the historical context that it resists—between the aesthetic and the historical realities of Beethoven’s music. One might even argue that such a tension is constitutive of Beethoven’s heroic aesthetic—a tension eloquently compressed into a single dynamic gesture of erasure on the title page of the Eroica. Einstein’s critical doublethink, which allows him to recognize Beethoven’s musical militarism even as he hears it as somehow purified of militarism, is perhaps an understandably ambivalent response to music that rejects history from within history itself. In fact, Einstein implies that his critical approach in some way  

319 Ibid., 248.
reflects Beethoven’s supposed position as the first socially emancipated musician:

Beethoven was the first example, and a dangerous one, of the “free artist” who obeys his so-called inner compulsion and follows only his genius. [...] Even Haydn and Mozart hardly ever wrote music that did not have some such defined purpose.\textsuperscript{320}

In other words, Einstein argues that, until Beethoven, all works were occasional works. Beethoven gave music its own voice—a voice that was more than mere historical ventriloquism.

\textbf{The Historical Birth of the Heroic Style}

And yet, almost all critics have attributed the unusual power of Beethoven’s new musical voice to history. For when Beethoven scholars discuss the origins of the heroic style around 1803, they invariably cite music that is endowed with the most historically local significance—music that seems entirely historically determined; compositions or genres that one would be inclined to call occasional. Just as history functions as a critical deus ex machina that intervenes to destroy the heroic style around 1812, so history also intervenes at an earlier stage in order to bring the heroic style into being.

As we have observed, ephemeral historical forces are seldom German in Beethoven scholarship: as the heroic style dies an Italian death, so it has a French birth. The heroic style is the product of “a collaboration between Vienna and France,” writes Solomon.\textsuperscript{321} Solomon’s account of the origins of the heroic style is representative of

\textsuperscript{320} Ibid., 244.
\textsuperscript{321} Solomon, \textit{Beethoven}, 180.
a wider scholarly consensus: Haydn and Mozart somehow complete or exhaust the “Viennese Classical style” in the 1790s, after which Beethoven reinvigorates it with “an infusion of fresh elements” from revolutionary France.\(^\text{322}\) These fresh elements seem to have as much to do with social function as compositional technique: the main innovation of revolutionary music according to Solomon is its “explicit ideological and ethical function” as well as its enhanced role in public ceremonies.\(^\text{323}\) Likewise, most scholars count a certain pompous militarism and a serious or exhortative tone as “French” characteristics.\(^\text{324}\)

The most evident confluence of the Viennese and the French in Beethoven’s oeuvre is **Leonore–Fidelio**—French rescue operas having been a fixture on the Viennese stage since Schikaneder brought **Lodoïska** and **Les deux journées** to the Theater an der Wien in 1802.\(^\text{325}\) Cherubini had worked with Bouilly on **Les deux journées**, and the similar rescue theme and elevated moral tone of Bouilly’s **Léonore**, 


\(^\text{323}\) Ibid., 71.

\(^\text{324}\) Lockwood devotes a section of his Beethoven study to “The French Dimension and Military Music”; Beethoven, 151–156. Broyles also discusses “The Military Element” as a largely French revolutionary phenomenon; Heroic Style, 123–124.

even when mediated through Sonnleithner, was plain to the German speaking public: Der Freymüthige described Beethoven’s Leonore as “a story of liberation of the kind that has come into fashion since Cherubini’s Deux journées.”

That Beethoven was an ardent admirer of Cherubini and French opera is well documented. It is also clear that Beethoven absorbed the monumental yet dramatic manner of Cherubini’s orchestral writing. Beethoven’s contemporaries, E. T. A. Hoffmann among them, often compared Beethoven’s instrumental works to the overtures of Cherubini. The overtures to Lodoïska and Les deux journées, both popular concert pieces in Napoleonic Vienna, are typical of the compositions that Hoffmann had in mind when he compared Beethoven and Cherubini. Both are dense and febrile pieces made from fanfare-like material—generative rhythmic tags that create local

327 The famous Cipriani Potter anecdote in which Beethoven named Cherubini (probably in 1817–1818) as the greatest living composer besides himself can be found in Thayer–Forbes, 683. Two items of correspondence are usually cited to illustrate further Beethoven’s admiration for Cherubini: his flattering letter to the composer of 12 March 1823 concerning the subscription list for the Missa solemnis and a letter to the copyist Peter Gläser of 19 April 1824 in which he refers to Haydn, Mozart, and Cherubini as “those great composers.” See Anderson III, no. 1154 and no. 1275; Briefwechsel V, no. 1611 and no. 1814.
328 An important study of Cherubini’s influence on Beethoven’s instrumental music remains Arnold Schmitz, “Cherubini’s Einfluß auf Beethoven’s Overtüren,” Neues Beethoven Jahrbuch 2 (1925), 104–118. See also Michael Broyles, Heroic Style, chapter 6.
329 See, for example, Hoffmann’s references to Cherubini in his review of the Coriolan overture in the AMZ 14 (5 August 1812), cols. 519–526; translated in Contemporaries II, 70–79.
330 Cherubini’s overtures were among the most frequently performed pieces in Vienna in the first decade of the nineteenth century after Haydn symphonies, at least according to the slightly partial concert calendar provided as Appendix I in Mary Sue Morrow’s Concert Life in Haydn’s Vienna: Aspects of a Developing Social Institution (New York: Pendragon Press, 1989).
excitement as well as extended and taut musical paragraphs. This method of producing maximum dramatic effect from minimal musical material is now considered typically Beethovenian—evident in all his overtures from Coriolan to the C-major Overture on the Kaiser’s name day. Arnold Schmitz has even argued that the opening motif of the Fifth was derived from Cherubini’s Hymne du Panthéon.

Most critics find themselves writing of French influences to explain anything apparently ceremonial or pompous, however. The grand march finale of the Fifth—its éclat triomphal, as Kinderman puts it—is where the symphony is most often heard as French. Likewise, beyond the dense thematicism of the first movement of the Eroica, critics tend to hear the funeral march as Beethoven’s clearest response to the occasional music of revolutionary France, which so often served to commemorate and apotheosize fallen heroes. Indeed, Claude Palisca has identified a number of topical similarities between the Eroica funeral march and its musical precursors in revolutionary France—including the imitated drum rolls, its descending diminished fourth, and the hymnlike melody—and even asserts that the section beginning at m. 18 parodies a passage from François-Joseph Gossec’s Marche lugubre.

---

332 Arnold Schmitz, Das romantische Beethovenbild (Berlin and Bonn: Dümmler, 1927), 167.
333 Kinderman, Beethoven, 129.
So much for the French part of the heroic style. As for the Viennese part, Solomon looks to the social trends of the 1790s. Once again, his discussion turns to occasional music—the historical deus ex machina that creates Beethoven’s heroic masterworks: “Slowly but inevitably, Viennese music responded to the reverberations of the French Revolution and the onset of the Napoleonic Wars,” he writes. In 1790s Vienna the “concept of a heroic music responding to the stormy currents of contemporary history” took shape. On the one hand, this heroic musical response to contemporary history seems to have consisted of little more than an increase in the number of patriotic or militaristic pieces dealing with current events. On the other hand, Solomon seems to posit something at once more interesting and harder to define: a pervasive change of musical tone.

Solomon argues that both responses are palpable in Haydn’s compositions from the 1790s—whereupon he provides a list of pieces that will prove crucial to the present study:

The music of Haydn began to take on a new character: he wrote one symphony (1794) titled Military, another (1795) called Drum Roll, and in 1796 he wrote the hymnlike anthem, “Gott erhalte Franz den Kaiser” (God Save Emperor Franz), which became the rallying cry of Austrian patriotism. Also in 1796, Haydn composed incidental music to Alfred, oder der patriotische König (Alfred, or the Patriotic King), followed several years later by an aria, “Lines from the Battle of the Nile,” inspired by Nelson’s victory at Aboukir Bay. But it was in two full-scale masses with

---

335 Solomon, Beethoven, 251.
336 Ibid., 252.
337 Solomon appears to base his discussion of patriotic and occasional pieces on Eduard Hanslick’s Geschichte des Concertwesens in Wien, vol. 1 (Vienna, 1869), particularly 171–178. Hanslick dates the emergence of a new patriotic spirit to a benefit concert for Austrian soldiers in the Burgtheater on 21 January 1794; see Concertwesens, 170.
trumpets and kettledrums, the *Mass in Time of War* (1796) and the *Nelson Mass* (1798), that Haydn approached most closely what would later become Beethoven’s heroic style.\(^{338}\)

The compositions that Solomon cites have no fundamental characteristic in common, but a family resemblance based on political function, topical subject matter, martial atmosphere, incipient Austrian nationalism, imitative musical effects, the presence of trumpets and drums, and grand choruses or monumental orchestral writing. Thus, Solomon mentions the two symphonies, even though Haydn composed them with London audiences in mind: the C–major Allegretto of the Symphony No. 100 famously turns to C minor and a military percussion orchestra, eventually incorporating fanfares and trumpet signals; the Symphony No. 103—Solomon’s most dubious example, perhaps—seems to make the list because of the prominent drum roll with which it begins, and perhaps the sublime grandeur of its slow introduction.\(^{339}\) Solomon likewise emphasizes the grand style of the *Missa in tempore belli* and the *Missa in augstiis* (Mass in Times of Distress)—both of which are dominated by the tone of trumpets and drums. This is particularly true of the *Missa in augstiis*, which is scored only for strings, organ, trumpets and timpani—its warlike character surfacing most noticeably in the abrupt fanfare that concludes its Benedictus. Both masses are also topical to a degree: the *Missa in tempore belli* was composed against the

---


background of renewed hostilities with France; the dark Adagio of its Agnus dei incorporates menacing rumbles from the timpani that seem to imitate the distant approach of an army. The Missa in augustiis is, of course, associated with the figure of Admiral Nelson, although it acquired its nickname rather later than the date of its composition—soon after Haydn met Nelson at Eisenstadt in early September 1800. It has been supposed, though without any conclusive evidence, that the Missa in augustiis was performed during Nelson’s brief stay in Eisenstadt.

A more direct musical association between Haydn and Nelson can be found in “Lines from the Battle of the Nile”—a song with piano accompaniment based on sections of a Pindaric ode by Lady Emma Hamilton’s traveling companion E. C. Knight. This occasional piece was actually written at Eisenstadt during Nelson’s visit—and Knight even recorded that Emma Hamilton herself performed the song with Haydn at the piano. Its topical character hardly calls for much critical exegesis, since it celebrates Nelson’s victory over Napoleon in Egypt in the most florid and mythic terms. The song is in two sections: a dramatic C–minor recitative and a rousing Air in B flat.

---


341 Landon concludes that the mass probably was performed. An elaborate mass certainly was celebrated—and receipts show that the Te Deum for Empress Maria Theresa, which features trumpets and kettledrums, was also played; see Chronicle, vol. 4, 562.

The principal tune of the second section—which is foreshadowed during the opening recitative, when a triumphant fanfare announces the words “Britannia’s Hero gives the dread command”—is constructed almost entirely from fanfares and martial dotted rhythms.

Lastly, Solomon mentions a pair of political compositions from 1796: Haydn’s setting of Leopold Haschka’s “Gott erhalte Franz den Kaiser,” a direct commission from the upper tiers of the Austrian administration, and the incidental music to Alfred—a drama loosely adapted from Alexander Bicknell’s English play about Alfred the Great, which was performed as part of the festivities surrounding the name day of Princess Esterházy on 9 September. Haydn composed three numbers, including a rousing C-major Kriegerischer Chor.343

Finally, one should add that, according to Solomon’s story, Beethoven himself also contributed to the changed musical

---

343 For information on Haydn’s incidental music and the play it was composed for, see Landon, Chronicle, vol. 4, 106–109, 183–189; also Thomas Tolley, Painting the Cannon’s Roar: Music, the Visual Arts, and the Rise of an Attentive Public in the Age of Haydn (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 261–262. Following Solomon’s logic, one might add a further two compositions by Haydn to the list. First, yet another piece that was performed during Nelson’s visit to Eisenstadt in 1800: the joyful C-major Te Deum, with trumpets and drums, that Haydn apparently composed for Empress Marie Theresa. It appears that the Te Deum was performed as part of the name day celebrations for Princess Marie on 8 September—although since settings of the Te Deum were traditionally used as a thanksgiving gesture after military victories, it seems likely that Haydn’s new composition would also have served to honor Nelson, either implicitly or explicitly (see Landon, Chronicle, vol. 4, 562 and 604–615). Second, another London composition, the incomplete cantata Invocation of Neptune, apparently begun for the Earl of Abingdon before the earl’s imprisonment in 1795. Based on the introductory stanzas prefixed to Marchimont Nedham’s translation of Selden’s work on the sovereignty of the sea entitled Mare Clausum, this work celebrates British sea power in the most bellicose terms. Haydn’s music, particularly in the surviving D-major chorus “Thy great endeavours,” is couched in a grand manner similar to the joyful choruses in the Missa in augustis. See H. C. Robbins Landon, Haydn Chronicle and Works, vol. 3 (Bloomington: University of Indiana, 1976), 317–318. Balázs Mikusi has kindly allowed me to see his useful summary and assessment of the available literature and documentation relating to Haydn’s fragment in his unpublished essay “Haydn’s Invocation of Neptune and Its Possible Model.”
atmosphere of the 1790s. Like many critics before and since, Solomon emphasizes one occasional composition in particular from the Bonn period that seems to anticipate the heroic works of the early nineteenth century—the Funeral Cantata for Joseph II. Solomon hears this early composition, commissioned by Bonn’s *Lesegesellschaft*, as an echo of French revolutionary cantatas, and the source of Beethoven’s preoccupation with the death of the hero that would resurface throughout his life—in the slow movement of the Piano Sonata, Op. 26, *Christus am Ölberg*, the *Eroica*, and even the incidental music to *Egmont*.344 Aside from this early example of Beethoven’s adopted French ceremonialism—shared by the other Bonn cantata composed for the elevation of Leopold II—the new musical atmosphere of the 1790s is also reflected in some of Beethoven’s early Viennese compositions. The Joseph Friedelberg settings, “Abschiedsgesang an Wiens Bürger” (Farewell to Vienna’s Citizens) WoO 121, published by Artaria with a dedication to corps commander Major von Kövesdy in November 1796, and “Kriegslied der Österreicher” (War Song of the Austrians) WoO 122, published the following April, both reflect the warlike turn of contemporary music and, as one might expect, contain fanfare figures, dotted rhythms, and simple triadic melodies.

According to Solomon, then, a principal trend in the Viennese music of the 1790s—particularly in the case of Haydn—was historical awareness and topicality. Solomon actually defines the 1790s by its occasional pieces—even though the majority of recent critics have

defined the decades around 1800 by the emergence of the historically indifferent work concept. He thus implies that Beethoven’s heroic masterworks—which ostensibly instantiated the work concept itself—were somehow produced out of the spirit of occasional pieces: the function and style of occasional pieces from the 1790s were “sublimated into a subtle and profound form of expression” during Beethoven’s heroic decade, he writes.345

But this sublimation appears to take place at least as much in Solomon’s rhetoric as Beethoven’s music. Like Einstein—who would train us to block our ears to Beethoven’s militarism even as we hear it—Solomon rhetorically converts the martial and ceremonial tone of Beethoven’s music into something more elevated. Once again, history is legible only under erasure. “Sublimation” veils the ceremonialism and militarism of Beethoven’s music: the hero’s Funeral March in the Eroica is a sublimated piece of ceremony; the march at the end of the Fifth is a sublimated march. While Solomon recognizes that Beethoven’s heroic masterpieces partake of a “public style” that developed in the 1790s, this style mysteriously sheds its historically or geographically local significance in the case of the heroic masterworks: the “public” of the heroic style is a distinctly abstract concept next to the bellicose public sphere that Solomon envisions in the 1790s.346

Solomon owes this vision of the sublimated “public style” of Beethoven’s heroic masterpieces in part to Paul Bekker’s 1921 Beethoven—another example (along with Einstein) of early twentieth-

345 Ibid., 287.
346 For Solomon on Beethoven’s “public style” see ibid., 71 and 260.
century criticism that shies away from Beethoven’s bellicosity.\textsuperscript{347}

Bekker saw Beethoven’s symphonies as both reflecting and creating a radically inclusive notion of the human public: the symphonies “might well be described as speeches to the nation, to humanity,” he wrote, moving from the local to the universal even in his own rhetoric.\textsuperscript{348}

Solomon transforms Bekker’s optimistic communitarian vision into a historical thesis—although without explaining fully how Beethoven’s symphonies managed to universalize the public mood of the 1790s. To be sure, Solomon’s contention that the 1790s saw a mood of wartime solidarity emerge in Vienna is supported by a great deal of contemporary evidence; reporting on the theatrical events of February 1797—which included the singing of Haydn’s “Gott erhalte” in Vienna’s theaters on the Kaiser’s birthday—one writer remarked:

Wenn die Theater das untrügliche Barometer des Nationalgeistes sind, so ist der unsrige jetzt im höchsten Grade marzialisch.\textsuperscript{349}

(If the theaters are the infallible barometer of the national spirit, then ours is now militaristic to the highest degree.)

Moreover, Solomon connects this spirit from the 1790s with the burst of militarism and public ceremony that greeted the end of the Napoleonic Wars. He argues, in fact, that Beethoven’s “mock-heroic” style of the Congress period can be traced “to the ‘Joseph’ and ‘Leopold’ cantatas of 1790, and even to the two little war songs to texts by Friedelberg of 1796 and 1797”—thus naming the early Funeral

\textsuperscript{347} Solomon cites Bekker in ibid., 260.
Cantata as a precursor of both the heroic style and its corrupted Other. Nevertheless, between these historically contaminated moments, Beethoven composes music that feeds off the public outlook of the 1790s while leaving its militarism and ideology on the side of the plate.

