

The Symphony as Pindaric Ode

MARK EVAN BONDS

Recent decades have witnessed great advances in our understanding of how Haydn's symphonies were performed during his lifetime, yet we still know relatively little about how the composer's contemporaries actually perceived this music. What did Haydn's original audiences hear in his symphonies? In one sense, there ought to be as many answers to this question as there were individual listeners. But virtually none of those listeners recorded their views for posterity, so that the paucity of direct evidence makes it difficult to reconstruct even the basic, consistent attitudes toward Haydn's symphonies during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, let alone the idiosyncratic ones. Concert reviews from the time are few in number, and the brief notices we do have rarely go beyond such bland generalities as "bold," "original," "spirited," or "moving." Indeed, we scarcely know which of Haydn's London symphonies were premiered at which concerts, so vague is the record from even one of the best-documented periods of the composer's life. Private correspondence and diaries are equally uninformative on this count. The idea of recording one's responses to a specific work of music in any kind of detail would not begin to take hold until later in the nineteenth century.

With so little to go on in the way of direct testimony, we must look to other kinds of evidence in order to reconstruct contemporaneous perceptions of Haydn's symphonies. Among the most revealing sources of this kind are the half dozen or so descriptions of the symphony as a genre that appeared during the composer's lifetime. Brief as they are, these accounts identify specific elements that distinguished the symphony from all other genres. In so doing, they suggest the particular qualities to which an informed eighteenth-century listener might have given special attention while hearing a symphony. Genres are more than just categories: they guide perception. By its very nature, the generic designation of a work predisposes listeners to

Haydn
World
Symphony
Symphony
(1997)

hear and judge that work against a tradition of similarly-named works. Consciously or unconsciously, audiences of the day anticipated—and heard—certain specific features in a symphony that they did not expect in other genres like the string quartet or the piano sonata. A genre can of course change over time and almost always does in at least some way; but there seems to have been a fairly stable set of expectations for the chamber symphony in the German-Austrian tradition of the late eighteenth century. Contemporaneous accounts of the genre of the symphony—particularly those that go beyond such basic external criteria as “a large work for orchestra in three or four movements”—can thus provide important (if indirect) clues about what late eighteenth-century audiences heard when they listened to a symphony. By combining these accounts with other, more general commentaries on Haydn’s instrumental music, we can at least begin to reconstruct an outline of what particular features eighteenth-century listeners found so appealing in Haydn’s symphonies.

By far the most detailed account of the symphony in the second half of the eighteenth century appears in Johann Georg Sulzer’s *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste* of 1771–74. Sulzer’s “General Theory of the Fine Arts” encompasses literature, painting, sculpture, architecture, and dance as well as music. It was not a radical work in its time and yet for this very reason can be understood as documenting the more or less conventional wisdom of its day. Sulzer’s encyclopedia was popular enough to appear in three different editions and several reissues over the next twenty-five years, with new bibliographies added to many of the entries in later editions.¹ Beethoven is known to have used this source on at least one occasion.² And when Heinrich Christoph Koch produced his lengthy and highly influential musical dictionary in 1802, he still considered Sulzer’s entry on the symphony worth quoting at length.³

Most of Sulzer’s three-page article necessarily concerns itself with the external characteristics of the symphony, such as the number of instruments, the sequence of movements, and the traditional distinction among the three types of symphony according to the intended place of performance: in the church (the *sinfonia da chiesa*), the theater (the opera overture), or the concert hall (the chamber symphony). Although of considerable interest, these points need not detain us here. What is of greater import for our purposes is the manner in which Sulzer describes the “true spirit” of the chamber symphony.

Symphonies in general, according to Sulzer, are “especially suited to the expression of the grand, the solemn, and the sublime.” While the purpose of a theater symphony—an overture—is to prepare the

listener for an important musical event,” the purpose of a chamber symphony, “which constitutes a self-sufficient entity, without reference to any following music,” is to “exhibit the full splendor of the orchestra.” A chamber symphony can achieve this end

only by means of a full-toned, brilliant, and fiery manner. The allegros of the best chamber symphonies contain grand and bold ideas, free handling of compositional techniques, apparent irregularity in the melody and harmony, strongly-marked rhythms of various sorts, powerful bass melodies and unisons, concerting middle voices, free imitations, often a theme handled fugally, sudden transitions and shifts from one key to another, which are the more striking the weaker the connection is, bold shadings of *forte* and *piano*, and particularly the *crescendo*, which has the greatest effect when used with a rising melody and its climax. To this is added the art of weaving all the voices in and out of one another in such a way that all parts, when played together, create a single melody that is incapable of accompaniment, but rather one in which every voice is making its own particular contribution to the whole. Such an Allegro in a symphony is like a Pindaric ode: it elevates and moves the soul of the listener in the same way, and it requires the same spirit, the same sublime imagination, and the same knowledge of art in order to achieve this effect.⁴

The culminating analogy to Pindar’s odes is striking and resonates with many of the features emphasized not only here, in Sulzer’s account, but in many other contemporaneous discussions of symphonies in general and of Haydn’s symphonies in particular. Even though Sulzer’s evocation of Pindar is unique within the eighteenth century, it is by no means isolated or eccentric, for this richly suggestive simile unites essentially all of the attributes that other writers of the day consistently associated with the genre of the symphony. The connection of the ode and symphony, moreover, extended into the nineteenth century, culminating in the finale of Beethoven’s Ninth.

The Prestige of Artifice

Late eighteenth-century accounts of genres in all the arts are almost invariably presented within an aesthetic hierarchy of value, even if that hierarchy was not always made explicit.⁵ From this

perspective, instrumental music as a whole had long stood in the shadow of all vocal genres, particularly opera and oratorio. Because it lacked a text and any specific object of representation, instrumental music was seen as vague and somehow incomplete. Sulzer himself repeatedly emphasized the decided superiority of vocal music on the grounds that instrumental music, although pleasing and at times moving, was indeterminate. Even Koch, whose compositional manual of 1782-1793 devotes unprecedented space to the forms of instrumental music, insisted on the fundamental superiority of vocal music. "Instrumental music, to use Kant's celebrated phrase of 1790, was 'more pleasure than culture' because it could not transmit concepts. Music without a text could move the passions but not the mind.