This seems implausible: to the extent that it was “public,” Viennese music from the 1790s until the Congress of Vienna tended to be militaristic—the two went hand in hand. Vienna during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, not least as it was delineated through music, was a fiercely contested space of coercion and tub thumping. Indeed, the martial spirit of the 1790s continued more or less unabated in the subsequent decades. Haydn’s political and occasional compositions did not disappear with the history that occasioned them; rather, they were continually reabsorbed into new political and military contexts. Through wide circulation in print and a central role in public ceremonies, Haydn’s “Gott erhalte Franz” was swiftly taken into the mainstream of Viennese musical life. Other compositions also followed a politicized route into the nineteenth century. Symphony No. 100, for example, was rapidly assimilated into the martial atmosphere of turn-of-the-century Vienna, often appearing on programs of battle music, patriotic song, or military marches. Haydn directed it himself in a 1799 concert that also featured Salieri’s

---

350 Solomon, Beethoven, 287.
curious cantata-cum-battle piece Der tyroler Landsturm,\textsuperscript{352} and one can surmise that it was the unspecified Haydn symphony that was played alongside Franz Xavier Süssmayer’s patriotic cantata Der Retter in Gefahr in a series of concerts in 1796.\textsuperscript{353} The symphony even followed Nelson from Eisenstadt, opening a musical evening in the hero’s honor at Laibach in 1800.\textsuperscript{354} In 1809, it was a fixture on a number of Viennese patriotic concert programs.\textsuperscript{355} It was perhaps also the symphony that began the second half of a grand concert during the Congress of Vienna held in the Zeremonien Saal on 21 December 1814.\textsuperscript{356} Even the triumphant chorus of warriors from Haydn’s Alfred reappeared at the time of the Congress—reprinted in the Algemeine musikalische Zeitung in 1814 with this suggestion:

\begin{center}
Vielleicht wendet man ihn eben jetzt, bey so vielen Gelegenheits-Concerten und Gelegenheits-Schauspielen um so lieber an.\textsuperscript{357} (Perhaps one can use it all the better even now, among so many occasional concerts and occasional dramas.)
\end{center}

Beethoven’s symphonic music thus spoke to a public sphere demarcated with marches and military music. The numerous tone

\textsuperscript{352} Morrow, Concert Life, 302. Erich Schenk has attempted to link Salieri’s cantata with Leonore–Fidelio in his “Saliers ‘Landsturm’-Kantate von 1799 in ihren Beziehungen zu Beethovens ‘Fidelio’,” in Colloquium Amicorum, Joseph Schmidt-Görg zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. Siegfried Kross and Hans Schmidt (Bonn: Beethovenhaus, 1967), 338–54. It should be mentioned that the finale of Salieri’s cantata was reissued with minor revisions in time for the Congress of Vienna with the title “Patriotischer Chor”; most secondary sources such as the New Grove dictionary date this chorus (“Der Vorsicht Gunst beschütze beglücktes Österreich”) to November 1813.

\textsuperscript{353} Morrow, Concert Life, 290–293.

\textsuperscript{354} See Landon, Chronicle, vol. 4, 562.

\textsuperscript{355} Morrow, Concert Life, 354–355; see also Langsam, German Nationalism in Austria, 101–102.

\textsuperscript{356} HHistA, Zeremoniell Protokoll 1814; Dancing Congress of Vienna, 326.

\textsuperscript{357} AMZ 8 (23 February 1814), interpolated after col. 140.
paintings that depicted key moments of the Congress are as good a record as any of the musical character of Vienna’s public spaces: the public depicted in the piano pieces by composers such as Diabelli or Gyrowetz—both men, for example, wrote extended characteristic pieces portraying the “grosse militarisches Praterfest” on 18 October 1814—is one of marches and fanfares, discordantly mingling in the streets. Marches even monopolized the more notional public sphere of the publishing industry. By the time of the Congress, the “Alexander March”—a popular tune of no known authorship, which was supposed to be a favorite of Tsar Alexander—had appeared in a great many versions: as a decorous arrangement for flute and piano; virtuosic piano variations by Moscheles; and even as a sprightly dance by Diabelli.358

Beethoven himself contributed to the swelling number of marches in performance and print. Aside from several miscellaneous marches from the first decade of the nineteenth century, he composed several marches as part of incidental dramatic music that featured regularly in public concerts, including the March and Chorus from Die Ruinen von Athen and the Triumphmarsch WoO 2 from Christoph Kuffner’s Tarpeja. Moreover, marches often impinged on Beethoven’s music in public concerts. Mälzel’s mechanical instruments, which attracted enormous attention and discussion in concerts and the music press, tended to perform marches and military music.359 The famous mechanical trumpeter, which performed in the University Hall

358 See also chapter 3 of the present study.
359 Military music was a feature of all such mechanical instruments; see Dolan, “The Origins of the Orchestra Machine,” 15–16.
on 8 December 1813, between the premieres of the Seventh Symphony and Wellingtons Sieg, entertained the crowd with marches by Gyrowetz. And when Beethoven composed Wellingtons Sieg for Mälzel’s Panharmonicon, the repertoire of the instrument was almost a summation of the various trends by which Solomon defines the 1790s: besides a grand chorus from the second part of Handel’s Alexander’s Feast (known in its German translation at the time as Timotheus), the Allegretto from Haydn’s Symphony No. 100 and the overture to Cherubini’s Lodoïska. 

Thus, Mälzel’s machine juxtaposed the Viennese and French halves of the heroic style.

Public music was in essence militaristic because, from the 1790s onwards, the Viennese public itself rapidly became a quasi-military construction—especially after the introduction of the territorial levy or Landwehr in 1808, a sort of universal military conscription on the model of the French levée en masse. Marches and songs followed the new ceremonies of the Landwehr—the public blessings and farewells to the battalions. On government instruction, the poet Heinrich von Collin (the author of the Coriolan for which Beethoven composed an overture in 1807) wrote his Lieder österreichischer Wehrmänner (Songs of the Austrian Territorial Reserves). Beethoven made a few sketches for a setting of one of the songs, “Österreich über Alles” (Austria Above Everything)—although

---

360 See the report in the Wiener Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (23 January 1813), 55.
362 See Langsam, German Nationalism in Austria, 114–115.
Joseph Weigl eventually penned the most popular contemporary version, which was performed in several concerts in 1809.\(^{363}\) Beethoven composed his F-major March WoO 18 for the Bohemian Landwehr in 1809 and was to publish several songs that allude to the same world of public military ceremonial: his 1814 setting of Christian Ludwig Reissig’s “Des Kriegers Abschied” (The Warrior’s Farewell) WoO 143 maintains almost unchanged the spirit and style of his two Friedelberg settings from the 1790s.\(^{364}\)

The Landwehr and its associated ceremonies were only the most tangible manifestations of an Austrian public whose self-image was increasingly founded on war. The nationalist poet Caroline Pichler, whose influential Viennese literary salon included both Collin and Hormayr, sought to revive a Romanticized vision of Germans as a warrior race: every man must know how to wield a plough and a sword, she wrote.\(^{365}\) Pichler sent Beethoven a patriotic opera libretto in June 1814, which he politely refused—although Pichler ended up collaborating on another grand Congress composition with Louis Spohr: the cantata Das befreite Deutschland (Germany Liberated), commissioned by the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, although never actually performed in Vienna.\(^{366}\) Like many contemporary choral

---

\(^{363}\) For Langsam on the ceremonies of the Landwehr see \textit{German Nationalism in Austria}, 73–74; for a transcription and translation of Collin’s “Österreich über Alles” see 200–201. Beethoven’s sketches for the song survive in Landsberg 5; see JTW, 187–188 and 192. Beethoven was to begin another collaboration with Collin in 1810—an operatic version of Macbeth, which was never completed.

\(^{364}\) Reissig himself had joined up in 1809 and had been badly wounded and crippled in action; see Clive, 282–283.

\(^{365}\) Langsam, \textit{German Nationalism in Austria}, 102–104.

\(^{366}\) See Beethoven’s letter to Baroness Dorothea von Ertmann from 18 June 1814. Anderson I, no. 516; Briefwechsel III, no. 718.
works, Das befreite Deutschland is concerned to represent the German public to itself—in this instance in a “Chor der deutschen Völker” (Chorus of the German Peoples). As if emphasizing that the German people were defined and produced by military conflict, Spohr juxtaposes the simple expressive movements of his cantata with imitative battle music, rather like Salieri in his earlier Der tyroler Landsturm or Weber in his later Kampf und Sieg. One can find a similarly militaristic definition of a specifically Viennese public in the final movement of Beethoven’s Der glorreiche Augenblick, in which each section of the chorus enters in turn—women, children, and men—before all sing together in an idealized musical depiction of social consensus. The men are the last to enter, musically and textually represented as warriors, bringing with them the raucous Turkish musical staples of cymbals, triangle, and bass drum:

Auch wir treten vor,/ Die Mannen der Heere,/ Ein Kriegrischer Chor/ Mit Fahnen und Wehre. (We also step forth/ The troops of the armies,/ A warlike chorus/ With flags and weapons.)

When all voices join together, this martial register, against the more gentle contributions of the women and children, comes to define the tone of the whole: this musical public is a military construction.

Beethoven’s cantata, and indeed Wellingtons Sieg, exploited a metaphorical relationship with the military public sphere that was latent in much orchestral or choral music—a relationship that


368 See also Buch, Beethoven's Ninth, 82–85.
naturalized the place of militarism and military imagery in much contemporary music. John Spitzer has shown how, as the eighteenth century drew to a close, German critics and musicians increasingly drew on the metaphor of the army and the civil polity to describe the orchestra.369 This metaphorical interplay between orchestra and a militarized public sphere was perhaps at its most explicit in Napoleonic Vienna: the massed ranks of the military and the orchestra were, so to speak, conceptually adjacent—ever ready to transform into one another. Brentano’s transposition of orchestra and army in his turgid poetic homage to Beethoven merely elaborated the basic metaphor of Wellingtons Sieg. But Brentano drew on the same metaphor even when discussing music that superficially had little to do with militarism: “If I were the foremost of singers and had no role in such a magnificent work, I would join the chorus,” he fantasized in a report on the revived Fidelio, “In the good fight the most magnificent join the lowest ranks; this gives a victory, which glorifies everyone.”370

The leader of these massed ranks was, of course, Beethoven himself. It seems fitting that, around the time of the Congress, Beethoven began a running joke in which he conferred military ranks on his colleagues in the music business, giving the title of Lieutenant General to his publisher Steiner, and even referring to himself as the

370 Berlinische Nachrichten von Staats- und gelehrt en Sachen 124 (17 October 1815); Contemporaries II, 224.
Generalissimo.\textsuperscript{371} The language and imagery of war was latent in many spheres of Beethoven’s musical activity.

**Music Between the Work and the Occasional Work**

One should not conclude from these contextual investigations, however, that Beethoven’s supposed emancipation from historical forces is merely an illusion spread by critics such as Einstein—nor that Beethoven’s alleged collusion with historical and political impulses during the 1790s and the Congress of Vienna represents the condition of all his music. It would make no sense to argue that the era traditionally associated with the emergence of the work concept was in reality the Age of the Occasional Work. The 1790s and the Congress of Vienna cannot simply debunk the scholarly and aesthetic mythology of the heroic style with history. Crucially, this is because the emergence of the modern notion of the occasional work—in both the generic sense of the early nineteenth century and its more recent pejorative sense—was actually dependent on the social emancipation of the composer. To put it another way, the occasional work could only emerge in the age of the work concept—and conversely the modern notion of the musical work could only emerge alongside the idea of the occasional work.

Once again, Haydn is a pivotal figure. It is not by chance that Solomon situates Haydn’s newfound complicity with historical forces in the decade that marked the composer’s greatest independence from

\textsuperscript{371} See, for example, the letters of 20 and 29 May 1815. Anderson II, no. 542 and no. 543; Briefwechsel III, no. 807 and no. 808.
institutional and official political pressures. Indeed, Einstein’s familiar contention that Beethoven was the first socially emancipated musician—and his concomitantly belittling claim that the works of Haydn (and every other composer before Beethoven) are thus in essence a kind of Gebrauchsmusik—is open to question. Several critics have argued that Haydn had established the paradigm for Beethoven’s later status as a culture hero even before the younger composer had left Bonn.\footnote{This has most recently been argued by Thomas Tolley in 
\textit{Painting the Cannon’s Roar}; see chapter 5, 201–206 in particular. Tia De Nora has also recognized Haydn’s part in creating the role of cultural hero in \textit{Beethoven and the Construction of Genius}—although she is keener to emphasize Beethoven’s paradigmatic status; see 107–109.} Haydn’s lucrative sojourns to England in the early 1790s saw him continue his emergence, begun a decade earlier with his independently negotiated entry into the fledgling Viennese publishing market, from a creative life based almost exclusively around the Esterházy court. While aristocratic patronage remained a reality of Haydn’s working life until his death,\footnote{The same could be said of Beethoven, of course.} and there remained many institutional continuities between the 1770s and the 1790s—Haydn still composed several masses for the Esterházy court after the death of Prince Anton in 1794, for example—his London trips nevertheless placed him at the center of the newest social and aesthetic trends.

If Haydn’s ever greater involvement in Viennese musical life, removed from his princely employers, had already given him a taste of independence, then London alerted Haydn to his status as a public figure of some note: “My arrival caused a great sensation throughout
the whole city, and I went the round of all the newspapers for three successive days,” he wrote to Maria Anna von Genzinger on 8 January 1791. Indeed, the kind of public adulation that had created the posthumous cult of Handel—soon to be exported to Vienna along with the revival of the oratorio—now turned on Haydn. Charles Burney published an official poem of welcome, which was sold in London as a pamphlet costing a shilling:

No treatise, code, or theory of sound,/ Whose narrow limits, fixed by pedants vain,/ Thy bold creative genius can restrain.375

“Genius” was undoubtedly the critical watchword of the day—the theoretical wing of this hero worship, which Kantian critical philosophy would, of course, absorb and theorize throughout the 1790s. Few perceived Haydn’s fame as the transient adulation of a fickle public; rather, it signaled his transformation into a classic:

“Haydn has not outlived his fame,” mourned Griesinger in 1810. By the middle of the 1790s Haydn had already begun to acquire the trappings of an immortal Napoleonic hero. In 1793 a monument was erected in his birthplace of Rohrau to honor the “immortal master” (unsterbliche Meister).377 Before his death he was presented with

375 See ibid., 34; 32–35 for the full poem.
377 The monument prompted a great deal of discussion about the preservation and commemoration of music and musicians: in 1810 the critic and composer Friedrich Rochlitz bemoaned that musicians’ accomplishments have “so much mortality amidst their immortality”—an apt expression of the anxiety behind the Viennese preoccupation with musical monuments; see AMZ 24 (12 March 1810), col. 418. In 1799, Haydn was invited to sit on the editorial board of a projected “History of Music in Monuments” under the leadership of Joseph Sonnleithner; see Landon, Chronicle,
several medals—from 142 Parisian musicians in 1801, from the Municipal Council in 1803, and from the Philharmonic Society of St Petersburg in 1808—and was honored at the famous 1808 performance of Die Schöpfung with a poem by the laureate of the Austrian Landwehr Heinrich von Collin.\footnote{Haydn was moved to thank the Parisian musicians in a letter of 19 August 1801: “I have often doubted whether my name would survive me,” he wrote, “but your goodness raises my confidence, and the token of esteem with which you have honored me strengthens my hope that perhaps I shall not completely die”; see The Collected Correspondence and London Notebooks of Joseph Haydn, ed. and trans. H. C. Robbins Landon (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1959), 189.}

When a rumor of Haydn’s death reached Paris in 1805, Cherubini composed a funeral hymn in his honor, as if he were a French revolutionary hero.

Haydn himself had been fascinated by war heroes: he had purchased an engraving of the Battle of Aboukir Bay while in London and also owned Artaria’s 1798 engraving of Nelson. But by the time Nelson arrived in Eisenstadt, Haydn had become a hero in his own right. Miss Knight’s autobiography demonstrates the fascination aroused by the most famous composer in Europe—even if Nelson’s entourage could not quite match the feverish excitement of those who greeted them on the road to Vienna.\footnote{Autobiography of Miss Knight, 73.} When the two heroes finally encountered one another, they did so almost as equivalent figures in music and war—a parallelism that was reinforced by the swapping of gifts: Nelson gave Haydn a gold watch, requesting in return a worn-out pen from the composer—an intimate relic and symbol of Haydn’s

The composer’s pen was, of course, an established iconographical trope; but now its familiar symbolism held a new heroic significance: John Hoppner was only one of the English painters who depicted Haydn with pen in hand in his 1791 portrait of the composer—a decade before the artist’s famous portrayal of the heroic Nelson standing before a raging naval battle. (see figures 4 and 5).

Figure 4. Hoppner’s Haydn, 1791.

See Tolley’s reading of this exchange in Painting the Cannon’s Roar, 187.
Haydn’s newly heroic status had a parallel in both the style and aesthetic of his music. Just as the tours to England brought him unprecedented creative autonomy, so the London concerts staged the emancipation of his music itself.

Figure 5. Hoppner’s Nelson, 1802.
The Salomon concert series in principle made Haydn’s music available to anyone with the half guinea to hear it: the audience for Haydn’s London compositions was a notional “general public” rather than a group of court cognoscenti or a church congregation. Such commodification was in many respects the concomitant of the emergent autonomy aesthetic; as Eagleton explains:

> When art becomes a commodity, it is released from its traditional social functions within church, court, and state into the anonymous freedom of the marketplace. Now it exists, not for any specific audience, but just for anybody with the taste to appreciate it and the money to buy it. And in so far as it exists for nothing in particular, it can be said to exist for itself.\(^{381}\)

If the symbiotic relationship of commodification and aesthetic autonomy was Haydn’s discovery in the 1790s, it was a fact of Beethoven’s creative life. Reporting to Zmeskall in 1814 on his efforts to receive remuneration from the Prince Regent for the dedication of Wellingtons Sieg, Beethoven moved seamlessly from the most blatant salesman’s pitch to the loftiest language of creative independence:

> If people want me, then they can have me, and, what is more, I am still free to say yes or no. Freedom!!!! What more does one want???\(^{382}\)

Much of Haydn’s music established a paradigm for Beethoven’s elevated aesthetic principles precisely because it existed to be consumed.

> More than this, it cried out to be consumed. A major stylistic consequence of Haydn’s exposure to London’s vibrant concert life was


\(^{382}\) Letter of early 1814. Anderson I, no. 476; *Briefwechsel* III, no. 693.
the exaggeration of an element already present to some degree in his musical style—the use of what one might call gimmicks or tricks to grab the attention: the surprise entry of the military percussion orchestra in the Allegretto of the Symphony No. 100; the unusual drum rolls in the Symphony No. 103; the famous “surprise” in the Andante of the Symphony No. 94; and so forth.\textsuperscript{383} The kinds of imagistic effects, surprises, and jolts that seem to cry out for poetic or narrative responses—and which became a defining feature of Beethoven’s symphonic writing—found a lasting place in Haydn’s music after London: Thomas Tolley traces the startling fanfares and evocative imitative passages in the Missa in tempore belli or Missa in augustiis to the sonic and formal experiments of the London Symphonies.\textsuperscript{384} Thus, just as Haydn encountered the social and aesthetic conditions that granted his music independence from worldly matters, his compositions seemed to have something to say about the world—they seemed to embody meanings to be consumed or, indeed, “consummated” in Kinderman’s sense. And, as we have seen, the

\textsuperscript{383} Haydn told Griesinger that he was interested in “surprising the public with something new” in his Symphony No. 94; see Two Contemporary Portraits, 33. The central argument of Thomas Tolley’s \textit{Painting the Canon’s Roar} is that Haydn’s music created and responded to an “attentive listening public” by adapting to music a primarily English culture of attentive looking, through pictorial and atmospheric effects. David Schroeder has also theorized the specifically “public” style of the London Symphonies in \textit{Haydn and the Enlightenment: The Late Symphonies and Their Audience} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990). Meanwhile, Gretchen Wheelock has argued that a newly “public” style of composition, calling for greater listener engagement as a result of playful or subversive compositional strategies, is evident in the Op. 33 String Quartets—which is to say, from Haydn’s Artaria publications of the 1780s; see Haydn’s “Ingenious Jesting With Art”: \textit{Contexts of Musical Wit and Humor} (New York: Schirmer, 1992).