Against this backdrop, Sulzer's analogy of the symphony to a Pindaric ode is all the more striking, for no genre of instrumental music had ever been compared to such an elevated literary form. Music had long been understood as a kind of language in its own right, and it was by no means unusual for critics of the eighteenth century to compare an instrumental work to a poem, a drama, or (most commonly) an oration.⁶ But the analogy to the Pindaric ode is particularly significant because of this genre's prestigious standing among literary forms. The ode in general, according to Sulzer, was too diffuse a category of poetry to tolerate any concise characterization: no one element common to all odes could differentiate this genre from all others. The only point that critics could agree on about the ode, Sulzer maintained, was that it represented "the highest form of poetry" because it demanded the greatest degree of poetic artifice. It is not the greatness of the ode's object that sets it apart, but rather its expression, its manipulation—which is to say, its poetic artifice. And the "high Pindaric ode," in Sulzer's account, stands as the most musical and most prestigious exemplar of this highest poetic form. The ostensible subjects of these particular odes, as Sulzer points out, actually hold very little interest for us in and of themselves. Why should anyone, Sulzer asks, really care about the winners of various Pan-Hellenic athletic competitions from the fifth century, B.C.?

Pindar was not a universally admired figure in late eighteenth-century Germany. Because his victory odes—the large majority of his surviving poetry—were written on commission from aristocrats wishing to honor themselves, Pindar's detractors were quick to dismiss him as a "flatterer," a hired pen. More egregious still, in the opinion of these critics, was the poet's propensity toward garrulousness, digression, and obscurity.⁸ But a more discerning generation of German critics and poets was beginning to take up his cause in the second half of the

eighteenth century, and many leading figures of the *Geniezeit* looked to Pindar as the paradigm of the poetic genius. For Lessing, Herder, Goethe, Hölderlin, and others, Pindar's works embodied a synthesis of both extreme originality—a product of inspiration, of nature—and extreme artifice. His daunting syntax, neologisms, and seemingly disordered line of thought were seen as assets rather than as liabilities, as complications that richly rewarded those who made the effort to come to terms with them.⁹ Pindar's admirers valued his odes for their richness of voice and imagery, and for the manner in which they weave myth, history, current events, and praise of the gods into a richly textured narrative. In the end, the athletes whose triumphs are celebrated in these odes were seen as figures of secondary importance; what resonated for later generations, in the words of one modern scholar, were the poetic "webs of connotation, implication, and association [that] branch out indefinitely in every direction."¹⁰

Haydn's admirers similarly emphasized his synthesis of natural genius and technical skill. Critics repeatedly praised the composer's ability to integrate the highest degree of artifice into a work that on the surface, at least, remained easily apprehensible. Pointing to the symphonies and string quartets as the genres in which Haydn had made his greatest impression, Ernst Ludwig Gerber observed that Haydn "possesses the great art" of presenting that which "often appears to be familiar." And "in spite of all contrapuntal artifices" to be found in his works, his music remains "popular and pleasing to every amateur."¹¹ Johann Karl Friedrich Triest concluded his review of Haydn's music along the same lines by noting that "if one wished to define further, with two words, the character of Haydn's compositions, it would be—so it seems to me—artistic popularity or a popular (perceptible, penetrating) fullness of art."¹²

Aside from the most obvious and audible of technical artifices—polyphony—Haydn's contemporaries acknowledged the synthesis of genius and artifice most openly in their comments on his ability to make so much out of such seemingly insignificant thematic ideas. Over and over again, critics of Haydn's symphonies noted a pleasing disparity between the subject at hand—the opening theme of a movement—and its subsequent artistic elaboration. Haydn was rarely lauded for his powers as a melodist (as well he might have been), but he won consistent praise for his ability to transform an apparently simple idea into something that was at once both pleasing and profound. The London *Morning Herald's* review of Salomon's concert of 23 March 1792 is typical in this regard. Most of this brief review is given over to an evaluation of the performances by the soloists in the evening's arias

and concertos. Alone among all the program's many works, Haydn's symphony (no. 94) is evaluated not in terms of its performance, but in terms of its design, and specifically the first movement's "subject," which "was remarkably simple, but extended to vast complication, exquisitely modulated, and striking in effect. Critical applause was fervid and abundant."¹³ In essence, the entire movement was perceived as one vast elaboration of a seemingly modest idea.

Along much the same lines, the *Mercur de France* had already identified the composer's ability to develop a single subject in a rich and varied manner as the one characteristic that set Haydn apart from those "sterile composers who pass continually from one idea to another, without knowing how to present one idea in varied forms, . . . and jumping from effect to effect, without connections and without taste."¹⁴ This view is remarkably similar to Haydn's own account of how he composed, as recorded by one of his early biographers, Georg August Griesinger:

I sat down [at the keyboard] and began to fantasize, according to whether my mood was sad or happy, serious or playful. Once I had seized an idea, my entire effort went toward elaborating and sustaining it according to the rules of art. . . . And this is what is lacking among so many of our young composers: they string together one little bit after another, and they break off before they have barely begun, but nothing remains in the heart when one has heard it.¹⁵

Haydn's contemporaries clearly perceived the result of this method. After summarizing the composer's life in his biographical dictionary of 1790, Gerber began his evaluation of Haydn's music by crediting him with "giving to our instrumental music, and in particular to quartets and symphonies, a perfection that never before existed. Everything speaks when he sets his orchestra in motion." Haydn's themes "consistently bear the mark of genius, and the attentive listener will immediately recognize them as Haydn's own among thousands of others." But at the same time, his themes often seem almost haphazard, and at first glance appear to "have nothing to say." Yet "in the hands of this master," they take "remarkable turns," and in the end, "one is swept up in them."¹⁶ Gerber would amplify these remarks four years after Haydn's death in an important essay devoted to the idea of basing an entire symphonic movement on a single theme, and again, it is Haydn's symphonies that are held up as paradigms of this technique.¹⁷