\textsuperscript{384} \textit{Painting the Cannon’s Roar}, 259.
symbolism of Haydn’s music was repeatedly “consummated” in the wartime atmosphere of the 1790s and beyond.

This is the inaugural paradox of the autonomy aesthetic—the paradox of Beethoven’s heroic style, and the paradox of the Eroica: if one thinks of music as in essence free from any institutional function or meaning that it might acquire, then it will seem as though music can manifest itself meaningfully in the world only by being coopted. An aesthetic of autonomy might appear to safeguard the uncontaminated musical work—but it actually turns cooption into its primary mode of being. Banishing politics from the sanctuary of the work actually places music at the mercy of politics. The autonomy of a musical work such as the Eroica can consequently only be measured by a disavowal of anything that it might be said to represent: this is the conceptual origin of the gesture of assertion and retraction that Beethoven left to posterity on the title page—reenacted in Marx’s rhetoric of the Ideal or Kinderman’s rhetoric of the unconsummated symbol. Indeed, this gesture is constitutive of the work concept itself, which stands in need of history in order that it might deny it. “It is as if music and mythology needed time only in order to deny it,” writes Claude Lévi-Strauss. Yet this constitutive gesture of assertion and retraction—the acceptance that what a work means on a particular occasion never represents all that it can mean—was precisely what gave the occasional music of the 1790s a new potency.

---

The reception of Haydn’s political music of the 1790s clearly illustrates music’s new power. When the then President of Lower Austria Count Saurau commissioned “Gott erhalte,” he wrote that he had turned to “our immortal compatriot Haydn” because he was “the only man capable of creating something” equal to the political task.\textsuperscript{386} When the Napoleonic Wars drew to a close, the Kriegerischer Chor from Alfred resurfaced in print in 1814 to add its voice to “so many occasional concerts and occasional dramas.” When Nelson’s entourage crossed Austria, Haydn’s music followed. Music that is thus drafted in to speak on behalf of institutions or ideologies rather than merely echo them must of necessity have its own voice: it does not passively reflect history, but rather becomes a historical agent, with the power to shape discourse. This is the novelty of Haydn’s political music from the 1790s: both resisting and yielding to the historical occasion, his supposedly autonomous art gains a more secure purchase on the world. Scott Burnham puts it this way:

if we wish to grant music the power to speak of other things, we inherently need to understand music as music, as an autonomous voice: we couldn’t reasonably expect something without its own voice to comment on anything.\textsuperscript{387}

The history of the heroic style shows that autonomy and the “power to speak of other things” go hand in hand: musical autonomy is constituted by a gesture in which music is seen to reject the history with which it is otherwise complicit.

\textsuperscript{386} Landon, Chronicle, vol. 4, 241.  
\textsuperscript{387} Scott Burnham, “Theorists and ‘the Music Itself,’” Music Theory Online 2.2 (http://mto.societymusictheory.org), para 15.
The reception of Der glorreiche Augenblick in the 1830s neatly illustrates this point. Beethoven’s cantata was not issued in a performing edition until Haslinger’s editions of 1837, which is when it acquired its opus number: another Great Work, which Haslinger had announced to the world as “Beethoven’s greatest posthumous masterpiece,” had resurfaced. In an effort to salvage one of Beethoven’s most compromised occasional pieces, Haslinger simply redefined it with a telling gesture of assertion and retraction. Although he published several presentation scores of the piece, which were sent to each of the monarchs present at the first performance in the großer Redoutensaal, the principal performing edition was issued with a new text by Friedrich Rochlitz: if the cantata were to become a work, it had first to shed all remnants of the occasion for which it was composed. Reinforcing the autonomy of Beethoven’s music in the most blatant terms, Rochlitz’s trope was called Preis der Tonkunst (In Praise of Music): “Heil dir Tonkunst, Heil und Dank!” (Hail to you, Music, hail and thanks!) sings the chorus at the end of the third movement, where they had formerly sung the praises of Vienna. In its metamorphosis from an occasional piece into a “work,” Beethoven’s cantata turned to the true subject of autonomous music—music itself. But—as the surviving monarchs from the time of the Congress knew only too well—without the historical occasion that Rochlitz had erased, Beethoven’s cantata would have had no voice at all.

388 See his notice about Beethoven’s bequest in Allgemeine Musikzeitung für Beförderung der theoretischen und praktischen Tonkunst I (20 February 1828); Contemporaries I, 114.
Myth and Musical Architecture

Despite the constant dialectical oscillation between history and myth in the discourse of the heroic style, there is one critical concept that apparently refuses any dialectical compromise: the idea of musical architecture. Form is Beethoven’s ultimate protection against history—and the only sure basis on which to distinguish the heroic style from either its historically compromised predecessors or the parodistic pieces that mark its terminal decline.

Solomon’s contention that Beethoven elevated and purified the “public style” of the 1790s goes hand in hand with an argument about musical form; the instrument with which Beethoven effected his alchemical sublimation of the base materials of the 1790s was sonata form:

The highly ordered yet flexible structure of sonata form readily expanded to embrace the driving, ethically exalted, “grand style” elements of French music, which had itself lacked that kind of formal concentration and intensive development.\(^{389}\)

History—once again styled as French—is embraced and sublimated by timeless, German form. The prevalent “musical form” of the French Revolution, according to Solomon, was the cantata; Beethoven’s two Bonn cantatas thus reflect French musical ceremonialism without yet constructing lasting musical architecture from it:

The loosely structured cantata form was sufficient to strike ideological poses and to express conventional feelings of piety.

\(^{389}\) Solomon, Beethoven, 180. Solomon owes this argument to Riezler; see Beethoven, 89.
and mourning, but it proved inadequate to explore the concepts of heroism or tragedy.\textsuperscript{390}

This is further demonstrated, in Solomon’s view, by Christus am \textit{Ölberg}, where

Beethoven returned, almost instinctively, to a form similar to that of the “Joseph” Cantata, in which he earlier treated the subjects of death and heroism. Here, as in that cantata, the discursive oratorio form proved insufficient to the task.\textsuperscript{391}

The heroic style results only after Beethoven has absorbed the “disintegrative forces” and “hostile energy” of music from the 1790s\textsuperscript{392} into sonata form—the only means of releasing “the most explosive musical concepts within binding aesthetic structures,” as Solomon puts it.\textsuperscript{393} It is hardly surprising, therefore, that with the “dissolution of the heroic style” after 1812 comes the parallel dissolution of sonata form and a recrudescence of the cantatas of the 1790s:

Beethoven has no use for the various sonata forms in these works [from the Congress period]; he returns to the forms favored by the French Revolution’s composers, such as the cantata and the hymn, along with instrumental potpourris and medleys.\textsuperscript{394}

The heroic style, with its historically impervious sonata forms, is thus framed by cantatas: the Funeral Cantata for Joseph II on the one side, \textit{Der glorreiche Augenblick} on the other. Ideologically implicated gestures seep into the heroic style via the leaky musical forms of the

\textsuperscript{390} Solomon, \textit{Beethoven}, 73.
\textsuperscript{391} Ibid., 250.
\textsuperscript{392} Ibid., 252.
\textsuperscript{393} Ibid., 250–251.
\textsuperscript{394} Ibid., 287.
1790s, are sealed within the hermetic sonata structures of the heroic decade, and finally trickle back into contemporary history again at the end of the Napoleonic Wars.395

The opposite of history is thus not only myth but form—indeed, musical form guarantees a kind of mythic purity. And yet, as the next chapter explores, the dialectic of history and myth is played out even on the level of form itself.

---

395 Solomon hints that the Ninth stages the reconciliation of the cantata and the sonata; it succeeds where the earlier cantatas fail, argues Solomon, partly “by grafting the cantata form into the sonata cycle”; Solomon, Beethoven, 408.
CHAPTER 3

Beethoven’s Moments:
The Congress of Vienna and the Politics of Musical Form

[...] Only by the form, the pattern,  
Can words or music reach  
The stillness, as a Chinese jar still  
Moves perpetually in its stillness.

T. S. Eliot, Four Quartets I.V

Operatic Moments

The word Augenblick recurs throughout Fidelio, as the protagonists look forward to moments of liberation or revenge, and wallow self-consciously in them once they arrive. Treitschke’s 1814 revision shortened Sonnleithner’s cumbersome libretto by an entire act but retained every one of his Augenblicke. The resulting text maintains a self-conscious commentary on the key moments of the story as they happen—a textual tick that draws attention to the elasticity of the operatic moment: the arresting instants of transformation and the moments stretched across time.396

“O Gott! Welch’ ein Augenblick” (O God! What a moment!) sings Leonore as she releases her imprisoned husband Florestan from his bonds during the finale, echoing and subverting the words of the tyrannical prison governor Pizarro, words with which he himself had

gleefully envisioned the moment of Florestan’s demise. The release itself—the moment when Leonore, on the invitation of the benevolent minister Don Fernando, actually removes her husband’s chains—is over in an instant. The musical release, however, stretches the moment into a contemplative Sostenuto assai, which transforms the preceding A–major tonality into a glowing F major with an arching oboe melody that Beethoven borrowed from the third movement of his own Funeral Cantata for Joseph II: this self-conscious dramatic moment is also a potentially self-sufficient melodic moment, transplanted from cantata to opera, albeit with greater contrapuntal resource in the later composition.397 “O Gott, o welch’ ein Augenblick,” repeat the principal characters with the chorus of assorted townspeople and prisoners, the musical consensus of their tutti reflecting the textual turn from narrative particularity to allegorical generality: “Gerecht, o Gott, ist Dein Gericht/ Du prüfest, Du verläßt uns nicht” (Righteous, O God, is Thy judgment/ Thou testeth us, [yet] Thou abandoneth us not).

Ever since the timely arrival of Don Fernando, just as Leonore and Pizarro face each other with dagger and pistol, the opera unfolds as a series of these stretched moments—or what Dahlhaus dubs “expressive tableaux”: moments that freeze an emotional state on stage, somehow appropriating a “static” visual aesthetic for music.398

While the finale comprises a more varied period of recitative, brief

choral interjections, and dialogue during which Pizarro’s misdeeds are revealed, the action is framed by moments of collective celebration and thanksgiving that bring narrative development to a standstill. Either side of Don Fernando’s gracious C–major recitative of self-introduction and the A–major passage of explanation, the libretto dwells on the unsurpassable plenitude and satisfaction of the moment: “Heil sei dem Tag, Heil sei der Stunde” (Praise be the day! Praise be the hour!) sings the joyous chorus at the start of the finale. Having little to add to the plot, which can hardly develop a great deal after the unequivocal resolution effected by the minister’s arrival, the libretto recedes into sententiousness and repetitious exuberance, allowing the music to elevate and magnify its sentiments—to elongate the moment of narrative closure and monumentalize the opera’s otherwise predictable denouement. The libretto almost seems to signal this progress from narrative closure to musical closure, periodically invoking the rhetoric of inexpressibility. Leonore and her husband sing of their “namenlose Freude” (indescribable joy) after “unnennbaren Leiden” (un-nameable sorrows) in the duet that sees them reunited; the F–major Augenblick of Florestan’s release is one of “unaussprechlich süßes Glück” (inexpressibly sweet happiness). The emotion has clearly risen to sublime heights where words no longer belong and, more to the point, where words are dramatically redundant: unable to increase the impact of the already emphatic narrative closure, words simply speak of their inadequacy—and music floods in to the resulting semantic void.
Indeed, if one were to divide Beethoven’s opera into “active” and “expressive” sections, as John Platoff has done in the case of opera buffa finales, one would have to conclude that the end of Fidelio unfolds more or less as one “expressive” section after another—a succession of “static emotional contemplations,” as Platoff calls them, which slow the dramatic pace by giving short sections of text extended musical treatment, providing a perspective on the unfolding drama as if from outside of the principal narrative domain. Prolonged chorus-dominated conclusions, usually triggered by last-minute reprieves or an unexpected piece of good fortune, are typical of the French revolutionary operas that Beethoven admired—Cherubini and Bouilly’s Les deux journées foremost among them. Monumental choral scenes were crucial to a French operatic aesthetic that idealized social consensus and conceptualized numbers in terms of their visual impact: operas on the Parisian stage in the 1790s were often described as tableaux historiques or tableaux patriotiques. Thus, while Platoff can write of several “action–expression cycles” within an opera buffa finale, the entire finale of Fidelio appears to be the conclusion of a gargantuan “action–expression cycle,” starting with the closing D-major tutti of the famous dungeon quartet, which marks, to all intents and purposes, the completion of the story.

400 Ibid., 211.
Don Fernando’s opening C–major recitative and his subsequent A–major conversation with Leonore, Rocco, and Florestan might be considered “active” sections—they are faster-paced settings of dialogue, with very little word repetition and a declamatory vocal style—but their function is hardly to move the story along. These periods of dialogue are framed narratives: with the battle already won, the protagonists relate to the minister much that the audience already knows.\textsuperscript{402} Indeed, the joyous C–major chorus at the start of the finale celebrates the triumph of justice and clemency even before Don Fernando officially makes his judgment. The narrated events are a shadow of former horrors, which serve to justify ever more choral exuberance. “Heil sei dem Tag” and the F–major Sostenuto assai bracket the minister’s exchanges with Rocco, Pizarro, and Leonore like quotation marks: the putative action of the dialogue merely commemorates the true action of the dungeon quartet.

If the finale consists of one prolonged moment after another, then the startling reversal of fortunes that triggers them is, by contrast, truly momentary. Pizarro advances on the helpless Florestan, the orchestra sounding a bloodcurdling D–major fanfare of triumph. Over ferocious passagework in the strings, the tyrant relishes his moment: “nur noch ein Augenblick” (just one more moment), he seethes, his dagger poised. But Leonore interrupts his D–major triumph over a diminished seventh in the orchestra, throwing herself between Pizarro and her husband: “Zurück!” (Get back!). The

\textsuperscript{402} See Robinson, “\textit{Fidelio} and the French Revolution,” 87; also Kerman “\textit{Augenblicke in Fidelio},” 153.
Wiener Hof-Theater Taschenbuch of 1815 chose to freeze this fleeting dramatic moment in a tableau of its own (see figure 6).

Figure 6. “Zurück!” The fleeting moment is fixed in the Wiener Hof-Theater Taschenbuch (1815).

From Leonore’s diminished seventh, a modulating sequence begins, and she squares up to Pizarro while Rocco looks on, horrorstruck by her rashness. Now comes one of the most startling moments in the opera, as Leonore reveals her true identity. After shifting without
warning directly from G to an E–flat sixth chord on the downbeat, the orchestra comes to a complete stop and Leonore lays down her challenge with a striking high B flat: “Tödt erst sein Weib!” (Kill his wife first!). The orchestra reenters in a straining fortissimo with an E–flat seventh chord supporting the stunned responses of the men; a tense, anapestic rhythm in oboes and bassoons on a D–flat/E–flat major second accompanies a brief exchange between Leonore and Florestan—“Ja, sieh’ hier Leonore!” (Yes, see Leonore before you!)—before the music plunges back into a furious modulating sequence via a diminished seventh. Leonore and Pizarro prepare to fight—and only the intervention of a higher power can stop them.

Which it does. Don Fernando’s arrival comes decidedly from ex machina in various ways.⁴⁰³ His trumpet signal enters from outside both the physical space of the stage and the prevailing narrative domain of the music—a spatial and diegetic disruption of the violent struggle taking place in the dungeon. The signal is also a harmonic

⁴⁰³ See also the analysis of this moment in Rudolph Bockholdt, “Freiheit und Brüderlichkeit in der Musik Ludwig van Beethovens,” in Beethoven zwischen Revolution und Restauration, 81. Berthold Hoeckner has argued that Don Fernando’s fortuitous arrival is not a true deus ex machina. His argument is based on a notable pair of affinities between Leonore’s and Don Florestan’s startling Augenblicke. First, Hoeckner makes the oft-repeated observation that Leonore’s wild lurch to B flat presages the B flat trumpet flourish that signals Don Fernando’s arrival. Second, and more importantly, he suggests that Beethoven intended a pair of 1814 revisions—namely, an adjustment to the rhythm of the trumpet flourish and a re-composition of Leonore’s words “Ja, sieh’ hier Leonore”—to establish a rhythmic parallel between Leonore’s attempted rescue and Don Fernando’s successful one. These connections, he concludes, comprise a musical demonstration that Don Fernando’s intervention is somehow willed by Leonore herself. Although his argument is compelling and insightful, I remain unconvinced. First, the rhythmic connections that Hoeckner identifies might be coincidental or taken simply as evidence of Beethoven’s instinct for thematische Arbeit. Second, a barely perceptible, long-range rhythmic connection between two striking moments in the dungeon quartet is surely only the most marginal of musical "motivations" for what is, by any standard, an extraordinary narrative turn. See Hoeckner, Programming the Absolute, 36–40.
intervention as if from without: arriving at the dominant of the home key of D, Leonore turns a pistol on the prison governor—“Noch einen Laut und du bist tot!” (one more sound and you’re dead!)—yet her vocal line sinks to an F natural with word “tot,” as a sudden sustained B flat in the orchestra and Don Fernando’s triadic B–flat (flat VI) trumpet signal interrupt a potential cadence. A short tutti of collective surprise prolongs the B–flat interruption before the trumpet signal sounds again, while the gate-keeper Jaquino brings news of the minister’s arrival. “Wir kommen augenblicklich” (we’re coming presently) cries Rocco—and the orchestra (with the whole vocal ensemble entering a measure later) plunges into a diminished seventh, redisovers the global V that the trumpet signal had interrupted, and finally cadences in D. The B–flat intervention prompted by the trumpet signal, though momentous in dramatic terms, turns out to have been an interruption—an extension of a deceptive cadence—and the harmonic progress of the quartet can resume its course. The headlong rush to D (accompanied by a recapitulation of the quartet’s opening material) takes us where we had been heading all along. To be sure, the extended B–flat disruption makes the eventual return to D more satisfying—perhaps more appealing—but in no demonstrable way does it “motivate” the return.

Driving towards its D–major cadence, the frenzied music of action turns to expression—a transformation that begins the progressive erosion of Leonore’s vigorous musical individualism: all the characters sing together as D is prolonged and emphasized by a series of thwarted cadential moves, arriving at a firm cadence with the
fortissimo of a final orchestral stretta. And, as we might expect, during this concluding tableau, the libretto, with characteristic self-awareness, turns to the moment: “Es schlägt der Rache Stunde” (the hour of vengeance strikes), sing Florestan and Leonore; “Verflucht sei diese Stunde” (accursed is this hour), declares Pizarro; “O fürchterliche Stunde” (o terrifying hour), wails Rocco. But the moment of transformation has passed. Don Fernando’s moment of intervention has cleared the way for the prolonged moments of celebration.

Extended celebration motivated by brief incident; a musical plateau reached via a sudden dramatic ascent; prolonged moments articulated by a turning point. Generations of critics have struggled to conceal their disappointment that Beethoven could have written something so “undramatic”—especially those with Wagnerian predilections, which so often trump any attention to Beethoven’s French operatic models. Wagner himself claimed Beethoven’s symphonic writing rather than Fidelio as the precedent for his music-dramas, of course; indeed, Wagner considered the overture known as Leonore No. 3—often played before the finale in present-day productions—to be more “dramatic” than the opera that it temporarily prefaced:

What is the dramatic action of the librettist’s opera Leonora but an almost repulsive watering [down] of the drama we have lived through in its overture?\footnote{404 Richard Wagner, Beethoven in Richard Wagner’s Prose Works, vol. 5, trans. William Ashton Ellis (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1896), 106.}
For Wagnerians, the stasis of the finale is almost unworthy of the name drama: true stage action should not merely contemplate or celebrate turning points, but embody the process of turning.\textsuperscript{405} “The entire last scene in the prison courtyard is ceremonial rather than dramatic,” writes Kerman.\textsuperscript{406}

From Kerman’s perspective, the finale makes \textit{Fidelio} appear schematic. While the monumental close brings the utopian message of the opera to the fore, the absence of an attendant teleology makes this message seem unargued. The inner compulsion of the protagonists is reconciled with universal moral law—“the moral law within us and the starry skies above us,” as Beethoven famously reproduced the opening of Kant’s \textit{Critique of Practical Reason}—but only by forcing the poles together.\textsuperscript{407} Don Fernando’s arrival acts on the unfolding plot from “above”—a moment of intervention that pulls rank on the inner moral law driving the protagonists. When the celebrations begin, therefore, there is all of the moral certitude associated with heroic Beethoven, but little of the overbearing sense of necessity. Adorno observed as much in one of his notebooks: “No tension, just the ‘transformation’ in Leonore’s moment in gaol. Decided in advance,” he jotted. “No conflict. Action as mere working out,” he added in the margin.\textsuperscript{408} \textit{Fidelio} is more concerned with conclusions

\textsuperscript{405} Dahlhaus compares the aesthetic of the tableau in French grand opera with a Wagnerian opposite constructed around cause and effect; \textit{Nineteenth-Century Music}, 124–134, particularly 126.

\textsuperscript{406} Kerman, “\textit{Augenblicke} in \textit{Fidelio},” 153.


\textsuperscript{408} Adorno, \textit{Beethoven}, 164.
than proofs; the concluding tableaux thus insist on the necessity of
the dramatic outcome almost entirely through emphasis.

Symphonic Moments

Even though Fidelio earns the approbation of critics who prefer
Beethoven in his utopian vein, its apparent schematism runs counter
to another critical tradition: the Hegelian slant of Beethoven studies,
evident from A. B. Marx to Dahlhaus, which has made musical form
practically synonymous with dynamic process. Form conceived
along these lines is no structural mold or static receptacle; rather, it
comes into being through a process of transformation and
development in which the whole and its component parts are
inseparable, mutually dependent. Marx conceived of Beethovenian
form as a constantly unfolding dialectic of “open” or transitional
musical fragments that he called Gänge and “closed” or potentially
self-sufficient sections that he called Sätze. Dahlhaus echoes this
Marxian mode of thought when he describes Beethoven’s “symphonic
style”—more precisely, the style of the “heroic,” odd-numbered
symphonies:

The most prominent syntactic characteristic of a symphonic
style that is perceived to be dramatic is that its parts lack
independence: tension is created because the individual element

409 See Janet Schmalfeld, “Form as the Process of Becoming: The Beethoven–
410 See, as an example, A. B. Marx, “Form in Music,” in Musical Form in the Age of
Beethoven, ed. and trans. Scott Burnham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
1997), 55–90. For a further discussion of Beethoven and Marx, see Burnham,
Beethoven Hero, 69–81.
is not self-sufficient but demands a complement, and thus points the way to something beyond itself.\textsuperscript{411}

Indeed, some critics have suggested that the individual element in the symphonic style has no positive identity; rather, it acquires its meaning from a tension with Beethoven’s ruthless holism. As Adorno wrote in his Aesthetic Theory—perhaps thinking of the opening triadic motif of the Eroica or the ubiquitous rhythmic motto of the Fifth:

In Beethoven the particular is and is not an impulse towards the whole, something that only in the whole becomes what it is, yet in itself tends toward the relative indeterminateness of basic tonal relations and toward amorphousness. If one hears or reads his extremely articulated music closely enough, it resembles a continuum of nothing.\textsuperscript{412}

In a radio talk from 1965, he spoke in a similar vein of the “deliberately planned insignificance of the individual element” in Beethoven’s music.\textsuperscript{413}

While this “processive” conception of musical form has many opposites, Dahlhaus draws on opera for an opposing formal vision, thus offering a technical basis for his division of the early nineteenth century into the aesthetic territories of Beethoven and Rossini (a division derived from Kiesewetter). After briefly showing Beethoven’s constantly developing conception of his triadic thematic material in the first movement of the Piano Sonata Op. 31 No. 2, Dahlhaus turns to the G–flat Cavatina from the fourth act of Meyerbeer’s Les Huguenots,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{411} Dahlhaus, Beethoven, 84.
\textsuperscript{413} Theodor Adorno, “‘Beautiful Passages’ in Beethoven,” in Beethoven, 182–183.
\end{flushright}
and concludes that, in this instance, “the meaning of the form resides not in the development of theme but the presentation of melody”:

The isolated moment does not point to a larger context through which it receives its meaning; instead, the proceedings are, in a manner of speaking, compacted into the moment, which in its isolation represents the actual musical event. This is not to say that the context is irrelevant or a mere prop, as in a potpourri; but it is not a unified whole into which the particular slips into place so much as a backdrop from which the particular stands out.414

Thus, a form in which moments barely exist opposes a form made from a succession of moments. The “bringing into being” of musical material opposes its presentation; motifs and their development oppose tunes and their repetition; dynamism opposes stasis. Whereas symphonic process is perpetually conscious of where it has developed from and where it is going, a form made of musical moments appears to be stuck in the moment; deaf to the unfolding of the whole, it potentially obliterates all but the musical here-and-now.

Necessity is the keyword of symphonic process. Theoretical systems that elucidate musical processes tend also to assume what Schenker, writing of the Eroica, described as the music’s “necessary and willed course” (gemusster wie gewollter Weg)—a course willed as if by the inherent tendencies of the musical material.415 Musical potpourris and even variation procedure—that is, forms predicated on the repetition and decoration of a tune or several tunes—might appear somehow arbitrary in this theoretical context. “Why has the composer

414 Dahlhaus, Nineteenth-Century Music, 13.
415 Schenker, “Beethovens Dritte Sinfonie,” 32; cited and translated in Burnham, Beethoven Hero, 54 and 179n36.

Adorno considered repetition itself to be among the greatest threats to the appearance of necessary process even in a sonata form, characterizing the recapitulation as “the schematic aspect of the sonata form which, from the standpoint of autonomous composition, needs to be justified each time it occurs”—in other words, a moment in which convention can appear to trump the inherent tendencies of the thematic material.\footnote{Adorno, “Beautiful Passages,” 185.}

Indeed, many critics have argued that, in the wrong hands, even sonata form itself can degenerate into a succession of moments. There is a long tradition of denigrating composers, commonly Beethoven’s successors, for producing schematic versions of the sonata principle—conventional frameworks filled out with tunes. The most common target of such criticism is Schubert.\footnote{For a discussion of Schubertian sonata procedure as the Other of Beethovenian process, see McClary, “Constructions of Subjectivity in Schubert’s Music.”}

Charles Rosen reaches this verdict in his \textit{Classical Style}:

> the structures of most of his large forms are mechanical in a way that is absolutely foreign to his models. They are used by Schubert as molds, almost without reference to the material that was to be poured into them.\footnote{Rosen, \textit{Classical Style}, 456.}
Rosen’s conclusion is similar to Schenker’s more vociferous critique of Romantic symphonists, which argued that, as soon as Beethoven’s musical forms were accepted as models, they ossified into a static succession of melodies:

> the talents snatched at melodies and ideas, thinking that the organic coherence of form was guaranteed so long as they filled their imaginary form with melodies and themes. The result was, predictably, lamentable.\textsuperscript{420}

Even Dahlhaus, who is more accommodating of post-Beethovenian understandings of symphonic form, seems to accept Schenker’s basic premise. From Schubert to Mendelssohn and Berlioz, Dahlhaus argues that the essential conundrum of the nineteenth-century symphony is

> how to integrate contemplative lyricism, an indispensable ingredient of “poetic music,” into a symphony without causing the form to disintegrate or to function as a mere framework for a potpourri of melodies.\textsuperscript{421}

Again, the contemplative “stasis” and potential formal self-sufficiency of tunes are the enemies of true symphonic development.

Musical processes ruptured by moments thus appear to mount only the flimsiest resistance to what has often been characterized as external interference. In fact, un-integrated musical moments invite and provide proof of such interference: within these moments, a musical form is at its closest to the world around it. With no strictly


\textsuperscript{421} Dahlhaus, Nineteenth-Century Music, 153.
musical process to motivate it, the moment must be prompted from elsewhere—from a literary narrative, a convention, or a social function: the static first and second themes of Schenker’s lamentable symphonists reveal the dead hand of convention; the content of a set of piano variations perhaps suggests the mere whim of an improviser. The implied hybridity of the moment—the way in which it gestures towards a non-musical as well as a musical context—is perhaps another reason for Dahlhaus’s division of the early nineteenth century into the worlds of opera and symphony: maybe only a mixed medium such as opera is able to justify musical structures made of self-sufficient moments.

It is this conceptual framework, perhaps, that allows Michael Broyles, in his study of the heroic style, to invoke opera almost as shorthand for any supposedly external interference—from literary narratives to unwelcome musical influences. When Broyles detects the sundering of moment and form in Beethoven’s heroic works, opera is usually to blame. Broyles is particularly critical of the earliest overture for Leonore known as Leonore No. 2, for example, claiming that Beethoven contaminates his symphonic writing with musical and dramatic moments transplanted from his opera—a section of Florestan’s aria and, of course, Don Fernando’s surprise trumpet signal: “symphonic momentum proves to be incompatible with the operatic elements,” concludes Broyles.\footnote{Broyles, "Heroic Style," 135.} That Beethoven probably borrowed the idea of the trumpet signal in the overture and the opera from Méhul’s Hélène (1803)—an opera based on another of Bouilly’s
librettos—only reinforces Broyles’s notion: the moments that supposedly upset the “symphonic” progress of Leonore No. 2 can be shown to be both “operatic” and derived directly from one of Beethoven’s French contemporaries. The conflict is national as well as generic: German unity is disturbed by the un-integrated moments of what Broyles calls The French School.  

“Praise Be the Day!”

It might thus appear that moments unprompted by an internal developmental principle must be motivated by an external power. In the case of the prolonged final moment of Fidelio, most critics have conceived of this power as political. Martin Cooper, for instance, ascribes the dramatic stasis of the finale to simplistic political enthusiasm: the “naïve oratorio finale is the nearest that Beethoven ever came to subordinating his ‘big’ music to social or political preaching,” he concludes, the allusion to oratorio suggesting a kind of Baroque emotional formalism.

Meanwhile, Adorno’s doubts about the schematic structure of Fidelio reflect his broader conception of ideology critique in music. According to Adorno, great music describes a dialectic of form and moment, universal and particular, by analogy with the dialectic of self and society, at once constructing a utopian vision of their synthesis and allowing the dynamism of each passing moment to question a monolithic, oppressive conception of totality. Thus, when a musical

---

423 Ibid., 134.
moment draws attention to itself—asserting its sensuous, affirmative, or diverting qualities in such a way that it overrides or conceals the dialectic of part and whole—the result is a kind of musical false consciousness; dialectical processes are arrested by the illusion of a synthesis already achieved.\textsuperscript{425} This, maintains Adorno, is the most basic ideological maneuver of any music that fails to live up to his “symphonic” model of dialectical process, whether it be nineteenth-century Italian opera or twentieth-century hit tunes:

The delight in the moment and the gay façade becomes an excuse for absolving the listener from the thought of the whole. [...] No longer do the partial moments serve as a critique of the whole; instead they suspend the critique which the successful aesthetic totality exerts against the flawed one of society.\textsuperscript{426}

Musical moments paper over the cracks in an imperfectly realized musical dialectic, uncritically affirming the present. Fidelio’s finale is thus inherently ideological: its monumentality brings an illusory sense of necessity to a contingent political intervention.

The precise nature of the politics that can be thought to have prompted the intervention has been a matter of some debate—in part because the complex compositional history of Leonore–Fidelio offers


several political contexts to choose from.\textsuperscript{427} One thing is plain, however: the 1814 revisions accentuate the basic structure of sudden intervention followed by extended celebration. Don Fernando’s deus ex machina—the last-minute intervention of a good prince—became an instantaneous reversal of fortunes only in the months before the Congress of Vienna. In the earlier versions, the spouses are not immediately convinced that the disruption means that they are saved—in fact, they assume that the cries of revenge coming from outside of the dungeon are directed at them. A moving recitative, during which the Florestan and Leonore grope towards one another in the dark, had formerly built up to the joyous duet of reconciliation, all the more poignant given that their fate is still uncertain. By contrast, the 1814 opera has Leonore and Florestan saved upon the sound of the trumpet signal, without any subsequent uncertainty. Rocco, rather than disarm Leonore as in the earlier versions of the opera, seizes the moment (“benutzt den Augenblick,” as the stage direction reads) to take the spouses’ hands and point heavenwards—a sentimental gesture that reassures both the audience and the

\textsuperscript{427} Adorno, like many present-day critics, reads Leonore–Fidelio as a revolutionary allegory. Although some recent critics have recognized the role of the Congress of Vienna in shaping the reinvention and reception of Beethoven’s opera, a residual belief in Beethoven’s radicalism has blinded others to this more reactionary context—which also offers a more tangible political environment than a general revolutionary \textit{Zeitgeist}. Even Paul Robinson, who argues that the stark dramatic structure of Leonore–Fidelio betrays a post-revolutionary preoccupation with transformation (“Fidelio and the French Revolution,” 75), overlooks the Congress of Vienna as an alternative political context. Part of the reason for this oversight, perhaps, is the continuing strength of a critical tradition that interprets the teleological character of (some of) Beethoven’s symphonic music as a reflection of a revolutionary sense of time. See, for example, Greene, \textit{Temporal Processes in Beethoven’s Music}, 17–20 and Reinhold Brinkmann, “In the Time of the \textit{Eroica},” trans. Irene Zedlacher, in \textit{Beethoven and His World}, 1–26.
characters on stage. After a few lines of dialogue, Florestan and
Leonore burst immediately into their duet, which, in the altered
context, is hardly different in mood from the celebration yet to come; it
is only a more personal paean to liberation, perhaps, before the
culminating move from the particular to the universal.\footnote{428}

The ensuing finale then invites the audience to luxuriate in the
satisfaction of closure; although one could argue that it establishes
itself as a musical and dramatic goal in large part by imitating “goal-
like” features. First, as with most operatic finales, its conclusiveness
is established by a text that repeatedly emphasizes a general
satisfaction with the present: a choral sentiment such as “Heil sei dem
Tag, Heil sei der Stunde” is so general that it might have concluded
any contemporaneous German opera. Second, the C-major sections of
the finale insistently assert their tonal stability as if performing the
musical character of a harmonic resolution. The orchestral
introduction of “Heil sei dem Tag” piles one tonic–dominant alternation
onto another, prolonging a fundamental chord through paratactic
intensification. It is at best a rudimentary “prolongation” in
Schenker’s sense; indeed, A. B. Marx’s terminology seems more
appropriate here: the opera ends with an un-dialectical string of Sätze,
each willing its own close.

Third, and perhaps most obviously, these concluding Sätze
strike a tone that owes much to musical topics, which is to say that it
is a wider cultural context or a modest kind of intertextuality that
creates the impression that closure is necessary as much as any

\footnote{428 See Dean’s account of this revision in “Beethoven and Opera,” 44–50.}
formal imperatives. The martial dotted rhythms and choral solidarity of “Heil sei dem Tag” (composed for the 1814 version of the opera) amount to an official festive topic; indeed, it sounds like an official song. Like many operatic finales that depict mass celebration, the finale thus blurs the distinction between diegetic and non-diegetic music. The massed crowds almost seem to be aware that they are singing a jubilant chorus to liberation, their song even misquoting Schiller’s “An die Freude”: “Wer ein holdes Weib errungen, stimm’ in unsern Jubel ein” (whoever has won a fair wife, join in our celebration).\footnote{The line in Schiller’s ode reads, “Wer ein holdes Weib errungen, mische seinen Jubel ein.”} The relentless stress on the dramatic present thus threatens to fracture the diegetic space occupied by the music.

Moreover, by alluding to the sound of an official chorus, “Heil sei dem Tag” blurred the distinction between theater and contemporary reality. The concluding scene of rejoicing would have been familiar to Viennese audiences around the time of the Congress, when elaborate street festivals with parades, dancing, and patriotic song were daily occurrences. Indeed, during the Congress, “Heil sei dem Tag” belonged not only to the fictional world of Leonore and Florestan, but also to a real world of Congress festivities. The stage directions in the 1814 finale specifically call for a “statue of the king” in the parade ground; moreover, an early performance of the revised opera actually took place on the Kaiser’s name day—an event that Rocco seems to allude to in the finale of Act I: “des Königs Namensfest ist Heute” (the king’s name day is today).\footnote{See also chapter 2 of the present study.} Such interplay between offstage and
onstage worlds was common in French revolutionary opera, with its emphasis on the simultaneous depiction and encouragement of social cohesion, especially in the form of official choral solidarity.\textsuperscript{431} Likewise, in its final choral moments, \textit{Fidelio} elides with its own political context.