Haydn's art of "making something out of nothing" also comes in for special attention in Jérôme-Joseph de Momigny's *Cours complet d'harmonie et de composition* of 1805. In an unusually detailed technical analysis of the first movement of the Symphony in E-flat major, no. 103 ("Drumroll"), Momigny places great emphasis on motivic connections and the coherent unfolding of ideas. At m. 14 of the slow introduction, for example, he points out how Haydn "always remains faithful to variety without ever detracting from unity" by avoiding the easy introduction of another theme and instead repeating the "same theme, but with other instruments, and with modifications that give the effect of something new." At the close of the exposition, in turn, Haydn "derives his idea from the preceding material rather than finishing the section with something banal or foreign." In Haydn's music, "all appears simple, for his art is infinite"—which is to say (in part) that his apparently "natural" themes are subjected through his artifice to seemingly infinite expansion and manipulation.¹⁸

A similar outlook is evident in Triest's extended retrospective on eighteenth-century music, written in the first year of the nineteenth. Triest contrasts the empty artistry of concertos and much chamber music with the genre of the symphony, which "uses an entire mass of instruments for the development of the beautiful and the significant, which lies in the main idea, which is easily grasped and often seems to be simple."¹⁹ A few short paragraphs later, Triest identifies Haydn as the greatest symphonic composer of his (and all) time. E. T. A. Hoffmann valued this same quality in Haydn's symphonies. Reviewing a new symphony by Friedrich Witt in the last month of Haydn's life, Hoffmann declared that he missed in its finale "those profound elaborations, those always new turns of the theme" one finds in Haydn's music. In spite of their "loose arrangement," it is precisely these turns of the theme that constitute the "thread of the work" in Haydn's symphonies, and it is this thread that "holds the listener in constant suspense until the final measures." A year later, Hoffmann would celebrate the genius of such thematic transformations even more explicitly in his celebrated review of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony.²⁰

That the symphony—as opposed to, say, the sonata—should be singled out for its propensity to manipulate an opening idea is at least in part a function of the simple fact that orchestral players were not able to embellish or improvise to any substantial degree. With more than one performer to most parts, the symphony was a genre that precluded such performative freedom. Sulzer explained this distinction by means of a secondary metaphor, in which he called the

symphony a choral work for instruments and contrasted it with the sonata, which he likened to a cantata for solo voice and instruments. In the latter,

the melody of the leading voice can be constructed in such a way that it will accommodate (or indeed, as is often the case, demand) ornamentation. In the symphony, by contrast, in which each voice is performed by many instruments rather than by a single instrument, the melody must be capable of making its greatest impression at once, in the notes written on the page; no voice can tolerate even the slightest embellishment or coloratura. Unlike the sonata, which is a piece to be practiced, the symphony must also allow for sight-reading by the performers and therefore may not include any difficulties that cannot be performed simultaneously and clearly by many different players.

One effect of these restrictions in writing a symphony was to place greater weight on the perceived role of the composer in the ultimate success of the artwork. The aesthetic impression of a solo work (or a work like a concerto, whose central line is performed by a soloist) depends in large measure on the performer's skill, particularly his ability to improvise and embellish. More often than not, as Sulzer pointed out, such performative elements are not only permissible but essential. The symphony, by contrast, neither demands nor permits such latitude. The virtuosity demanded by the symphony is compositional rather than performative and thus demands a correspondingly higher degree of poetic—compositional—artifice.

Sulzer's analogy manifests no small change in aesthetics. One need only glance at a typical eighteenth-century opera libretto to be reminded that it was the performers who took center stage, both literally and figuratively. The composer, if mentioned at all, is often listed alongside the choreographer, the costume designer, and the master of swords. The great instrumental virtuosos of the day, in turn, could make a name for themselves as soloists in the sonata and concerto repertoires. But the growing art of instrumental music for large ensembles with no soloists at all—manifested most notably by the symphony—opened the way for the composer to emerge as the principal agent of artistic achievement, equal to if not of even greater importance than the performer.

The Sublime

Sulzer's pronouncement that the symphony is like a Pindaric ode is foreshadowed in his more general observation that the symphony is "especially suited to the expression of the grand, the solemn, and the sublime." No other poet was as consistently and as quickly associated with the sublime as Pindar, whose odes are full of the grand, bold strokes that "elevate" and "move the soul of the listener" to a higher, almost spiritual kind of aesthetic ecstasy.²¹

From a musical perspective, a good part of this effect depended on the sheer size of the symphonic orchestra. In our own time, period ensembles that perform Haydn's symphonies seem small to us because we inevitably hear them in contrast to the larger orchestras of Brahms or Mahler. But it is important to remember that by eighteenth-century standards, Haydn's ensembles were very large and very loud indeed. And it is scarcely coincidental that the musical genre most closely associated with the sublime in the late eighteenth century was the oratorio, whose forces of chorus, vocal soloists, and orchestra constituted what at the time were the largest indoor ensembles of any kind. The term "sublime" surfaces over and over again in accounts of Handel's oratorios, particularly the monster performances that took place during the Handel celebration at Westminster Abbey in 1784. To our late twentieth-century ears, historically-informed performance practice has made Haydn's music sound less monumental and less loud, whereas to his contemporaries, the perceived effect was precisely the opposite.

Among instrumental genres, then, only the symphony could sustain the analogy to Pindar's odes. The string quartet, although prized as the "purest" of genres—a "conversation among four rational individuals" with a minimum of timbral contrast—was almost never described in terms of the sublime because its sonic dimension was too limited, its tone too intimate. And while the concerto could project a sound as forceful as that of the symphony, it was never able to free itself entirely from the specter of empty virtuosity. Self-serving display was simply not consistent with the idea of the sublime. The sublime may have been complex and loud, but it was never vapid or bombastic.

Not all symphonies passed this test, of course, and a number of eighteenth-century critics bemoaned the tendency of grandeur to devolve into grandiloquence. Even Triest, a sensitive and sympathetic admirer of the "grand and bold gestures" in newer symphonies, conceded that at least some of these works "deafen us through their

chaotic noise, in which the timpani increasingly play the main role (for who still composes symphonies without timpani?)²² William Jackson of Exeter, writing in the year of Haydn's arrival in London (1791), was more blunt. Recent composers, in order "to be grand and original, have poured in such floods of nonsense, under the sublime idea of *being inspired*, that the present SYMPHONY bears the same relation to good music, as the ravings of a bedlamite do to sober sense."²³

Jackson's complaint about "floods of nonsense" relates to another element of the poetic sublime, the notion that ideas are to be presented not in a painstaking, logical order, but in a sequence that might seem random or at times even chaotic. The sublime appeals to a level of the soul that stands above and beyond reason. While the beautiful could appeal to contemplation, the sublime relied on the effect of sheer and immediate impact. A storm at sea provided eighteenth-century critics with one of their favorite illustrations of the sublime because it combined force with unpredictability. And even if most of Europe had only a secondhand knowledge of Pindar, many of Sulzer's readers would have been directly familiar with Horace's celebrated description of the Pindaric ode as "a powerful mountain torrent, swelled by strong rains, which with irresistible power sweeps up everything along with it."²⁴ Here we sense the importance of the poet's frenzy—the *favor poeticus*—in the creation of a sublime work of art. At times, this quasi-ecstatic state threatens to overwhelm the work, and the result is a torrent of ideas that cannot be rationalized in every detail.