\section*{Self-Conscious Moments}

The interaction between \textit{Fidelio} and its 1814 context was part of a trend in Viennese public culture that reached new heights in the years of the Congress: just as theater became increasingly political during the Napoleonic Wars, politics itself became more theatrical.\textsuperscript{432} During the Congress, politics often appeared to be a form of public performance above all else—a performance of power, military triumph, and civic togetherness.\textsuperscript{433} The coexistence of a political theater and a theatrical politics blurred the diegetic boundaries of dramatic pieces such as \textit{Fidelio}.

Beethoven’s \textit{Schlußchor “Germania,”} for example, was potentially as much a self-sufficient piece of Congress ceremony as the rousing culmination of Treitschke’s \textit{Die gute Nachricht}. Conversely, offstage musical ceremony had the potential to be absorbed into drama: Beethoven offered Treitschke a setting of a \textit{Kriegslied} by Karl

\textsuperscript{431} See Bartlet, “Opéra During the Reign of Terror,” 134–149.
Joseph Bernard—possibly his chorus of welcome to the allied princes, “Ihr weisen Gründer glücklicher Staaten”—as a potential substitute for “Germania” in Die gute Nachricht. Theatrical politics could easily become political theater.

One might even say that the Congress of Vienna was in its very conception a performance. The famous depiction of the assembled leaders by Jean-Baptiste Isabey reflects the self-consciousness of an epoch-defining moment (see figure 7)—a moment that his picture itself helped to create, turning the historical event into a historic one.

Figure 7. Isabey’s tableau of the Congress participants (1814).

434 See Anderson I, no. 472; Briefwechsel III, no. 712. Ladenburger prefers the idea that Beethoven was referring to a number from the cantata that he had planned with Bernard entitled Europas Befreysungsstunde, although no completed part of the cantata survives; see “Der Wiener Kongreß im Spiegel der Musik,” 295–298.
Johann Cappi published a musical version of this tableau in October 1814: Joseph Huglmann’s *Polymelos, oder Musikalischer Congress* […] *Bey Gelegenheit der ewig merkwürdigen Zusammenkunft der alliirten Majestäten im October 1814* (Polymelos, or Musical Congress […] Upon the Occasion of the Eternally Remarkable Meeting of the Allied Majesties in October 1814). Huglmann’s piano suite represents each participant in turn—including Scotland, presumably for reasons of musical taste—with a corresponding national tune; the frontispiece depicts a group of instruments coming together, as if in a congress of their own.

Theater was the metaphor of choice among the plenipotentiaries and foreign dignitaries at the Congress. Dominique de Pradt wrote at the start of his dense account of the political negotiations that the conflicts of the Napoleonic Wars had vanished “comme une décoration de théâtre” (like a stage set): “L’Europe pousse un long soupir, et respire” (Europe took a long sigh and breathed)—a moment of contemplation in what one is tempted to call a historical “action–expression” cycle. He continued:

> Vienne va devenir le noble théâtre du patriotisme le plus étendu et le plus généreux qui fut jamais, car il embrasse l’Europe, et, par elle, le monde.

(Vienna was to become the noble theater of patriotism, the broadest and most generous that ever was; for it embraced Europe, and through it, the world.)

---

435 It is accordingly also Klaus Günzel’s preferred metaphor in his Der Wiener Kongreß: Geschichte und Geschichten eines Welttheaters (Berlin: Köehler und Amelung, 1995).
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Likewise, Johann Genersich’s colossal eight-volume history of the Austrian monarchy, published in Vienna in 1815, presented the Congress as the culmination of centuries of history—the “return of better times” (die Rückkehr besserer Zeiten).\textsuperscript{438}

Meanwhile, the music and poetry of the Congress returned continuously to the idea of the moment, as art self-consciously commented on the complete fulfillment of the present day. An avalanche of occasional poems and songs almost seems to echo the recurring temporal vocabulary of Beethoven’s opera—its days, hours, and moments. The Denkbuch für Fürst und Vaterland records such examples as Müller’s “Wiens schönster und merkwürdigster Tag” (Vienna’s most beautiful and remarkable day); Müllauer’s “Oesterreichs heiligste Stunde” (Austria’s holiest hour); Friedrich Starke’s “Feyer des großen Tages” (celebration of the great day); and Nitzel’s “Schilderung des glorreichen Tages” (depiction of the glorious day).\textsuperscript{439}

It is in keeping with the language of the Congress, therefore, that Beethoven’s largest occasional composition of the time should have been entitled Der glorreiche Augenblick. Indeed, before he encountered problems with the censors, Beethoven had intended to set a cantata with a title that was likewise concerned with the moment: Europas Befreyungsstunde (Europe’s hour of liberation) by Karl Joseph Bernard. It seems that Beethoven asked Bernard to touch up and shorten the text of Der glorreiche Augenblick, which was the work

\textsuperscript{439} Rossi, Denkbuch, 4–7.
of the Salzburg surgeon Aloys Weissenbach. Weissenbach was a
fanatical Beethoven devotee and German patriot who, by all accounts,
 forged a close acquaintance with the composer, in part because they
were both hard of hearing.\textsuperscript{440} Weissenbach’s worship of his nation and
of Beethoven led him to conflate the glorreicher Augenblick of the
Congress with Beethoven’s own glorreicher Augenblick of fame—a
common trope among Beethoven’s contemporary admirers:

\begin{quote}
Die Herrscher Europas werden sich in diesen Mauern
versammeln, es kann keiner kommen, den nicht der Geist
Beethovens in schönen Augenblicken auf himmelischen Tönen
über den Thron hinausgehoben hätte.\textsuperscript{441} (The rulers of Europe
will assemble within these walls; none can come that
Beethoven’s spirit would not on heavenly tones raise above the
throne in beautiful moments.)
\end{quote}

Recalling the first performance of Der glorreiche Augenblick on 29
November 1814 in the großer Redoutensaal, alongside Wellingtons
Sieg and the Seventh Symphony, Schindler concluded:

\begin{quote}
Jeder schien zu fühlen, ein solcher Moment werde in seinem
Leben niemals wiederkehren.\textsuperscript{442} (Everyone seems to have felt
that never again in his life would such a moment return.)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Der glorreiche Augenblick presents no narrative, but instead a
succession of affirmative tableaux in which conflict has no place. Like
many other cantatas written in response to the end of the Napoleonic
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{440} For a brief account of their acquaintance see Clive, 394–395. Weissenbach
produced several other occasional verses during the Congress, including a patriotic
poem celebrating the return of Kaiser Franz to Vienna. His memoirs of the Congress,
published in 1816, contain a great deal of information about Beethoven’s music, his
physical appearance, and his character.
\textsuperscript{441} Aloys Weissenbach, Meine Reise zum Congreß: Wahrheit und Dichtung (Vienna,
1816), 174.
\textsuperscript{442} Anton Schindler, Beethoven (Leipzig: Reclam, 1988), 222.
Wars—Spohr’s *Das befreite Deutschland* and Weber’s *Kampf und Sieg* among them—Der glorreiche Augenblick arranges its singers in an allegorical pattern: the four soloists are identified as Vienna herself, a prophetess, Vienna’s guardian angel, and the Leader of the People; the chorus stands for the People themselves. Carl Bertuch, a Weimar bookseller and Congress diarist who was present at the first performance, found the text static and repetitious: “all that it really contains is the fact that there are now many sovereigns in Vienna,” he observed, before making a note himself of how many sovereigns were in attendance.443

Each number reemphasizes the self-consciousness of the title, constantly making reference to the present, to the place of the Congress in history, and to the historic role of Vienna herself. Time is the abiding theme, even in the first lines, which offer a clumsy spatial image of history and a personification of its epochs:

Europa steht!/ Und die Zeiten,/ Die ewig Schreiten,/ Der Völker Chor,/ Und die alten Jahrhundert’/ Sie schauen verwundert empor! (Europe stands still!/ And the epochs/ Which press eternally onwards/ The chorus of the Peoples/ And past centuries/ Gaze up in wonder!)

Beethoven sets the opening words with full chorus and resplendent orchestral tutti. Two colossal gestures on tonic and subdominant occupy the first eleven measures, each holding its harmony fortissimo for more than two full measures on the word “steht.”

---

Of course, Der glorreiche Augenblick eschews anything that one might understand as “symphonic” process or developmental forward motion; reveling in the moment, it is music made of moments. It appears to confirm Solomon’s view of “the loosely structured cantata form,” at once the Other, the forerunner, and the destroyer of the heroic style: it is “sufficient to strike ideological poses,” but to do little else.\textsuperscript{444} Aside from its recitatives, Der glorreiche Augenblick tends to occupy stretches of time with melodies and their repetition, or monumental fugato passages redolent of a sublime, Handelian musical register,\textsuperscript{445} which remain thematically static and repetitious despite their textural density. It is worth noting that A. B. Marx had trouble incorporating fugue into his dialectical, sonata-oriented conception of musical form, concluding that a fugue is in essence the cyclic repetition of a self-contained Satz without the complement of an open-ended Gang: “the essential task of the fugue is accomplished with the exposition,” he wrote.\textsuperscript{446}

The cantata tends to build to its climaxes through repetition and parataxis, piling up its forces even as its material remains relatively uniform. The most arresting example of this comes at the end, with the entrance of each section of the chorus, first in turn and finally all together. Beethoven’s method of achieving rousing and convincing closure is almost entirely paratactic. Although the passage consists of more than 100 measures, it is essentially built from a single

\textsuperscript{444} Solomon, Beethoven, 73.
\textsuperscript{445} Buch reads the concluding fugue as Beethoven’s appropriation of what he calls the “official” Handelian sublime; see Beethoven’s Ninth, 85.
\textsuperscript{446} A. B. Marx, “Form in Music,” 84.
contrapuntal complex of 8 measures (mm. 87–95), which Beethoven separates into its component voices and presents linearly, with brief orchestral interjections, before the rousing choral tutti. The opening section of the sixth movement of Der glorreiche Augenblick thus combines something of the circular structure of a strophic song with the paratactic intensification characteristic of a variation set. From the point of view of thematic process or harmonic direction, the music does not “go anywhere”: by dividing up counterpoint into melodic segments and laying them side by side, Beethoven keeps the music in the same thematic and harmonic location for as long as possible. It is as good an illustration as any of how to prolong a single musical moment. Any sense of direction is thus a matter of quantity: more voices, more instruments, louder dynamics. And a brief Adagio dominant preparation leads into the final glorious moment—a passage that upstages even the massiveness of the previous chorus with a monumental Presto fugue, addressing Vienna with its Latin name: “Vindobona, Heil und Glück” (Vindobona, Hail and Good Fortune), the countersubject answering, “Welt, dein großer Augenblick!” (World, your great moment!).

Such incessant emphasis on closure and climax in Der glorreiche Augenblick follows from its self-conscious aesthetic of the moment and its ideological raison d’être. One could even claim that Beethoven’s cantata is in spirit nothing but a climax writ large—a culmination from its very start. The opening assertion of the home key in a vast orchestral and choral tutti with the words “Europa steht!” sums up the political, harmonic, and gestural message of the cantata
in a single, concentrated blast—the rest is prolongation and repetition. After all, Der glorreiche Augenblick was about the very idea of culminating—it performed a moment of historical culmination, cajoling the Viennese public into a politically potent mood of self-awareness: “Steh und halt!” (stand and stop!) calls the opening chorus to the personified Vienna. Although its climaxes might lack the context of a preceding musical process, Der glorreiche Augenblick claims decades of European history as its gargantuan lead-in. Moreover, insofar as the politics of the Congress was a kind of theater, Beethoven’s cantata helped to create the glorious moment that it described. Indeed, given that this historic moment was largely an artistic construction—a moment that art made monumental, self-aware, and public—one might almost say that Der glorreiche Augenblick fuels its own celebration; its triumphant climaxes circularly justify themselves, self-consciously reveling in their own moment of closure.

Congress compositions habitually talk about closure even as they provide it. Beethoven’s Schluschor for Treitschke’s Die Ehrenpforten is one such example. This tale of love among simple village folk celebrated the second capitulation of Paris, as seen through the eyes of local families involved with the Austrian Landwehr. Beethoven’s song brought a certain official grandeur to the otherwise provincial story. “Es ist vollbracht” (It is Accomplished), which is led by the honest local squire, the appropriately named Teutschmann, and supported by a chorus of villagers, is in essence a strophic repetition of a single tune. Its quasi-official function is given blatant emphasis by a short quotation from Haydn’s “Gott erhalte Franz” in its
final cadence—part of an extended final strophe that adds formal weight to the ending. The opening line, stated twice at the start of each verse by the soloist and echoed by the chorus, compresses the musical, dramatic, and ideological message into one utterance: it is accomplished. The recurrent musical setting of “es ist vollbracht” at the start of each strophe traces a harmonically basic maneuver to $V/V$ and back again to I with a bold falling fifth, its almost crude cadential simplicity repeatedly accomplishing closure anew.

_Vollbracht_ was yet another favorite word of Congress composers. It was a trope of occasional choral music during the Napoleonic Wars: the eighteenth number from the Habsburg Cantata (1805) by Antonio Salieri—a massive E–flat chorus marked Andante maestoso—echoes the words of an earlier duet for two basses:

_Das hohe Werk ist nun vollbracht in Welt und Kriegs Gewühl./ Franz ruht, gestützt auf Oestreichs Macht, und schaut zurück vom Ziel. (The lofty work in the whirl of the world and war is now accomplished./ Franz rests, buttressed by Austria’s power, and looks back from his goal.)_

As in many later Congress compositions, this choral thanksgiving portrays its present as a kind of vantage point, a privileged position from which to survey history. Spohr and Pichler similarly ended their Congress cantata _Das befreite Deutschland_ with a “Chor der Deutschen” singing “nun ist das große Werk vollbracht!” (the great work is now accomplished). These references to the completion of great or noble work are presumably secular echoes of Haydn’s _Die Schöpfung_ and its grand B–flat chorus (No. 26) at the end of Part II—the completion of the biblical days of creation—“Vollendet ist das große
Werk” (the great work is now completed). The biblical gravitas of the word vollbracht was certainly part of its appeal, es ist vollbracht or consummatum est being among Christ’s seven last words on the cross. Haydn’s Sieben letzte Worte was often performed during the Napoleonic Wars, especially as the institutional support for oratorios and grand choral performances increased during the first decade of the nineteenth century. Beethoven’s Christus am Ölberg—in which Jesus is given the lines “meine Qual ist bald verschwunden,/ der Erlösung Werk vollbracht” (my agony will soon vanish,/ the work of redemption accomplished) before the culminating chorus of angels—was also a well-known setting of the words; Christus am Ölberg was performed during the Congress of Vienna in the hall of the Zum römischen Kaiser hotel on 5 March 1815.\(^{447}\)

**Visual Moments**

Even as the occasional music of the Congress of Vienna made historical moments musical, it borrowed from a visual aesthetic—a language of looking and a practice of visual contemplation. The notes that accompanied the music in the numerous festive Tongemälde for piano were foremost concerned with visual description or accounts of looking, even when depicting intangible public emotion or corporate sentiment. The moment of witnessing the Kaiser himself or his noble guests is often a highpoint. In Diabelli’s Der 18te October, oder der große militarische Prater-Fest in Wien anno 1814—whose running poetic commentary was by Kanne—the appearance of the Kaiser is

\(^{447}\) HHstA, Zeremoniell Protokoll 1815; Dancing Congress of Vienna, 316.
announced with a fleeting quotation from Haydn’s “Gott erhalte Franz” and a fortissimo sequence of broken chords. The description above the stave reads:

Die Herzen, sie sind dein O Franz! denn alle jauchzen dir entgegen. Auch ihr erhabene Gäste lest [sic] es hell im Funkeln aller Augen, wie froh die Herzen euch entgegen schlagen. (Our hearts are thine, O Franz! For everyone raises a cheer to you. Also one sees in the sparkling eyes of all thy sublime guests how happily all hearts beat.)

The experience of the glorious moment itself is often portrayed as a kind of awestruck response to visual splendor. In Der glorreiche Augenblick, Weissenbach not only describes how “past centuries gaze up in wonder” at Vienna but continually exhorts the audience to gaze upon their city and its rulers. In the recitative that opens the second number, the Leader of the People conjures up this rather fussy medievalist vision of Vienna’s sovereign:

O seht sie nah und näher treten! Jetzt aus der Glanzflut hebt sich die Gestalt! Der Kaisermantel ist’s der von dem Rücken der Kommenden zur Erde niederwallt! Sechs Kronen zeigt er den Blicken; an diesem hat den Busenschluß der Aar gehetzt mit den gold’nen Spangen, und um des Leibes Faltenguß seh ich der Isters Silbergürtel prangen. (O see it draw ever nearer! Now the form rises up from a blaze of glory! It is the Imperial Mantle, which ripples to the earth from the back [of the approaching one]. Six crowns he displays to the onlookers; an eagle fastens the mantle at his breast with golden clasps, and amidst the torrent of folds encircling the body I behold the resplendent Danubian belt of silver.)
Beethoven’s setting begins with a sentimental cello obbligato, which is soon followed by a simple sequence of interjecting orchestral fanfares that add the requisite musical glitter to Weissenbach’s visual feast.\footnote{See also Rumph, \textit{Beethoven After Napoleon}, 171–172. Rumph emphasizes the text’s Romantic vision of medieval chivalric protocol.}

During the Congress, the Viennese did a great deal of gazing—whether at illuminations, fireworks, parades, or carousels. Among the most popular forms of entertainment were \textit{tableaux vivants}: the Viennese nobility planned several evenings dedicated to the elaborate recreation of famous paintings, scenes from the bible, or classical myth with live actors—including a presentation in the \textit{großer Redoutensaal} on 22 December 1814 entitled \textit{The Painting that Came Alive}.\footnote{HHstA, Zeremoniell Protokoll 1814; \textit{Dancing Congress of Vienna}, 308, 310. Ozouf draws attention to the similarity between revolutionary political festivals and the \textit{tableau vivant}; see Festivals and the French Revolution, 153. On the history and technique of the \textit{tableau vivant} in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, see Kirsten Gram Holström, \textit{Monodrama–Attitude–Tableaux Vivants: Studies on Some Trends of Theatrical Fashion 1770–1815}, vol. 1 Stockholm Studies in Theatrical History (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1967).} Many of Beethoven’s collaborations performed in the time of the Congress provide comparable visual stimulation, establishing scenes of static contemplation or celebration around an arresting visual image.

One example, mentioned briefly in the previous chapter, took place during the concert of 2 January 1814 in the \textit{großer Redoutensaal}—at the end of the High Priest’s aria from \textit{Die Ruinen von Athen}, sung on this occasion by the bass Karl Weinmüller (who was to sing the part of Rocco in the revised \textit{Fidelio}). The aria (with a short concluding chorus) is a small-scale version of a familiar dramatic structure: a swift momentary intervention followed by a prolonged...
moment of celebration. When the High Priest requests an image of his city’s guardian angel towards the end of his sonorous prayer, the response is almost a literal deus ex machina: “O Vater Zeus! Gewähre ihre Bitte!” (O father Zeus, grant their prayer!) whispers the watching Minerva over string tremolos that take us to $V^V$. The closing Presto section of choral celebration is only a moment away—a simple transitional dominant chord and rapturous whirl of woodwind. The final choral celebration continues into a patriotic Schlufschor, “Heil unserm König.” The celebration itself formed part of a striking tableau that Beethoven arranged around the Kaiser’s statue in the großer Redoutensaal; indeed, he was keenly aware of the importance of the visual dimension. In one of the composer’s most entertaining letters, which he had written the previous evening as he tried to arrange some kind of curtain with which to veil the Kaiser’s statue, he wrote:

There must be something [to cover the statue]. As it is, the aria is more or less dramatic, for it was composed for the theater and thus cannot be effective in a concert hall; and without a curtain or something of its kind its whole significance will be lost!—lost!—lost!—The devil take the whole business! […] Curtain!!! [Vorhang] Or the aria and I will be hanged [gehangen] tomorrow.\footnote{Letter of 1 January 1814. Anderson I, no. 456; Briefwechsel III, no. 688. Beethoven’s emphasis.}

Beethoven had made similarly potent use of performance space at the premiere of Wellingtons Sieg on 8 December 1813, when the French and British bands advanced towards each other down corridors on either side of the University Hall in Vienna.
Beethoven’s Schlußchöre for Treitschke’s Congress-era occasional dramas were also integrated into patriotic tableaux, providing the musical parts of culminating crowd scenes that aimed for maximum visual impact. The earlier drama, Die gute Nachricht, told the story of Bruno, an honest local landlord, who has promised his daughter to the man who can bring him the good news of the drama’s title—namely, the capitulation of Paris (although only the first capitulation, as it turned out). Bruno’s daughter Hannchen is ultimately fortunate that her true love Robert outwits his rival Süßlich—a pretentious Francophile—by delivering the news with Bruno’s trusted white dove. The concluding tableau has the crowd of villagers stand silently as the bird sails into view before Beethoven’s chorus brings the Singspiel to an end: “Germania! Wie stehts du jetzt in Glanze da!” (Germania! How you stand there now in glory!). Bruno alternates with the chorus of villagers in this strophic song, whose cyclic repetitions sustain the musical and dramatic moment for as long as required; Beethoven only expands the final strophe to accommodate cries of “Franz, Kaiser Franz, Victoria!”

The final crowd scene of Die Ehrenpforten made use of comparably simple but arresting imagery. Later performances of Treitschke’s drama on 3 and 4 October 1815 combined the celebration of Napoleon’s final defeat with Franz’s name day, and incorporated a significant number of changes in the last scene, including a reversion to Beethoven’s earlier Schlußchor from Die gute Nachricht in place of
his newer finale.\textsuperscript{451} The basic principle of the concluding scene was the same in all performances, however. Throughout the play, the triumphal arches of the title stand in readiness to be used at a triple wedding ceremony of the two daughters and one son of the local squire Teutschmann. The continuation of the war with France has led to the postponement of the festivities, however, and we first encounter Teutschmann on the eve of his birthday, hoping against hope that the end of the war will return his family to him. The joyful culmination of the story is a striking tableau in which Teutschmann’s son and future sons-in-law reveal themselves one by one beneath each of the triumphal arches. Each arch bears upon it a piece of good news about the war with France: first, “Guter Anfang” (good start) and “Neapel” (Naples); second, “Guter Fortgang” (good progress) and “Bell’ alliance” (i.e. Waterloo); third—with a burst of Haydn’s “Gott erhalte Franz” and a train of white-robed maidens strewing flowers—“Gutes Ende” (good conclusion) and “Paris.”\textsuperscript{452} In the October performances of Die Ehrenpfoten, the first two inscriptions became more general: “Allgemeiner Sieg” (total victory) and “Nachher Friede” (Peace hereafter). The third became more specific—the Kaiser’s image now appearing beneath the arch, atop an altar bearing the inscription “dem Sieggekrönten und Friedensgeber” (to the victory-crowned one and bestower of peace). “Glückseliger Tag! Schöne Stunde!” (Blissful day!)}

\textsuperscript{451} The textual changes are given in the edition of Willy Hess, “Zwei patriotische Singspiele,” 314–318. See also table 2 in chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{452} The place name is not included in the text of the play, since at the time of writing Treitschke appeared not to know where the end of the war would officially be celebrated. The AMZ dutifully transcribed the messages on all the Ehrenpfoten, however; see AMZ 34 (23 August 1815), col. 567.
Beautiful hour!) cries Teutschmann in his final speech, characteristically commenting on the moment of fulfillment. It was against this tableau of arches that Beethoven’s concluding choruses were performed, the music reinforcing an arresting visual summation of the moment.

**The Moment of Return**

The triumphal arch was a symbol that would have struck a chord with the Viennese public: an arch had been the centerpiece of one of the most magnificent political tableaux in the time of the Congress. The Congress had begun unofficially on 16 June 1814 with the entry of Kaiser Franz into the city through a triumphal arch erected at the Kärntnertor bridge—a neoclassical design by the Viennese architect Johann Ferdinand Hetzendorf von Hohenberg. Triumphal entries and the arches designed to mark them were a millennia-old tradition, rituals with strict religious and civic protocol that gave symbolic expression to the relationship between rulers and subjects. The entrance of Franz was among the most theatrical moments of the Congress, a self-conscious enactment of a historic occasion and a moment of visual splendor that lent itself to a productive interchange with theater, commemorative poetry, and pictorial music. Like a

---

454 The original plans for the entry itself are held in the HHstA. On Franz’s triumphal reentry see Günzel, Der Wiener Kongreß, 55–78.
455 On the history of triumphal entries, see Theater and Spectacle in Europe, ed. Helen Watanabe O’Kelly (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999), 643–768; for an examination of the transformation of the tradition in a revolutionary climate, see Ozouf, Festivals and the French Revolution, 126–157.
concluding operatic crowd scene, it framed and organized public elation as a kind of narrative closure; “Rührend, freudenvoll und erhebend war dieser Moment” (stirring, joyful, and uplifting was this moment), recalled Caroline Pichler.\footnote{Caroline Pichler, Denkwürdigkeiten aus meinem Leben, vol. 3 (Vienna, 1844), 24.}

The departure and return of monarchs or noble patrons was not a new subject; throughout the Napoleonic Wars, the comings and goings of Franz had been celebrated in the most extravagant terms. His first triumphal entry into Paris in 1814 had elicited reams of descriptive piano music by what would appear to be almost every musician in Vienna: Friedrich Starke (\textit{Der Einzug in Paris}); Daniel Steibelt (\textit{Marche Triomphale sur l’entrée à Paris}); Ignaz Moscheles (\textit{Triumph Einzug der verbündeten Mächte in Paris}); and Anton Diabelli (\textit{Siegreicher Einzug Franz der Allverehrten in Paris}).\footnote{Ladenburger calls this genre \textit{Begrüßungs-Musik} or “greeting music”; see “Der Wiener Kongreß im Spiegel der Musik,” 282–286. It had a long history in the court context; for example, Haydn composed cantatas of this kind as early as the 1760s.} The return of the Kaiser to Vienna in the course of earlier stages in the conflict had also been celebrated in music: the cantata \textit{Die Rückkehr des Vaters} (The Return of the Father), composed by both Anton Fischer and Ignaz von Seyfried—who was to contribute a sextet and a chorus to Treitschke’s \textit{Die Ehrenporten}—was performed in the Theater an der Wien on 16 January 1806 and presented again in 1808 as part of Christmas Day celebrations in the \textit{großer Redoutensaal}.\footnote{See AMZ 17 (25 January 1809), cols. 269–270; also the announcement in the \textit{Preßburger Zeitung} on 13 December 1808, reproduced in Marianne Pandi and Fritz Schmidt, “Musik zur Zeit Haydns und Beethovens in der Preßburger Zeitung,” \textit{Haydn Yearbook} 8 (1971), 225.} The return of important public figures other than the Kaiser was also celebrated.
in music: Hummel, for example, published a “Patriotischer Chor und Canon” (patriotic chorus and canon) with Artaria that celebrated the “siegreiche Rückkehr” (victorious return) of Carl von Schwarzenberg to his Vienna residence on 24 June 1814.

Beethoven perhaps alludes to this genre with his Piano Sonata Op. 81a, “Les Adieux,” turning an overtly public form of address to more intimate ends. The dedicatee, his friend, pupil, and patron Archduke Rudolph, had fled Vienna upon the approach of the French army in 1809. On a now lost sketch leaf, Beethoven headed the last movement “Die Ankunft Seiner Kaiserlichen Hoheit des verehrten Erzherzogs Rudolph den 30 Jan 1810” (The Arrival of His Imperial Highness the revered Archduke Rudolph on 30 January 1810): the return of the Archduke received a direct musical analog in the joyful tonal return of the closing Vivacissimamento.459

“Les Adieux” belonged to a tradition of more intimate, domestic compositions that marked the departure and return of patrons or friends from a self-consciously personal perspective.460 Beethoven was aware that his sonata could be taken to represent a more official and perhaps impersonal gesture, however: he wrote to Breitkopf shortly after its publication to complain that the specific dates that he had given each movement and his dedication to Archduke Rudolph—which further spelt out the intimacy of the composition, “aus dem Herzen

459 Cited in Elaine Sisman, “After the Heroic Style,” 83. The Archduke was the dedicatee of many more obviously politicized piano pieces, such as Friedrich Starke’s Der Einzug in Paris.
460 An earlier “Les Adieux” Piano Sonata was published by Jan Ladislav Dussek. See Sisman on “farewell sonatas” and Beethoven’s own contribution to the genre in ibid., 83–89.
geschrieben” (written from the heart)—had been omitted.\textsuperscript{461} He was particularly displeased that his preferred title “Das Lebewohl” had been changed to the French “Les Adieux,” explaining that “Lebewohl” means something quite different from “Les Adieux.” The first is said in a warm-hearted manner to one person, the other to a whole assembly, to entire towns.\textsuperscript{462}

Of course, with the return of the Kaiser on 16 June, musicians chose to emphasize the collective sensibilities of “entire towns” rather than individual residents. The sonata that comes closest to Beethoven’s Op. 81a in its overall musical plan is the “characteristic sonata” Wiens Empfindungen bey der Rückkehr seiner Majestät Franz der Ersten Kaiser von Oesterreich im Jahre 1814 (Vienna’s Feelings upon the Return of His Majesty Franz the First Emperor of Austria in the Year 1814) by the young piano virtuoso Moscheles—a composition with three more or less conventional sonata movements: a B–flat Allegro con brio, “Ausdruck des innigen Wonnegefühls bey der glorreichen Rückkehr seiner Majestät” (Expression of the innermost feeling of bliss upon the glorious return of his majesty); a set of F–major variations on the popular song “Freut euch des Lebens” (Rejoice in Life); and a Tempo de Valse Rondo, “Freudenjubel des beglückten Oesterreich” (Joyous jubilation of the felicitous Austria). Like Beethoven’s Op. 81a, the ecstatic mood of return found a musical

\textsuperscript{461} Ibid., 83.  
\textsuperscript{462} Letter of 9 October 1811. Anderson I, no. 325; Briefwechsel II, no. 523. Rumph suggests that this passage indicates Beethoven’s rejection of a “public,” monumental, Napoleonic style in favor of intimate lyricism; see Beethoven After Napoleon, 101.
analog in the plan of a three-movement sonata—although, with Moscheles, the mood itself was collective civic and national feeling.

This sonata was but one among many piano pieces on this subject. Some, like Moscheles’s sonata, confined themselves to the representation of collective sentiment in music, such as Die glückliche Wiedergenehung unsers allgeliebten Landesvaters Franz I (The Happy Return of Our Beloved National Father Franz I) by Max Josef Leidesdorf, which advertised itself as a Tongedicht (tone poem) rather than a Tongemälde. But most were detailed tone paintings, which turn to the general representation of collective celebration by way of a finale: Starke’s Des Kaisers Wiederkehr (The Kaiser’s Return) and Diabelli’s Glorreiche Rückkehr Franz des allgeliebten in seine Residenz (Glorious Return of the Beloved Franz into His Residence) are typical examples, reproducing the parade in all its visual and musical bustle—with fragments of church music, dance music, and marches—before concluding with jubilant crowd scenes. These publications have something of the character of souvenirs, their strings of detachable musical and melodic moments functioning as miniature, quasi-pictorial reminders of the occasion or of “der ewig denkwürdige Einzug” (the eternally memorable entry), as Diabelli’s Glorreiche Rückkehr put it. Consistent with this function, each publication dedicated its frontispiece to the defining image of 16 June 1814: the

---


464 Starke’s piece was published by Joseph Eder, Diabelli’s by Thadé Weigl.
procession making its way through Hohenberg’s triumphal arch (see figures 8 and 9). The engraving on the front of Diabelli’s composition even reproduces its inscription: “Er kehrt aus fernem Land des Friedens goldnen Zweig in segenreicher Hand” (he returns from a distant land, the golden branch of peace in benedictory hand).

Figure 8. The frontispiece of Starke’s musical account of the Kaiser’s return, depicting Hohenberg’s Ehrenpforte.

Just as Der glorreiche Augenblick at once marked and created the glorious moment that it celebrated, the musical and poetic representations of the glorreiche Rückkehr were constitutive of the return itself. Rossi describes the Kaiser’s arrival along with a list of the occasional works that greeted it—among them, an epic poem by
Weissenbach, “Der Einzug des Kaisers Franz I in Wien im Juni
1814” (The Entry of Kaiser Franz I in Vienna in June 1814)—thus
almost conflating the event with its own mediation. Many musical
publications seem to occupy a similarly ambiguous position in relation
to the event: street songs like Kanne’s pair of simple tunes entitled
“Der Friede, oder Feyerlicher Einzug in Wien” (Peace, or the Festive
Entry into Vienna) at once depict, commemorate, and strive to take
part in the ceremony—“Jauchze laut du frohes Wien!” (Cheer loudly,
you happy Vienna!) exhorts the second song.

465 Among other entries on his list: “Die Rückkehr des Kaiser Franz, oder
Oesterreichs schönster Tag” (The Return of Kaiser Franz, or Austria’s Most Beautiful
Day) by Hohler; “Bey der Zurükkunft des Kaisers” (On the Occasion of the Return of
the Kaiser) by Ignaz Liebel; “Franzens siegreiche Rückkunft” (Franz’s Victorious
Return) by Anton Pichler.

466 These songs were published by Steiner in 1814. Weinmann records several other
marches and songs composed for the occasion by Kanne, mostly published by
Joseph Eder in 1814. See Verzeichnis der Musikalien des Verlages Joseph Eder.
In turn, the ceremonies that marked the Kaiser’s return to Vienna shaded political theater into actual theater. Extravagant musical celebrations were the culmination of the Kaiser’s arrival. On the evening of 18 June, the celebrations moved to the Kärntnertortheater, where a chorus in white robes and an orchestra of 184 players performed Joseph Weigl’s Irene, oder die Weihe der Zukunft (Irene, or the Consecration of the Future)—a grand cantata based on an “allegorisch-dramatische Dichtung” (allegorical-dramatic poem) by Joseph Sonnleithner, the first librettist of Leonore. On 21 June, the Kaiser attended the performance of yet another cantata to

---

467 Rossi provides details of the dress of the chorus and the numbers in the orchestra in his Denkbuch, 8–9.
celebrate his return: *Der große Tag des Vaterlandes* by Ignaz Sauer.\(^{468}\)

As if the Kaiser’s triumphal return were an opera that had spilled out of its diegetic and physical space, it culminated with a succession of choral crowd scenes.

Given this “operatic” quality, it is scarcely surprising that the Kaiser’s return ended up as the subject of an opera. Hummel and Emmanuel Veith—who collaborated on the patriotic chorus of welcome for Carl von Schwarzenberg—quickly produced a one-act opera for the Theater an der Wien called *Die Rückfahrt des Kaisers* (The Kaiser’s Return), whose E-major finale “Wir haben ja alle der Kaiser gesehen!” (We’ve all seen the Kaiser!) once again celebrates the thrill of gazing upon the magnificent leader.\(^{469}\) Moreover, it appears that Beethoven considered composing an opera that alluded to the same subject.

When Pichler offered him the libretto *Mathilde ou Les Croisades* (Mathilde, or the Crusades) in June 1814, the composer informed Dorothea von Ertmann that he was not interested:

> I fully intend to speak to Frau von Pichler about it myself—It is very beautifully written. For this particular occasion, however, I should like to have a subject that would comprise the whole of Germany.

But he added at the foot of the page:

> But should this opera refer to the return of the Kaiser [die Widerkunft des Kaisers], then it would of course be best as it is.\(^{470}\)

---

\(^{468}\) Ibid., 11–12.

\(^{469}\) The opera was published in a piano reduction in 1814 by Artaria as Hummel’s Op. 69.

\(^{470}\) Anderson I, no. 516; *Briefwechsel* III, no. 718. Translation amended.
Melodic Moments

If musical forms are most vulnerable to the interventions of social forces in their un-integrated moments, then during the Congress these forces acted most tangibly on tunes, whose potential formal self-sufficiency was an aid to the institutional and compositional mechanisms that reproduced popular melodies in varying musical and social contexts: in the street, on stage, and in print. Indeed, the collage of marches and patriotic tunes that makes up Wellingtons Sieg and the brief quotation of “Gott erhalte Franz” in the Schlußchor to Die Ehrenpforten are symptomatic of a culture in which tunes were in constant circulation. Understandably, “Gott erhalte Franz” turned up in more musical and social contexts than any other during the Congress. When the tune appears briefly in a tone painting by Gyrowetz that depicts the celebrations in the Prater marking the anniversary of Napoleon’s defeat at Leipzig, a number of social and musical contexts merge in a single quotation: part of the public event that the composition depicts, the song is also a patriotic tune to be reproduced in the home and a musical symbol of the Kaiser himself—“Außerordentiliches Freudengeschrey beym Anblick Sr Majestät des Kaiser FRANZ” (extraordinary clamor of joy at the sight of his majesty Kaiser Franz), reads the commentary above the stave (see figure 10).
Figure 10. “Gott erhalte Franz” as quotation, depiction, and symbol in Gyrowetz’s Sieges- und Friedens-Fest der verbündeten Monarchen gefeyert im Prater und dessen Umgebungen am 18ten October 1814, als am Jahrstage der Völkerschlacht bey Leipzig, published by Thadé Weigl in 1814.