Horace's image of the Pindaric ode as a rushing, swollen river is implicit in other contemporaneous accounts of the symphony. As Michael Broyles has demonstrated, eighteenth-century distinctions between the "symphony" and "sonata" styles emphasize the rhythmic propulsion of the symphony and its tendency to elide cadences for the sake of forward motion. Cadences in the sonata style, by contrast, are more frequent and distinct and have the effect of dividing the music into relatively discrete units.²⁵ The symphony, in short, was heard as the more propulsive and rhythmically irregular of the two genres.

These same qualities of forward motion and unpredictability are evident in Sulzer's entry on the symphony, which points specifically to the genre's "apparent irregularity of melody and harmony" and to "sudden transitions and shifts from one key to another, which are the more striking the weaker the [harmonic] connection is" between the two keys. Originality and surprise are of course two of the qualities most commonly identified in Haydn's music by his contemporaneous critics, and not only in his symphonies. Burney considered "the most sublime Idea in Haydn's work" to be the depiction of chaos in *The*

Creation by means of "dissonance & broken phrases."²⁶ But in the realm of instrumental music, it was the symphony alone that was seen to integrate these qualities within the sublime. All of these elements are neatly subsumed in *The Times* report on the premiere of Haydn's Symphony no. 93 in D Major: "Novelty of idea, agreeable caprice, and whim combined with all *Haydn's* sublime and wonten grandeur, gave additional consequence to the *soul* and feelings of every individual present."²⁷ The very newness, strangeness, and disorder of Haydn's symphonies made them all the more sublime to his original audiences.

The Central Role of Texture

Sulzer's analogy of the symphony to the Pindaric ode occurs immediately after his account of ideal texture in a symphonic first movement. Texture, oddly enough, is a term for which the German language lacks any concise equivalent, even today. But texture is clearly what Sulzer has in mind when he describes how all the voices in a symphony should weave "in and out of one another in such a way that all parts, when played together, create a single melody that is incapable of accompaniment, but rather one in which every voice is making its own particular contribution to the whole." In this sense, a symphony is not merely an orchestrated sonata, but a work conceived from the beginning for *all* the instruments of the orchestra.

Sulzer illustrates his ideas on this point through a critique of symphonies by three of the most noted composers of his time: Johann Gottlieb Graun (1702 or 1703–1771), Carl Heinrich Graun (1703 or 1704–1759), and Johann Adolph Hasse (1699–1783). Noting that the "opera symphony"—the overture—"has more or less the characteristics of the chamber symphony," Sulzer praised the overtures of the elder Graun for their

exceptional degree of artistry and character. . . [B]ut his delicate soul lacked the fire they also require. The beautiful melodies that he never ceased to write, no matter how admirable they are, always have a feeble effect in every one of his symphonies. One thinks one is hearing a fiery operatic aria performed by instruments. Graun was surpassed in this respect by his brother, the late concert master, who found the true spirit of the symphony in some of his chamber symphonies. Hasse also surpassed him [Johann Gottlieb Graun], even though his opera symphonies also have a number of aria-like qualities to them.²⁸

By this account, a "fiery operatic aria performed by instruments" was precisely what a symphonic first movement should *not* be. An essentially homophonic texture—melody and accompaniment—was perfectly appropriate to the aria, but the first movement of a symphony called for a more polyphonic style of writing in which the resulting melody was "incapable of accompaniment," and in which "every voice is making its own particular contribution to the whole." Only occasionally, according to Sulzer, did the Grauns and Hasse succeed in achieving the "true spirit of the symphony," which is to say, a predominantly polyphonic texture in which all the voices contribute more or less equally.

This emphasis on texture relates at once to both the multi-faceted richness of the Pindaric ode and its status as the most "artful" of all literary genres. For polyphony, in the end, is a function of counterpoint and harmony: these were techniques that could be codified and taught, and scarcely a year went by in the second half of the eighteenth century without the publication of at least one new treatise on these subjects. Melody, by contrast, was perceived to be a product of inspiration and as such beyond the bounds of that which could be codified. It is for this reason that we have so few treatises on melody from the eighteenth century. The supreme accolade of any eighteenth-century melody, after all, was the epithet of "natural"—that is, spontaneous and unforced. For eighteenth-century critics, the ideal melody was artless in the best sense of the term.

Sulzer's emphasis on the importance of texture to the "true spirit of the symphony" can be read in part as an oblique criticism of Johann Adolph Scheibe's earlier (1745) emphasis on the importance of melody in this genre. Scheibe had pointed specifically to the symphonies of Hasse and Graun (presumably Johann Gottlieb) as exemplary in their use of melody. Still, even Scheibe had conceded that a chamber symphony must be worked out in manner more "fully voiced" than a theater symphony (overture), and that "one must give the middle voices more to do and allow them to come forward in an artful manner every now and again."²⁹

Scheibe's acknowledgment of the necessity for a richer texture in the chamber symphony would figure in almost every subsequent account of the genre throughout the eighteenth century—and, for that matter, well into the nineteenth. Even in the briefest of eighteenth-century accounts of the symphony, it is texture that stands out as the genre's most important distinguishing characteristic. "The German symphonists," according to François Jean de Chastellux in his *Essai sur l'union de la poésie & de la musique* of 1765, "are less

concerned with finding simple musical motives than they are with producing beautiful effects through the harmonies they draw out of the large number of different instruments they use and through the manner in which these instruments work in succession."