Other tunes circulated in similar ways. One of the most popular at the time of the Congress was the “Alexander” March or “Alexanders Favorit-Marsch” (Alexander’s favorite march), which was issued in some form by more or less every publisher in Vienna—in solo, duo, and piano-duet arrangements, and as the basis of many sets of variations for various chamber combinations. Starke published several versions of the “beliebtes Thema” (popular theme) with Eder (see figure 11), as well as a set of piano variations on it. Artaria issued elaborate piano variations on the theme by Moscheles, along with an optional orchestral accompaniment. Diabelli even changed the tune into a waltz in the third of his Tänze aus der Schlacht von Waterloo (Dances from the Battle of Waterloo), published by Steiner (see figure 12). The melody also appeared in Treitschke’s Die Ehrenpforten, transformed into a duet for Teutschmann’s future sons-in-law Walter and Horst, “Was wir fröhlich angefangen” (what we happily began); the two men sing a simple oompah bass while the violins carry the tune.⁴⁷¹

⁴⁷¹ See table 2 in chapter 1.
Melodies thus passed from publisher to publisher and from composer to composer, almost as if repeating in a set of variations; Diabelli’s later notion of inviting Vienna’s leading composers to compose one variation each on a waltz tune was only a more formalized version of what had long happened to many popular tunes.\footnote{That Beethoven finally responded with a disproportionate assertion of his authorial control—thirty-three variations by Beethoven alone—has long been of satisfaction to critics keen to protect the composer from the compromises of collaboration; see Solomon’s discussion of the reception of Diabelli’s most famous waltz and the critical construction of Beethoven’s attitude to it in “The End of a Beginning: The ‘Diabelli’ Variations,” in his \textit{Late Beethoven}, 11–13.} 

\footnote{227}
The circulation of tunes in this manner was an established part of the Viennese reception of opera, of course—the publishing market distributing popular operatic tunes as single songs, in chamber arrangements, and as variation sets. Indeed, one could argue that the discrete melodic moments that made up the larger part of most contemporary operas invited such fragmentation. Operatic hits continued to be recycled in Congress pieces: Starke’s Des Kaisers Wiederkehr, for instance, supplemented its concluding patriotic song with variations on “Es sind Thränen der inigsten Wonne” (There are tears of innermost bliss) from Weigl’s Die Schweitzerfamilie (The Swiss Family)—the 1809 opera that had barely left the stage of the Kärntnertortheater since its premiere.473

That the circulation of tunes was in part a function of the publishing market is perhaps a concrete illustration of Adorno’s more abstract notion that the tune—as distinct from the theme or motif, implicated in a developmental process—is at bottom a marketing concept, which standardizes a mode of consumption oriented towards the instant gratification of the moment rather than the emerging meaning of the whole:

Melody [in commodified music] comes to mean eight-bar symmetrical treble melody. This is catalogued as the composer’s “inspiration” which one thinks he can put in his pocket and take home, just as it is ascribed to the composer as his basic property.474

473 The reviewer of Die gute Nachricht welcomed Treitschke’s Singspiel as a change from the constant repetition of Weigl’s opera and a few others; see AMZ 34 (23 August 1815), col. 568. For a brief but informative discussion of Weigl’s Die Schweitzerfamilie, see Winton Dean, “German Opera,” 473–474. The libretto of the opera was by I. F. Castelli.

Adorno and his exegetes have sometimes implied that this mode of reception is confined to the age of mass production, which supposedly created both “commodity music” and what one might consider consumerist responses to masterworks. Nevertheless, such consumerist listening habits were widespread in early nineteenth-century Vienna: the Viennese habitually pocketed tunes and took them home.

The Viennese were even able to take home Beethoven’s opera, the 1814 piano arrangement of which was prepared under the composer’s supervision by Moscheles. Moreover, the most readily consumable elements of *Fidelio* were often performed as self-sufficient moments, separated from their musical and dramatic context. On 25 January 1815, for example, a concert in the Zeremonien Saal, part of birthday celebrations for the Empress of Russia, concluded with the canon “Mir ist so wunderbar”—a quartet that, as Kerman has argued, already stands apart to some degree from the rest of the first act because of its static, contemplative quality.

Operatic culture in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries comfortably accommodated the recycling of tunes, of course; only the ideal of the complete and inviolable work makes Beethoven’s engagement with this culture appear problematic. As it is, Beethoven’s reuse of tunes is an inescapable feature of the

---

475 For Moscheles’s reminiscences of his work with Beethoven, see Thayer–Forbes, 584–585.
compositional history of Leonore–Fidelio and its overtures—from the appearance of Florestan’s aria before the coda of Leonore No. 2 to Beethoven’s use of a melody from his early Funeral Cantata at Florestan’s moment of release. Moreover, Beethoven reused and rearranged melodic material across his Congress-era music. The overture to Die Ruinen von Athen, for example, begins with a short potpourri of melodies transplanted straight from later musical numbers: the gloomy Andante con moto comes from the instrumental opening of the duet (no. 2) while the subsequent Marcia moderato is a snippet of the march and chorus (no. 6). One of the later numbers from Die Ruinen is itself a reused tune: the Marcia alla turca (no. 4) is an orchestration and transposition (with a newly composed B section) of the melody from Beethoven’s own Piano Variations Op. 76, dating from 1809. Beethoven borrowed from his earlier piano music again in 1815, when he orchestrated and transposed the Funeral March from the Piano Sonata Op. 26 as the fourth and final number of his incidental music to Leonore Prohaska.

**Moments in the Pastoral Symphony**

While un-integrated, implicitly hybrid moments define Beethoven’s Congress music, the critical unease that they cause has also affected the reception of symphonic compositions such as the Pastoral Symphony—so often portrayed as the Other of its heroic companion, the Fifth.477 The Pastoral is descriptive or “characteristic” music, of

---

477 See Burnham’s brief discussion of the Fifth and Sixth as an opposing pair; *Beethoven Hero*, 153–154 and Raymond Knapp, “A Tale of Two Symphonies:
course, organized by a succession of conventional bucolic themes. But its pictorial aesthetic manifests itself in more than the trilling of nightingales or the rumbling of thunder: an early plan of the symphony shows that Beethoven had at one time intended to preface each of the movements with the designation *scena*, as if to present a series of musical tableaux.\(^{478}\) One might argue, therefore, that the pictorialism of the symphony resides in its contemplative, quasi-visual aesthetic almost as much as its imitative effects. Drones and other static harmonic devices are common throughout, gradually relaxing the tension of basic tonal oppositions. The symphony tends towards a cyclical, even repetitive, treatment of its musical material: the “scene by the brook” (the only movement to retain the word “scene”) attenuates the sense of harmonic or thematic dynamism with layers of rotating themes and motifs—the rippling accompaniment figure rotates within the slow-moving tune, which is itself prolonged by a repeating cadence melody first heard in mm. 13–15.\(^{479}\)

Further, the concluding scenes of the *Pastoral* describe a narrative that appears to have more in common with *Fidelio* or even *Die Ruinen von Athen* than any symphonic composition: a sudden intervention followed by prolonged celebration. The storm theatrically cuts short the F-major merrymaking of the countryfolk: the last measure of their dancing is an upbeat—three dominant chords, which

---


\(^{479}\) The idea of the multivalent “rotating” of the material in this movement was proposed by James Hepokoski in a paper entitled “Reflections in Beethoven’s Brook” presented in Cornell University’s Music Department Colloquium Series in 2004.
are silenced by the hush of a tremolo D flat in the cellos and basses. This is an intervention from “outside,” insofar as it intrudes upon the more or less conventional progress of the form, cutting off the scherzo and subsequently yielding to the finale. And yet, of course, the storm is precisely what gives the concluding Hirtengesang license to celebrate at such length. In the finale, Beethoven emphasizes the lack of harmonic dynamism in the principal tune with drone accompaniments, extending the melodic moment with both large-scale cyclical repetition and local paratactic intensification. The opening of the movement is a typical example: between mm. 9 and 32 the tune goes through three harmonically static cycles, each time with the orchestral forces expanding. Given the open-endedness of this large-scale cyclical motion, it is hard to hear the transition beginning in m. 32 as a product of the preceding intensification; the transition sounds like a turn from inaction to action, a musical hinge connecting the static melodic section from mm. 9–32 and its reprise at m. 64. The opening repetitions of the finale might even call to mind verses of a strophic hymn—an implicitly collective melodic rumination, much like the song of thanks that concludes Haydn’s Seasons. Indeed, while Beethoven’s Hirtengesang perhaps lacks a conspicuous formal motivation, it succeeds in its role as a finale largely because of its poetic significance: after the intervening storm, the spacious repetitions of the arpeggiated horn melody conjure up the devotional

---

480 The superimposed or external character of the storm in relation to the otherwise fairly conventional formal layout of the Pastoral is discussed in Will, The Characteristic Symphony, 157, 177.
481 Ibid., 181–182.
spirit of a kind of musical “natural religion”: “O Herr, wir danken dir” (O Lord, we thank you), wrote Beethoven among his sketches for the movement.\footnote{For the \textit{Pastoral} and “natural religion,” see ibid., chapter 4.}

The formal proportions of the finale permit one to hear contemplative musical “spaces” as much as processive musical arguments. Because of the absence in the finale of many large-scale tensions that demand resolution, one might assume that the coda of the \textit{Pastoral} would be a perfunctory affair. The opposite is true, however: it appears to compensate for the absence of a strong teleology with a kind of monumental broadening. The coda (starting at around m. 177) exaggerates the cyclical tendencies of the finale, building entire stretches of music from circular harmonic and melodic sequences that repeatedly fall back on themselves. First, the tune is adapted to a progression that Tovey calls “a round-like scheme”—a simple harmonic sequence (beginning at m. 182) with the potential for endless repetition: $V/\text{ii}\to\text{ii}\to V\to I$.\footnote{Donald Francis Tovey, \textit{Essays in Musical Analysis}, vol. 1 (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), 56.} Then, after a fortissimo climax that relaxes through the cadential sequence $I\to vi\to V/ V\to V$, the round-like scheme begins once again with greater embellishment (m. 206), and the ensuing repetition of the cadential sequence is extended, eventually reaching a simple variant of the principal tune (m. 237). This periodic version of the tune compresses the contemplative melodic mood into an even eight measures; David Wyn Jones even suggests that the concluding segment of the melody (mm. 242–244) is an implied setting of the words “O Herr, wir danken dir” that
Beethoven sketched at the start of the movement. The periods of the tune subsequently fragment into a succession of authentic cadences shared between strings and wind, with the resolution of the last cadence of all stretched by the reappearance of the opening horn call. One might take these concluding measures as emblematic of the style, technique, and aesthetic of the Pastoral as a whole: the melodic moment dissolves into the single chord of F, prolonged over seven measures; any appearance of dynamism is ultimately confined to textural qualities, such as the trickling sixteenth notes passed down through the strings and the internal rotation of the horn theme. As the opening horn call cycles its simple triadic message over sustained root notes in the rest of the wind, the symphony seems to meditate on one extended moment of tonal and thematic closure.

Rather than trace a linear process of development in the Pastoral, therefore, one perhaps apprehends its form through certain dramatic junctures or “enveloping” musical spaces—moments that do not “point the way to something beyond themselves,” to use Dahlhaus’s phrase, but rather demand that we attend to their own inherent qualities.

**Moments in the Heroic Style**

And yet, one might ask whether it is possible—and maybe even usual—to apprehend even Beethoven’s apparently most processive symphonic compositions in the same way. This is what Burnham suggests in his subversive conclusion to Beethoven Hero:

---

But maybe we hear even the heroic style more spatially than we would be inclined to admit. Perhaps our experience of this music is just as much one of memorable moments, of “places,” as it is one of temporal process. As we have seen, crux points often narrate the form in the heroic style, telling us our place by means of monumentality (e.g. the Eroica coda) or a feeling of uncanny incursion (e.g. the Eroica horn call).\footnote{Burnham, Beethoven Hero, 166.}

I would add that it is such moments that also appear to interact most palpably with non-musical elements: literary narratives, visual images, and political ideas.

The Egmont Overture and its triumphant coda—“high points of the heroic style,” according to Solomon—are good examples.\footnote{Solomon, Beethoven, 274.} The coda comprises the same music as the Siegessinfonie from Beethoven’s incidental music—the concluding fanfare that Goethe requested to accompany Egmont as he turns to face his martyrdom.\footnote{Burnham discusses the overture and its connection with Goethe’s play in Beethoven Hero, 124–142.}

In consequence, the overture appears to lack a developmental process to sanction its coda—something that alarmed Adorno, who heard the conclusion as disproportionate:

This is [...] a triumph without a conflict. Such a coda would have presupposed a far more dialectical development—which in this piece is merely hinted at.\footnote{Adorno, Beethoven, 79. Adorno’s emphasis.}

Unable to identify a developmental principle to validate the Siegessinfonie, Adorno blamed its alleged disproportion on politics (albeit of a rather unspecific kind), detecting “something brutal,
Germanic, [and] triumphalist” in the brash fanfare. Indeed, several later critics have regarded the Siegessinfonie as the incursion of a political or programmatic element from Goethe’s drama into Beethoven’s overture. Broyles, for example, writes that Beethoven’s recourse to the Siegessinfonie is “essentially programmatic”—once again attributing an apparent rupture in Beethoven’s symphonic processes to unwarranted generic hybridity.

Like the Siegessinfonie of Wellingtons Sieg, perhaps, the coda of the Egmont Overture depends less on its connection with what has gone before than on characteristics that one might associate with emphatic finality. This prompts Burnham to call the Siegessinfonie a “disembodied telos”—a composite of “goal-like” features that could serve as a satisfying end almost wherever it were transplanted. It is a triumphant fanfare, after all, during which the violins ascend almost to the limits of volume and register. One might even argue that the simple and repetitive harmonic structure of the Siegessinfonie “performs” as well as effects tonal resolution, constantly rotating basic harmonic progressions in order to work up a head of steam without actually advancing—most noticeably in the ostinato bass describing a I–V/ii–ii–V progression, which begins in the cellos and violas at m. 307. “There is a sense in which we are being told about closure even as we are closing,” writes Burnham of the harmonic directness of the Egmont coda—Es ist vollbracht, it seems to announce.

---

489 Ibid.
490 Ibid., 141.
491 Ibid., 141.
492 Ibid., 169.
Many of the goal-like features of the **Siegessinfonie**, including the recursion of basic harmonic progressions, are common in the finales of Beethoven’s stage works. Indeed, as Burnham suggests, Goethe’s drama harnessed these features in order to achieve its own dramatic closure.\(^{493}\) Like the expressive tuttis that concluded most contemporary operas—not least *Fidelio*—the **Siegessinfonie** has a universalizing and concluding role in Goethe’s play, emphasizing the heroism of Egmont’s self-sacrifice as if to suggest that it resolves rather than merely ends the drama. For this reason, perhaps, Schiller argued that Goethe was excessively reliant on a musical prop, and that the **Siegessinfonie** propelled the drama into another genre altogether: “werden wir durch einen Salto mortale in eine Opernwelt versetzt” (we are displaced into a world of opera by a *salto mortale* [somersault]).\(^{494}\)

Granted, the coda of the *Egmont* Overture is not entirely anomalous: the **Siegessinfonie** is its harmonic goal, since the relative major gives way to \(V/1\) only briefly before the coda begins.\(^{495}\) Ernst Oster went further, arguing for motivic connections between the **Siegessinfonie** and the rest of the overture.\(^{496}\) Nevertheless, one could argue that the unexpectedness of the coda—the theatrical way in

---

\(^{493}\) Burnham claims that the music conveys Egmont’s transformation from a troubled human being into a figure of universal symbolic significance; see Ibid., 125–126.

\(^{494}\) The review first appeared in the *Jenaische allgemeine Literaturzeitung* 227 (20 September 1788). Meanwhile, Beethoven evidently conceived of his *Egmont* music as components of opera-like tableaux; requesting that Treitschke revive the music to *Egmont* early in 1814, Beethoven commented that several theatrical accompaniments might be staged “as a spectacle for the eyes” (*Augenspektakel*). See Anderson I, no. 467; Briefwechsel III, no. 699.

\(^{495}\) Though the preponderance of the relative major in the recapitulation of minor-key sonata movements is hardly unusual in Beethoven’s music.

which the falling fourth of the violins appears to cut the overture short before the *Siegessinfonie* emerges from eight tremulous measures of dominant preparation—is the principal reason that it works so well as an ending. Indeed, critics who regard the coda as an inevitable conclusion or the completion of unfinished musical business perhaps infer structural depths from its compelling musical surface, converting musical rhetoric into analytical logic. While the coda undoubtedly achieves harmonic closure, its formal and poetic importance is guaranteed only through Beethoven’s prolongation of the moment of resolution itself—the sort of quantitative musical rhetoric that reductive analytical theories struggle to explain.\footnote{Marston explores this in connection with Schenkerian theory in his “Goal-Directness in Beethoven’s Music,” particularly 84.}

I would argue that the *Egmont* coda is characteristic of Beethoven’s most compelling heroic conclusions, which frequently draw their power from unpredictable formal interventions that precipitate them and monumentalizing repetitions that prolong them. The last movement of the Ninth is among the grandest and clearest examples, making a kind of theater out of its moment of intervention—providing a running commentary in the cellos and basses on its own formal choices before eventually “discovering” the Joy theme: “not only the basses but the other members of the orchestra welcome the deus ex machina with every mark of applause,” remarked George Grove.\footnote{Grove, *Beethoven and His Nine Symphonies*, 373.} Beethoven translated this moment into words in his sketches: “today is a day of celebration, let it be celebrated with song”: *Heil sei dem*
The Joy theme itself—a melodic moment that, as Robert Winter has shown, Beethoven sketched and completed before the start of his work on the symphony—is repeated and prolonged with variation procedure, and monumentalized in the context of fugal writing.