Their symphonies are a type of *Concerto*, in which the instruments shine in turn, in which they provoke each other and respond; they dispute and reconcile among themselves. It is a lively and sustained conversation. But throughout all these contrasts, one always recognizes, particularly in good works, one motive that constitutes the basis of the entire edifice. Each part, it is true, occupies itself with this edifice in its turn. This passage is destined for the horn, that one for the oboe; it is a period that is shared among all the parts of the orchestra, a canvas on which each instrument executes a small amplification.³⁰

This kind of texture is evident in virtually every symphonic first movement Haydn ever wrote (and a great many other movements). The opening presto of his Symphony no. 54 in G major, written the same year Sulzer's "Symphony" article appeared, offers a good example of the kind of "melody incapable of accompaniment" that so impressed Haydn's contemporaries (Example 1). When we first hear the theme (which enters after a brief slow introduction), our ear is drawn to the active rhythms of the strings; the winds, at least initially, seem to be there merely to "fill out" the sound of the orchestra. But after a few measures, we begin to realize that the held notes of the winds are actually the beginning of a melodic line, and that the repeated string motive is in fact more accompanimental than melodic. Yet the figure in the strings remains something more than mere underpinning, and in the end, the "accompanimental" line of the strings turns out to be no accompaniment at all, but rather an essential element of the whole. The very identity of this theme rests on its integration of contrasting lines, rhythms, and timbres between winds and strings.

The widely popular Symphonies no. 85 ("La Reine," 1785), no. 88 (ca. 1787), and no. 91 (1788) all use a similar interweaving of voices in the opening measures of their respective allegros. Such examples could be multiplied at will. This kind of writing offers up not an "ostentatious bustling of instruments," as Triest would put it in his description of symphonies by some composers other than Haydn, but rather a genuine polyphony in which "an entire mass of instruments" is used for the "development of the beautiful and the significant,

which lies in the main idea, which is easily grasped and often seems to be simple."³¹

The technical commentary from Haydn's own time, sparse as it is, repeatedly calls attention to this textural quality in his symphonies. In the account mentioned earlier, Gerber observes that "all the subsidiary voices—which in the works of other composers are mere accompaniment—often become decisive principal voices in his hands." Even in Italy, where the chamber symphony had declined greatly in popularity by the end of the eighteenth century, the distinctive texture of the genre continued to be an object of comment. In his textbook on composition published in 1796, Francesco Galeazzi devotes a mere three sentences to the chamber symphony, yet in these three sentences, he asserts that it is a genre "written with the greatest artifices of the art of music"; that the symphonies of Haydn serve as "a perfect model" for such works; and that the formal structure of the symphony is much like that of the string quartet, "with the sole dif-

2 Fl.
2 Ob.
2 Bsn.
2 Hn. in G
2 Trp. in C
Timp. in G-D
Vln. I
Vln. II
Va
Vc., Db.

Presto
mp Solo
pp
Soli
pp
Presto
pp

Example 1. Haydn, Symphony no. 54/i.

6
2 Fl.
2 Ob.
2 Bsn.
2 Hn. in G
2 Trp. in C
Timp. in G-D
Vln. I
Vln. II
Va
Vc., Db.

Presto
mp Solo
pp
Soli
pp
Presto
pp

Example 1, continued.

ference of a quite extensive interlacing that must emanate from the various parts."³² Thus we see, even in this very brief account, the demands of artifice, the paradigmatic status of Haydn's symphonies, and the deciding quality of an essentially polyphonic texture.

August F. C. Kollmann, a German émigré working in London during Haydn's years there, similarly proclaimed Haydn to have provided the best models of the genre, particularly in matters of texture. In his compositional manual of 1799, Kollmann recommends that "a symphony's principal themes" be written in such a way that "all Instruments can *execute* them, or at least *join* in them in the principal Key. If this rule is not attended to, a Symphony cannot answer the purpose of employing the whole Orchestra to advantage"—which, it will be recalled, was Sulzer's *raison d'être* for the chamber symphony. Kollmann goes on to note that "Haydn will be found very particular in attending to this rule, for the subjects of most of his best Symphonies are not only calculated for the Horn and Trumpet, but

The image shows a musical score for a string quartet, labeled 'Example 1, continued'. It consists of four staves, each representing a different instrument: Violin I, Violin II, Viola, and Cello/Double Bass. The score is written in a common time signature (C) and features a complex, rhythmic texture. The first two staves (Violin I and Violin II) are marked 'Tutti' and show a melodic line with some rests. The third and fourth staves (Viola and Cello/Double Bass) provide a more rhythmic and harmonic foundation. The notation includes various note values, rests, and dynamic markings.

Example 1, continued.

even for the Kettle Drums," as in the Symphony no. 97, with its insistent tonic-dominant opening.³³

A more or less equal-voiced texture is a quality we associate more readily nowadays with the string quartet than with the symphony. Yet eighteenth-century critics were equally inclined to hear this texture in the symphony, perhaps because the very size and diversity of its requisite performance forces made this quality all the more striking. When listening to a well-blended string quartet, one can at times imagine that one is hearing a single instrument. No such illusion is possible when hearing a symphony. To the contrary: it was the synthesis of such highly diverse timbres within an essentially equal-voiced texture that stood out for earlier listeners as the genre's most immediately audible feature.

The Quality of Massed Expression

Sulzer's secondary analogy of the symphony to an instrumental chorus is entirely consistent with his image of the Pindaric ode, a genre that itself had originally been sung (and danced) by a large chorus. The texts of Pindar's odes contain numerous internal references to their choric nature and at times even refer to accompanying instruments and the chorus master.³⁴

In this respect, Pindar's odes are closely related to the choruses of ancient Greek tragedy. Indeed, the perceived similarity of function between the chamber symphony and the Greek chorus had grown in part out of the earlier tradition of the theater: Lessing, for one, had already made such a comparison in his drama reviews of the 1760s, noting that "the orchestra at our stage plays takes the place, as it were, of the ancient choruses."³⁵ In the latter part of the eighteenth century, this tradition would be transferred to the chamber symphony by Bernard Germain, Comte de La Cépède, who in 1785 likened the individual instruments in a symphony to the characters in a drama, with the tutti orchestra representing the Greek chorus.³⁶ Heinrich Christoph Koch also accepted the analogy of the chorus and went on to note that the symphony "therefore has as its goal, like the chorus, the expression of a sentiment of an entire multitude." The portion of Sulzer's article on the symphony that Koch quoted at length in his own *Musikalisches Lexikon* of 1802 includes, significantly enough, the comparison to the Pindaric ode.³⁷

In this sense, both the symphony and the Pindaric ode were perceived as expressions of a communal—as opposed to personal—sentiment. The size of the requisite ensemble and the size of the performance venue combined to play an important role in both the production and perception of symphonies in Haydn's lifetime. The symphony was choric not only by virtue of the size of the orchestra performing it, but also by the nature of the genre's very "tone."

The idea of hearing a symphony as the "voice" of a large body may seem somewhat foreign to us today, yet it was too widespread in Haydn's time to be dismissed as idiosyncratic. Sulzer's analogy in fact resonates with many later writers. In the late 1770s, for example, Christian Friedrich Daniel Schubart praised a symphony by Christian Cannabich on the grounds that he could hear in this work "not the mere uproar of the rabble, shrieking in a tumult, but rather a musical whole, whose parts, like emanations of spirit [*Geisterausflüsse*], reconsti-

tute to make themselves a whole. The listener is not merely deafened, but rather shaken by and permeated with humbling, lasting effects."³⁸ Schubart's account thus directly links complexity and the variety of parts to the aesthetics of the sublime: the listener is "shaken," "permeated," and "humbled" by the experience of listening in part because the symphony projects the voice of a large and diverse community rather than that of a mere individual.

Nineteenth-century writers sustained this idea of the genre's communal tone. "Destined for a large gathering of persons," Momigny argued in 1805, the symphony "must have at once both grandeur and popularity. The composer should choose his subject from among scenes of nature, or from among scenes of society that are most capable of moving and engaging the multitude, without however descending at any time to that which is base and trivial. Those who have read our preliminary discourse will perhaps remember that we have cited the symphonies of Haydn" as exemplary in this regard.³⁹ And indeed, Momigny's analysis of the first movement of Haydn's Symphony 103 conjures up a large gathering of persons assembled to pray for relief against the terrors of thunder (the opening drumroll). The group rejoices at the arrival of sunny weather and cowers collectively at the resumption of the thunder when the slow introduction makes its unexpected return at m. 202. Momigny's analysis of a chamber work, by contrast—Mozart's String Quartet in D Minor, K. 421—focuses on Dido's grief at Aeneas's departure from Carthage. The emotional anguish we hear is that of an individual, not of an entire community. Later in the nineteenth century, virtually all the programmatic interpretations of Beethoven's Seventh Symphony would evoke images of some kind of communal gathering, ranging from a peasant dance or wedding (the first and third movements) to a priestly ceremony (the second movement) to a bacchanal (the finale).⁴⁰

Haydn himself was well aware of the communal implications of the genre. In a letter to a Parisian publisher of 28 August 1789, shortly after the beginning of the French Revolution, he announced his intention to call one of four symphonies he proposed to write a "National" Symphony.⁴¹ Such a title would have been unthinkable for a new quartet or concerto, for among instrumental genres, only the symphony could convey this quality of massed expression. The personification of the orchestra (and of instruments in general) is of course a venerable trope, extending back many centuries and forward to our own time, and it is applicable to virtually all genres. But the distinctive element here is the sense of a large group engaging in a quasi-public dialogue. This is not an intimate conversation among friends,

as the formulation most frequently applied to the string quartet would have it, but the deliberative discourse of a large populace, to be performed by a large body of musicians for a large audience.

It is scarcely coincidental, after all, that the most celebrated expression of communal ideals is to be found in a symphony—Beethoven's Ninth—and that this symphony bases its finale on an ode, Schiller's "An die Freude."⁴² While the idea of incorporating vocal forces into a symphony may have been novel, the idea of projecting a sense of communal expression was not. Even before Beethoven's Ninth, one anonymous German critic, writing in 1820, had asserted that in the symphony, as in a work for large chorus, there appears "the universality of humanity, in which everything that is individual finds itself melted as discrete entities within the whole."⁴³

In the wake of the Ninth, commentators would take this idea still further, maintaining that the true symphony represents not the self-expression of an individual composer, but rather the expression of a larger society. When Adolf Bernhard Marx likened the solo sonata to the ode (in the general sense, not to the Pindaric ode), he went on to compare the symphony to the hymn. Unlike the solo sonata, performed by one player on one instrument, the symphony was seen to express the emotions of a large body of individuals, a veritable chorus, and in this regard, the Pindaric ode and hymn are in fact closely related.⁴⁴ It is not a question of the depth of expression that is possible in either genre, but rather the tone and nature of that expression. Marx praised the profundity of such works as Beethoven's Piano Sonatas Opp. 110 and 111, but distinguished the expression of the "individual-subjective piano" from that of the chorus and the symphony, which address general conditions "in the grand sense of ancient tragedy."⁴⁵ The critic Gottfried Wilhelm Fink, writing a decade later (1835), argued that a symphony is "a story, developed within a psychological context, of some particular emotional state of a large body of people." Such sentiments prevailed through the end of the century. As August Reissmann pointed out in 1878, a true symphony does not present the subjective spirit of the individual, but rather "that objective spirit fulfilled by the manifest supremacy of the world-spirit." Only if the composer sublimates his personal ideas and emotions to the good of the larger whole could a symphony realize its full potential.⁴⁶ And in a conversation with his wife, Cosima, shortly before his death in 1883, Wagner emphasized the distinction between Beethoven's symphonies, on the one hand, and his sonatas and quartets on the other. In the sonatas and quartets, Cosima reports Wagner

as having said, "Beethoven makes music; in the symphonies, the entire world makes music through him."⁴⁷

These are nineteenth-century formulations, to be sure, and it would be anachronistic to read such interpretations into eighteenth-century descriptions of the symphony as a genre. At the same time, it would be equally mistaken to overlook the origins of these ideas in the earlier (if fragmentary) comments about the communal "tone" of the symphony.