Beethoven composed several finales that generate the sense of an ending by repeating and prolonging a single tune. Explaining the Ninth to his publisher, Beethoven compared the finale to the earlier Choral Fantasy, the culmination of his grueling 1808 Akademie. Based on a tune much like the Joy theme, the Choral Fantasy is also a kind of variation form, which gathers momentum during its repetitions largely by incrementally increasing the instrumental forces until the entry of a chorus. In a number of orchestral compositions, Beethoven also couples variation procedures with monumentalizing fugue. In part because of its association with Handelian pomp, concluding fugues are especially prominent in the music of the Congress period: the last movement of Der glorreiche Augenblick cycles a tune through each section of the chorus before a

499 The sketches are from Landsberg 8, bundle 2; see JTW, 292–298. The reading of Beethoven’s words is Nottebohm’s, translated in Solomon, Beethoven, 408.
501 See Sisman, Haydn and the Classical Variation and “Tradition and Transformation in the Alternating Variations of Haydn and Beethoven.”
502 The theme came from the second part of Beethoven’s through-composed setting of two poems by Bürger, “Seufzer eines Ungeliebten” and “Gegenliebe,” WoO 118. Beethoven compared the Ninth to the Choral Fantasy in a letter of 25 February 1824 to Maurice Schlesinger in Paris. Anderson III, no. 1267; Briefwechsel V, no. 1782.
503 Marston writes that the insertion of a fugue was Beethoven’s way of “adding weight toward the end of a variation movement”; see “Goal-Directedness in Beethoven’s Music,” 91.
fugal apotheosis, and the Siegessinfonie from Wellingtons Sieg varies “God Save the King” before its sprightly fugato conclusion. But variations and fugue are also basic structural principles in the last movement of the Eroica (based on an existing tune transplanted from the score of Prometheus). From a formal perspective, conclusions like these invite comparison not with Beethoven’s most dynamic and processive movements but with his most static and contemplative ones—the succession of reorchestrated repetitions and fugue in the Allegretto of the Seventh, for example.

One could argue, in fact, that the insistent and circular restatement of a single moment of resolution is one of Beethoven’s most characteristic sounds—whether on the largest formal scale, as within his variation-type movements, or on the smallest scale of local harmonic recursions, such as one finds in the coda of the Egmont Overture. In his stage music, small-scale thematic and harmonic recursions commonly make up the greater part of codas or Schlußchöre: “Heil unserm König!” from Die Ruinen von Athen, for example, constantly rotates a simple melodic fragment, in essence a

---

504 Stephen Rumph has argued that the last movement of the Eroica actually exemplifies Beethoven’s preoccupation with thematic process, claiming that it is “one of the clearest examples of the post-Kantian dialectical spirit.” It is worth noting, however, that Rumph cites Dahlhaus’s dialectical reading of the first movement by way of critical sanction; see Rumph, Beethoven After Napoleon, 88. To be sure, in the finale of the Eroica, Beethoven seems to have been exploring ways of imparting a greater sense of directionality to variation procedure—in part by presenting in the first instance only the bass line and harmonic skeleton of the theme. Elaine Sisman has made a sustained analytical attempt to accommodate the movement to a formal and generic ideal that she dubs “progressive” and “self-generating”; see “Tradition and Transformation,” 180. Nevertheless, I would argue that it is hard to hear the skeletal introduction as the germ of a “developmental process” as it is usually conceived: the theme does not “develop” as much as accrue additional layers in the course of its opening repetitions.
descent to the tonic via descending thirds, that outlines a repeating dominant–tonic alternation, as if to internalize the words “Dankend schwören wir auf’s Neue/ Alte ungarische Treue” (Gratefully we pledge anew/ our ancient Hungarian loyalty)—an unceasing insistence on resolution that is offset only by the pauses and minor-mode inflections on the line “Bis in den Tod!” (until death!). Likewise, the end of the König Stephan Overture operates almost exclusively by rotating thematic and harmonic fragments. From m. 445, the coda passes through four cycles of a four-measure passage in which the first violins descend through a tonic arpeggio and leap upwards to the crest of a dominant seventh. After this come yet another four cycles of a simpler four-measure passage—this time consisting of the tonic chord stretched out in ascending and descending arpeggios in the bass instruments and wind. The entire orchestra then erupts with two measures of dominant, outlining the shape and syncopated rhythm of the head motif, and is answered by two measures of tonic in the wind instruments; this exchange is repeated. Finally, four measures of the dominant chord, in which the opening falling third of the head motif rotates in the treble instruments, leads to a sequence of fifteen tonic chords in the final thirteen measures, two of which are filled with a timpani roll on the tonic.

Concluding thematic rotations that repeat or prolong a single chord or harmony even as they increase the sense of urgency can be found in several other compositions from the Congress period: the Overture Op. 115 repeats an eight-measure sequence in its coda (from m. 297)—a sequence whose opening four measures are themselves
made from the rotation of a simple rising and falling motif in the wind reinforced by a tonic–dominant alteration. Although critics may dismiss such musical rhetoric as examples of bombast or repetitiousness in Beethoven’s Congress compositions, thematic rotation of this kind is widespread across his oeuvre. The overture known as Leonore No. 3 provides a number of examples in its concluding Presto, which, like the coda of the Egmont Overture, prepares a concluding burst of the tonic major with its own dramatic formal intervention—layer upon layer of scalar flourishes in the strings, building up over twenty measures; from m. 614, the head motif of the Allegro repeats rapturously, adapted to the alternation of tonic and dominant. Moreover, this rhetoric is by no means the exclusive preserve of stage music: the passage of increasing paratactic intensity from m. 631 in the first movement of the Eroica famously monumentalizes the harmonic simplicity of its triadic opening motif as it swings between tonic and dominant. The final instrumental Prestissimo of the Ninth (m. 920) similarly alternates tonic and dominant while rotating a motif derived from the Joy theme.

In contexts like these, the rotation of simple motifs almost threatens to erase the distinction between “thematic working” and ostinato. This is one of the reasons, perhaps, behind Cook’s suggestion that the conclusion of the Ninth could have sounded like Rossini to Beethoven’s contemporaries. Rossini’s music gives precedence “to intensified repetition over motivic manipulation,” writes Dahlhaus—“motifs that are often rudimentary or even tawdry are

---

505 Cook, Symphony No. 9, 103.
whisked pell-mell into juggernaut crescendos."506 One could argue that, even though Dahlhaus portrays Rossini and Beethoven as aesthetic and stylistic opposites, a great deal of Beethoven’s music also fits this description. This is not to maintain that Beethoven was directly influenced by Rossini, of course. If one were seeking stylistic precedents for Beethoven’s treatment of motifs, however, one could reasonably maintain that it echoes Cherubini’s orchestral style.

Winton Dean, who argues that Beethoven’s symphonic style derives in large part from his encounters with French opera, writes of Cherubini’s “skill in constructing large-scale movements from neutral and even trivial tags”—notably stopping short of calling Cherubini’s musical fragments motifs.507 Indeed, in the case of overtures such as Lodoïska and Les deux journées, which generate local dramatic tension and construct monumental codas largely by rotating such fragments, whether one calls Cherubini’s procedures “motivic development” is in part a matter of value judgment: “motifs” signify a teleological process; “trivial tags” imply the static repetition of fragments.

I would argue that such a value judgment also informs the notion that Beethoven’s Fifth and Sixth Symphonies are opposites. After all, like the conclusion of the Pastoral, the end of the finale of the Fifth is punctuated with prolonged sequences of static motivic rotation, which alternate V and I while volume and instrumentation are intensified through parataxis: a clear example is the cycling of the

---

506 Dahlhaus, Nineteenth-Century Music, 59.
507 Winton Dean, “French Opera,” 40. See also chapter 2 of this study.
rising triadic motif (stated emphatically by the bassoon in mm. 317–319) between m. 319 and m. 327 and the subsequent varied repetition of the same passage. Indeed, one could argue that the entire recapitulation of the finale of the Fifth—perhaps because it concludes the entire symphony rather than merely the last movement—is in essence a prolonged moment of static celebration, comparable to the Hirtengesang of the Pastoral. Schenker remarks in his monograph on the Fifth that one could simply “pass over” the recapitulation: he appears to have believed that nothing of note happens in the reprise apart from the prolongation of C major and the mood of triumph.\(^5\) Tovey, who was otherwise more pragmatic than Schenker in his interpretation of formal proportions, portrayed the entire finale as “from its outset a final triumph”; with forty measures to go, “all is over except the shouting”—the eleven measures of tonic-dominant alternation and twenty-nine measures of tonic that bring the symphony to a close.\(^6\) Tovey’s formulation implies that there is a disjunction between Beethoven’s rhetoric and his logic. Indeed, this disjunction appears to prompt E. T. A. Hoffmann’s reading of the conclusion, which interprets the “excess” of the last forty measures not as an ending in itself—an ending that “cannot be followed,” as Kramer puts it\(^7\)—but as an uncanny “supplement” to the ending, even casting doubt on the symphony’s ability to conclude:

\[\text{The chord that the listener takes as the last is followed by one measure’s rest, then the same chord, one measure’s rest, the same chord again, one measure’s rest, then the chord again for}\]

\(^6\) Tovey, *Beethoven*, 62, 63.
three measures with one quarter note in each, one measure’s rest, the chord, one measure’s rest, and a C played in unison by the whole orchestra. [...] They act like a fire that is thought to have been put out but repeatedly bursts forth again in bright tongues of flame.\textsuperscript{511}

Further, what motivates this celebration is one of the most famous formal interventions in Western music: the unexpected reprise of the Scherzo at the end of the development section, a ghostly and insubstantial reminder of its former horror amid the festivities.\textsuperscript{512} One might compare the formal function of this intervention to the retelling of the horrific past events in the finale of \textit{Fidelio}: it permits a reprise of the dazzling transition from major to minor by which the finale first appears—and it accordingly sanctions yet more demonstrative triumphalism in response. Perhaps a retransition without the reappearance of the Scherzo would have made the recapitulation appear excessive or even redundant, especially given that the finale is, as Tovey remarks, a celebration from its outset. The recapitulation—Adorno’s “schematic aspect of the sonata form” that “needs to be justified each time it occurs”—is thus “justified” by the reprise of the Scherzo. Despite its hushed threats, the theme is reprised in a changed form that uses its dominant- and 6/4-heaviness to harmonic advantage; it now serves as a means of ushering in C major, even as its unsettling thematic character interrupts the triumphant course of the music. The Fifth thus describes a narrative structure made of an arresting moment of intervention and a prolonged moment of

\textsuperscript{511} Hoffmann, “Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony,” 250; translation amended.
\textsuperscript{512} See Burnham’s discussion of this moment, and various critical responses to it, in “How Music Matters: Poetic Content Revisited,” 200–208.
celebration—a structure like the storm and thanksgiving of the Pastoral.

Given these similarities, it is hardly surprising that Burnham, comparing the Fifth and Sixth Symphonies, should conclude that “similar means [lead] to very different ends”: he observes, for example, that both works construct extended sections of music from “motivic repetitions”—but asserts that

motivic repetitions in the Sixth Symphony do not build tension as they do in the Fifth. Those of bars 16 to 25, for example, swell and subside dynamically, but unlike the waves of tension and release throughout the exposition of the Fifth, there is no harmonic arrival at the top of the swell. In general, climaxes in the Sixth Symphony are those of plenitude rather than of arrival or the attainment of a peak.\(^{513}\)

And yet, Burnham describes the technical features that ostensibly dictate the contrasting characters of the Pastoral and the Fifth with images, such as his sea metaphor, that suggest a particular perception of these technical features; in other words, it seems as if a preconception about the character of each symphony shapes his understanding of the technical means by which this character is established. Thus, given that he detects “similar means” in the Pastoral and the Fifth, one could argue that the contrasting “ends” are often produced by different ways of listening. The distinction between climaxes of “plenitude” in the Pastoral and those of “attainment” in the Fifth, for example, might depend in part on our willingness to concentrate on the effect of each passing moment in the Pastoral—a consequence of its pictorial aesthetic, perhaps—as opposed to our

\(^{513}\) Burnham, Beethoven Hero, 153, 154.
preoccupation with the emerging musical future in Fifth, which notionally denies the musical present.

**Ideological Moments**

Burnham concludes his study of Beethoven’s heroic style by exhorting us to attend to our “engaged connection with the present moment”—to the almost physical “presence” of Beethoven’s music. According to Burnham, this is “a more fundamental sense of presence” than the idea of musical process can create. Indeed, he implies that the kind of listening traditionally encouraged in the academy—the concentration on “purely” musical processes—often suppresses as much as it reveals:

> the attempt to thwart current academic discourse is not to be construed as a refusal to think, in favor of some “be here now” haziness, a “dumbing down” in order to encourage emotional groping—it is rather the challenging business of talking about why music matters to us as something more than the occasion for a specialized branch of academic study.

I would argue that recognizing the similarities between Beethoven’s heroic masterworks and his Congress compositions can help to show us why so much of Beethoven’s music “matters to us.”

As we have seen, the arresting and disjunctive moments that characterize *Fidelio*, as well as Beethoven’s most reviled pieces of Congress propaganda, are also common in his most vaunted symphonic works. Indeed, they are the most compelling moments of

---

514 Ibid., 166. On Burnham and “presence,” see this study, chapter 1.
516 Ibid.
these works—the stunning interventions, the arresting contemplations, the insistent or monumental endings. These moments have elicited the most imaginative programmatic interpretations and poetic critical responses: as apparent ruptures in the musical or dramatic process, they seem to require critical exegesis or extra-musical justification. Further, and crucially, these moments have been especially prone to political appropriation: it was reported that one of Napoleon’s generals leapt to his feet crying “Vive l’empereur!” upon hearing the finale emerge from the Scherzo in the Fifth Symphony.517 The Vienna State Opera reopened in 1955 with Fidelio—its trumpet call readily interpretable as a signal of Europe’s freedom from fascism, just as it had signaled victory in the Befreiungskriege 140 years earlier.518 Bernstein performed the Ninth at the Berlin Wall in 1989, when the dramatic incursions and ensuing joy of the finale spoke for a Europe self-consciously leaving behind the Cold War era.519 It seems that Beethoven’s emphasis on the musical present can only be interpreted in the present: Heil sei dem Tag.

It is worth nothing the irony that, whereas Beethoven’s heroic, odd-numbered symphonies have often served propagandistic and even politically sinister ends,520 his most obviously “political compositions”—Wellingtons Sieg, say, or “Germania”—have been among the least susceptible of his works to repeated political

519 See Buch, Beethoven’s Ninth, 259–262.
520 See, for example, David Dennis, Beethoven in German politics, 1870–1989 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).
appropriation.\textsuperscript{521} Given that disjunctive moments characterize Beethoven’s heroic masterworks as well as his Congress music, however, the distinction between the two—like Burnham’s distinction between the Pastoral and the Fifth—is perhaps sustained in part by how we listen. Indeed, the “suppression” of the moment required by process-oriented listening seems worryingly like an ideological maneuver—a means of concealing and naturalizing the disjunctive moments that are responsible for much of the music’s political potency. By converting Beethoven’s compelling musical rhetoric into musical logic—as Oster does in the case of the Egmont coda, to take one example—critics make the very moments that invite politics into the work the foundation of the formal processes that supposedly keep them out.

If one can call Beethoven’s Congress music “political,” therefore, one might call his heroic music “ideological”—in the sense that it has helped not merely to propound but to naturalize political ideas. Uncovering the similarities between the Congress compositions and the heroic works is thus a form of ideology critique, insofar as the Congress compositions represent politics that the heroic works conceal or suppress. Indeed, a piece such as Wellingtons Sieg has escaped repeated political appropriation partly because its political message has never been a matter of debate. To listen to Beethoven’s battle piece as if to a “purely” musical process would seem out of keeping

\textsuperscript{521} There is perhaps a parallel between this point and Kerman’s observation that critics have often regarded the Fifth Symphony as the highest example of program music, overlooking the more obviously “programmatic” Pastoral; see Joseph Kerman, Write All These Down: Essays on Music (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 234.
with its basic aesthetic assumption: it has never been a pressing
critical task to uncover an internal motivation for the arresting
moments of Wellingtons Sieg—a purely musical process that would
take over from the political program that is currently heard to organize
the piece.

The formalist methodologies that have served to conceal the
politics of Beethoven’s music developed, in the main, after the
composer’s death—although their intellectual and technical origins
might be traced to Beethoven’s contemporaries, such as E. T. A.
Hoffmann and A. B. Marx. It is not clear, however, whether Beethoven
expected or encouraged his audiences to listen to his heroic works in a
different way from his Congress music—although his dissociation of
Napoleon’s name from the Eroica remains the strongest hint, perhaps,
that he preferred to keep the politics of his symphonies submerged. In
any event, it seems appropriate that Beethoven should have
composed, beside his overtly political music, covertly ideological
works—works whose subtle form of politics would prove more
attractive and perhaps more effective in the civil societies of the post-
Napoleonic era.  

522 The use of the word “ideology” in something approaching its modern sense, which
tends to connote the propagation and naturalization of falsehood, is often attributed
to Napoleon; see Raymond Williams, Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society
APPENDIX

Political Music by Beethoven’s Contemporaries:
Musical Sources Consulted

A-Wgm

Solo Piano Pieces:


Works for Chorus and Orchestra:


___________. Habsburg Kantate (text: anon). MS; Vienna, 1805.


A-Wn

Solo Piano Pieces:


___________. Der Sieg bey Brienne, oder Napoleons letzte Feld-Schlacht am 1ten Februar 1814. Vienna, 1814.

___________. Tänze aus der Schlacht von Waterloo. Vienna, 1815.

Leidesdorf, Max Josef. Die glückliche Wiedergenehung unsers allgeliebten Landesvaters Franz I. Vienna, 1814.


Solo Songs and Melodramas with Piano:


____________. “Wellington! Welcome to Us!” Vienna, 1815.

____________. Der Friede, oder Feyerlicher Einzug in Wien. Vienna, 1814.

____________. Die Schlacht von Belle-Alliance, oder Hermanns Herabkunft aus Walhalla. Vienna, 1815.

Works for Chorus and Orchestra:


Patriotischer Chor (text: anon.). Vienna, 1814.


**Stage Works:**


Various (Beethoven; Adalbert Gyrowetz; Handel; Hummel; Ignaz von Seyfried; Bernhard Anselm Weber; Joseph Weigl). Die Ehrenpforten (text: Friedrich Treitschke). MS; Vienna, 1815.

Various (Beethoven; Adalbert Gyrowetz; Hummel; Friedrich August Kanne; Mozart). Die gute Nachricht (text: Friedrich Treitschke). MS; Vienna, 1814.

**D-bds**

*Works for Chorus and Orchestra:*

Spohr, Louis. Das befreite Deutschland (text: Caroline Pichler). MS; Vienna, 1814.


**GB-Lbl**

*Solo Piano Pieces:*


Solo Songs and Melodramas with Piano:
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