• • •

The remoteness of Sulzer's image of the symphony as Pindaric ode reminds us that it is not only performance practice that has changed over the past two centuries, but also the very act of listening itself. In a sense, Haydn's symphonies—at least the late ones—are too familiar to us: they have come down in an unbroken line of tradition since the composer's own time, and they seem far more approachable than any number of later works by subsequent composers. Yet few of us today are as conscious of the elements that seem to have captured the imaginations of Haydn's original audiences: the synthesis of nature and artifice, the aesthetic of the sublime, the centrality of an integrated texture, and the perception of a communal voice in the symphony as a whole. Admittedly, the evidence for these eighteenth-century perceptions rests on fewer sources than we would like. The breadth and richness of newly heard or newly interpreted voices from Haydn's era make plain how the symphony came to occupy such a central place in the cultural imagination of the nineteenth century. We will surely gain by the attempt to hear in these symphonies something of what Haydn's own audiences might have heard in them.

NOTES

1. On the intellectual background and publication history of Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie*, see Johan van der Zande, "Orpheus in Berlin: A Reappraisal of Johann Georg Sulzer's Theory of the Polite Arts," *Central European History* 28 (1995): 175–208.
2. See Richard Kramer, "Beethoven and Carl Heinrich Graun," in *Beethoven Studies* [1], ed. Alan Tyson (New York, 1973), pp. 18–44. On the currency of Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie* in musical circles of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, see Owen Jander, "Exploring Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie* as a Source Used by Beethoven," *The Beethoven Newsletter* 2/1 (Spring, 1987): 1–7.
3. *Musikalisches Lexikon* (Frankfurt am Main, 1802; reprint, Hildesheim, 1964). The entry on the symphony in Sulzer's encyclopedia was actually written either wholly or in

part by the composer Johann Abraham Peter Schulz, whom Sulzer had commissioned to help with the articles on music. For the sake of simplicity and consistency, however, I shall refer throughout the present essay to Sulzer as the author of this entry, on the grounds that it clearly reflects the format, style, and tone of his encyclopedia as a whole. Sulzer went to great lengths to integrate the fine arts within his accounts of their individual elements: entries abound in cross-references linking literature to music, painting to dance, etc. As van der Zande and Christensen (see note 4, below) have argued, moreover, Sulzer was an active collaborator on earlier musical entries in the encyclopedia that had been prepared by Schulz's teacher, Johann Philipp Kirnberger. It is clear, in other words, that Sulzer did not merely transmit what Kirnberger or Schulz provided him in the way of articles on music.

4. Sulzer, *Allgemeine Theorie*, s.v. "Symphonie." The translation here is my own; for two other, different translations of the entire entry, see Bathia Churgin, "The Symphony as Described by J. A. P. Schulz (1774): A Commentary and Translation," *Current Musicology* 29 (1980): 7–16; and Thomas Christensen, "Johann Georg Sulzer: General Theory of the Fine Arts (1771–74): Selected Articles," in Nancy K. Baker and Thomas Christensen, eds., *Aesthetics and the Art of Musical Composition in the German Enlightenment: Selected Writings of Johann Georg Sulzer and Heinrich Christoph Koch* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 105–8.
5. See Klaus R. Scherpe, *Gattungspoetik im 18. Jahrhundert: Historische Entwicklung von Gottsched bis Herder* (Stuttgart, 1968), pp. 18–26.
6. See my *Wordless Rhetoric: Musical Form and the Metaphor of the Oration* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991).
7. Sulzer, *Allgemeine Theorie*, s.v. "Ode," "Pindar."
8. See Malcolm Heath, "The Origins of Modern Pindaric Criticism," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106 (1986): 85–98. Even in the twentieth century, Ezra Pound could proclaim Pindar to be "the prize wind-bag of all ages"; see D. S. Carne-Ross, *Pindar* (New Haven, 1985), p. 1. I am grateful to Professor William H. Race for his helpful guidance on the reception of Pindar's works.
9. On Pindar's reputation in eighteenth-century Germany, see Sigmund Lempicki, "Pindar im literarischen Urteil des xvii und xviii Jahrhunderts," *Eos: Commentarii societatis philologicae polonorum* 33 (1930–31): 419–74; Jochen Schmidt, *Die Geschichte des Genie-Gedankens in der deutschen Literatur, Philosophie und Politik, 1750–1945*, 2 vols. (Darmstadt, 1985), vol. 1, pp. 179–92; Thomas Gelzer, "Pindarverständnis und Pindarübersetzung im deutschen Sprachbereich vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert," in *Geschichte des Textverständnisses am Beispiel von Pindar und Horaz*, ed. Walther Killy, Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, 12 (Munich, 1987), pp. 81–115.
10. Thomas Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structures in Early Greek Poetry* (Leiden, 1985), p. 164.
11. Ernst Ludwig Gerber, *Historisch-Biographisches Lexikon der Tonkünstler* (Leipzig, 1790), col. 610: "Er besitzt die grosse Kunst in seinen Sätzen öfters bekannt zu scheinen. Dadurch wird er trotz allen contrapunktischen Künsteleyen, die sich darinne befinden, populair und jedem Liebhaber angenehm."
12. "Bemerkungen über die Ausbildung der Tonkunst in Deutschland im achtzehnten Jahrhundert," *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 3 (1801): 407.
13. *Morning Herald*, 24 March 1792, quoted in H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle & Works*, 5 vols. (Bloomington, 1976–80), vol. 3, *Haydn in London, 1791–1795*, p. 149. See also the review in the *Morning Chronicle*, 5 March 1794, quoted in Landon, *ibid.*, p. 241: "... having found a happy subject, no man knows like HAYDN how to produce incessant variety, without once departing from it."

14. *Mercure de France*, 5 April 1788, quoted in Landon, *Haydn Chronicle*, vol. 2, *Haydn at Eszterháza, 1766-1790*, p. 593.
15. Georg August Griesinger, *Biographische Notizen über Joseph Haydn*, ed. Karl-Heinz Köhler (Leipzig, 1975), 1st ed. 1810, p. 78. My translation.
16. Gerber, *Historisch-Biographisches Lexikon*, col. 610.
17. Gerber, "Eine freundliche Vorstellung über gearbeitete Instrumentalmusik, besonders über Symphonien," *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 15 (1813): 457-63.
18. Momigny, *Cours complet d'harmonie et de composition*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1805); the translation here is from Ian Bent, ed., *Music Analysis in the Nineteenth Century*, vol. 2: *Hermeneutic Approaches* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 130, 132, 133.
19. Triest, "Bemerkungen," p. 400. [See the translation in this volume.]
20. E. T. A. Hoffmann, review of Friedrich Witt, *Symphony in D Major, Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 11 (1809): 516; idem, review of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, 12 (1810): 630-642, 652-659. Both reviews are available in translation in E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Musical Writings*, ed. David Charlton (Cambridge, 1989).
21. The aesthetics of the symphonic sublime have already been well explored by a number of scholars. My account here is deeply indebted to Carl Dahlhaus, "E. T. A. Hoffmanns Beethoven-Kritik und die Ästhetik des Erhabenen," *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 39 (1981): 80-92; Nicolas Waldvogel, "The Eighteenth-Century Aesthetics of the Sublime and the Valuation of the Symphony," Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1992, chaps. 3 and 4; and Elaine R. Sisman, *Mozart: The "Jupiter" Symphony* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 13-20. For an account of Sulzer's concept of the sublime as applied to the symphonies of Beethoven, see Carl Dahlhaus, *Ludwig van Beethoven: Approaches to his Music*, trans. Mary Whittall (Oxford, 1991), pp. 67-80. See also James Webster's essay in this volume.
22. Triest, "Bemerkungen," pp. 400-1.
23. William Jackson, *Observations on the Present State of Music in London* (London, 1791), p. 23. Charles Burney's amusing review, reproduced in Landon, *Haydn Chronicle*, vol. 3, pp. 100-4, shows that Jackson's viewpoint was decidedly in the minority in his time.
24. From Horace's Odes, Book IV, no. 2. The paraphrase here is taken from Sulzer's entry on "Pindar" in the *Allgemeine Theorie*.
25. Michael Broyles, *Beethoven: The Emergence and Evolution of Beethoven's Heroic Style* (New York, 1987), chap. 1.
26. Burney, undated letter to Christian Ignatius Latrobe, quoted in David F. Schroeder, *Haydn and the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1990), p. 126.
27. *The Times*, 20 February 1792, quoted in Landon, *Haydn Chronicle*, vol. 3, p. 134.
28. Sulzer, *Allgemeine Theorie*, s.v. "Symphonie."
29. Scheibe, *Der critische Musikus*, new ed. (Leipzig, 1745), p. 620 (originally published 15 December 1739). For a more detailed discussion of Scheibe's critique of counterpoint in the symphony, see Waldvogel, "Eighteenth-Century Aesthetics," pp. 168-81.
30. Chastellux, *Essai sur l'union de la poésie & de la musique* (Paris, 1765), pp. 49-50. My translation.
31. Triest, "Bemerkungen," p. 400.
32. Francesco Galeazzi, *Elementi teorico-pratici di musica*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1796), p. 289.
33. August Friedrich Christoph Kollmann, *An Essay on Practical Musical Composition* (London, 1799), p. 17.
34. See William H. Race, *Pindar* (Boston, 1886), p. 13.
35. See Elaine R. Sisman, "Haydn's Theater Symphonies," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 43 (1990): 304-6. Wagner would later press this metaphor into service as a justification for his own theory of music drama.
36. Bernard Germain, Comte de La Cépède, *La politique de la musique*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1785), vol. 2, pp. 332-33.
37. Koch's acceptance of this image becomes all the more significant in light of the fact that he took exception to other portions of Sulzer's account of the symphony. See Carl Mennicke, *Hesse und die Brüder Grimm als Symphoniker* (Leipzig, 1906), 97-98.
38. Schubart, *Leben und Gesinnungen*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1791-1793), vol. 1, p. 211: "Es ist nicht bloß Stimmengerösch, wie der Pöbel im Aufruhr durcheinander kreischt, es ist ein musikalisches Ganzes, dessen Theil wie Geisterausflüsse wieder ein Ganzes bilden. Der Hörer wird nicht bloß betäubt, sondern von niederstürzenden, bleibenden Wirkungen erschüttert und durchdrungen." Although not published until the 1790s, Schubart dictated his memoirs in 1778-79.
39. Momigny, *Cours complet*, vol. 2, pp. 584-85.
40. See Thomas Grey, "Metaphorical Modes in Nineteenth-Century Music Criticism: Image, Narrative, and Idea," in *Music and Text: Critical Inquiries*, ed. Steven Paul Scher (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 99-103. In this regard, Berlioz's *Symphonie fantastique* and *Harold en Italie* are on one level anomalous as symphonies, for they focus on a single individual; yet on another level, they probe the gulf between those individuals and society as a whole. See my *After Beethoven: Imperatives of Originality in the Symphony* (Cambridge, Mass., 1996), chap. 2.
41. See Landon, *Haydn Chronicle*, vol. 2, p. 726; the original German is given in Landon, "Haydniana (II)," *Haydn Yearbook* 7 (1970): 317.
42. Although Schiller himself never called this poem an ode, it was widely circulated as such during his lifetime, particularly in musical settings, and Beethoven preserved this designation on the title page of the Ninth's first edition, published by B. Schotts Söhne of Mainz in 1826 (*Sinfonie mit Schluss-Chor über Schillers Ode: 'An die Freude'*).
43. Anonymous, review of two symphonies by J. Kuffner, *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 22 (1820): 273.
44. Marx, "Erwas über die Symphonie und Beethovens Leistungen in diesem Fach," *Berliner Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 1 (1824): 168. On the long-standing connection between the ode and the hymn, see Kurt Schläuter, *Die englische Ode: Studien zu ihrer Entwicklung unter dem Einfluss der antiken Hymne* (Bonn, 1954); Paul H. Fry, *The Poet's Calling in the English Ode* (New Haven, 1980), pp. 5-10; Stuart Curran, *Poetic Form and British Romanticism* (New York, 1986), chap. 4.
45. A. B. Marx, *Die Musik des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts und ihre Pflege* (Leipzig, 1855), pp. 162-63.
46. Hermann Mendel and August Reissmann, *Musikalisches Conversations-Lexikon*, vol. 10, article "Symphonie" (Berlin, 1878).
47. Cosima Wagner, *Die Tagebücher*, vol. 2, ed. Martin Gregor-Dellin and Dietrich Mack (Munich, 1977), p. 1103, entry for 30 January 1888. This idea of the symphony as a genre of communal expression would find its most eloquent exponent in the early twentieth century in the writings of the German critic and historian Paul Bekker, particularly in his *Die Symphonie von Beethoven bis Mahler* (Berlin, 1918).