

## **UC Irvine**

### **UC Irvine Previously Published Works**

**Title**

Introduction

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/52b1z48v>

**ISBN**

9781580465229

**Author**

Grimes, Nicole

**Publication Date**

2015-01-04

Peer reviewed

# Introduction

Nicole Grimes

Eduard Hanslick is celebrated today primarily for his seminal publication in the field of music aesthetics—*Vom Musikalisch-Schönen: Ein Beitrag zur Revision der Ästhetik in der Tonkunst*. Upon its initial publication in Leipzig in 1854, this small book elicited controversy and heated debate. The nine subsequent editions published throughout Hanslick’s lifetime—between 1858 and 1902<sup>1</sup>—ensured that the text remained the focus of debate on musical aesthetics well into the twentieth century.

*Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*, as Geoffrey Payzant reminds us, was directed against the aesthetics of feeling prevalent in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writings on music, and sought to “clear away the rubble of obsolete prejudices and presuppositions” and to “mark out the foundations upon which a new theory might be built.”<sup>2</sup> In writing his memoirs in the winter of his life, Hanslick acknowledged that the reception of the book was fraught with divisive reaction. He accepted some responsibility for this. Confronting directly the issue that had provoked the most controversy, and anticipating the concern that would continue to confound Hanslick scholarship, he conceded that it was misleading to speak of a “lack of content” [*Inhaltslosigkeit*] with regard to instrumental music. The fundamental issue he had tried to address was how musical form imbued with spirit [*beseelte Form*] was to be differentiated philosophically from empty form [*leere Form*].<sup>3</sup>

With a mixture of self-deprecation and self-assurance, Hanslick viewed his 1854 *Büchlein*<sup>4</sup> as little more than a sketch or foundation whose negative, polemic aspects towered above its positive, systematic ones. He felt that a comprehensive, methodical *Ästhetik der Musik* was what was required to come to terms with this fundamental issue, a task that demanded an undivided capacity for work, and complete concentration of thought.<sup>5</sup> Although Hanslick hinted at carrying out such a project in his 1861 letter of application for the position of Professor of the History and Aesthetics of Music at the University of Vienna (which he successfully secured), he became frustrated in his efforts to identify objective criteria by which to judge musical beauty and deviated from his original path, turning instead—as Kevin Karnes has recently shown—to writing a cultural and “living history” of Viennese concert life.<sup>6</sup>

It was in his capacity as a music critic for the *Neue Freie Presse*, Austria's leading liberal daily, that Hanslick was at once celebrated and feared throughout Europe for more than four decades.<sup>7</sup> From the 1860s onward, he collated his writings and began publishing volume after volume of collected criticisms, supplemented in 1894 by an extensive autobiography, *Aus meinem Leben*. These writings are as rich for their musical insights as they are for their penetrating and multifaceted exploration of the cultural, sociopolitical, and religious contexts in which the reviewed works were composed, performed, and received. Hanslick was as fascinated by the composers he critiqued and the relationship between their lives and works, as he was curious about his fellow audience in Vienna. He was writing for a well-educated, liberal-minded readership, the Viennese *Bildungsbürgertum*, who were conscious of tradition and their place within Viennese society.

Scholarship on Hanslick, from the mid-nineteenth century until recent decades, has tended to focus predominantly on the aesthetic monograph. Given the provocative nature of this text, discussion of Hanslick and musical aesthetics tends to be framed in terms of a series of binary oppositions: form/expression; absolute/program music; objectivity/subjectivity; formalism/hermeneutic criticism. In more recent years, there has been a growing recognition of the fertile middle ground that lies between such polarities, with Mark Evan Bonds having paved the way by recognizing the centrality of the spiritual and philosophical aspects of Hanslick's monograph. This is best articulated in the last paragraph, which was cut from all but the first edition:

This spiritual content thus combines, in the soul of the listener, the beautiful in music with all other great and beautiful ideas. He does not experience music merely as bare and absolute through its own beauty, but simultaneously as a sounding image of the great movements in the universe. Through deep and secret relationships to nature the meaning of tones is heightened far beyond the tones themselves, and allows us always to feel the infinite even as we listen to the work of human talent. Just as the elements of music—sound, tone, rhythm, strength, weakness—are found in the entire universe, so man rediscovers in music the entire universe.<sup>8</sup>

Bonds asserts that “the significance of this passage—and its subsequent deletion—can scarcely be overestimated. This was not merely one of many pronouncements buried deep within *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*, but rather the ringing culmination of Hanslick's entire treatise.”<sup>9</sup> Subsequently, Nicholas Cook clarified that “Hanslick did not say that music does not, cannot, or should not convey feelings, moods or emotions. . . . There should never have been any doubt as to what his basic thesis was—that the objective properties of music, rather than people's subjective responses to it, constitute the proper concern of musical aesthetics.”<sup>10</sup> Mark Burford would go one step further

by arguing that Hanslick negotiated a “middle ground between idealism and materialism.” Burford’s key insight is his claim that “in his attempt to characterize music’s essence, Hanslick did not so much reject musical metaphysics as, to a certain extent, reconceptualize it by arguing that the ideal content of music is a product of a human spirit, not a transcendent one.”<sup>11</sup>

Until very recently, however, scholarly investigation into Hanslick’s critical writings lagged far behind the advances made in research on *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*. This absence of scholarly study devoted to the critical writings is matched by the paucity of English translations of this material, with Henry Pleasants’s volume of 1950 continuing to stand alone in this regard.<sup>12</sup> Until the end of the twentieth century, Hanslick’s reviews tended to be drawn upon either in an attempt to better understand the aesthetic treatise, or as excerpts to bolster perceived views on certain composers. It is difficult to account for this disparity in the treatment of the aesthetic and critical writings in Hanslick studies, although we might do well to consider the turn that musicological writings took in West Germany and Anglo-America in the Cold War era and its aftermath.

As Celia Applegate points out, the reign of objective musical analysis and documentary studies in this period, with its emphasis on musical positivism, “meant the exclusion of what Joseph Kerman calls ‘criticism,’—that is the consideration of aesthetic criteria and extra-musical meanings in a work.”<sup>13</sup> Broadly speaking, musicology in West Germany in the Cold War years can be understood as identifying certain modes of thought (such as sociopolitical readings of musical works) as extramusical and thereby outside the concerns of musicological discussion. In this climate, music was considered to be a “socially functionless, non-authoritarian discourse.”<sup>14</sup> East German musicology during this period can be understood as “theorizing music as social discourse.”<sup>15</sup> Anne Shreffler sees the Marxist musicology of East Germany as anticipating the tenets of the North American “New Musicology” promoted by commentators such as Joseph Kerman and Lawrence Kramer. For Marxist music historians, the priority was to reconnect music with society. As Shreffler argues, “East German musicology was concerned with the need to find out how music communicates, between whom and in what contexts, how it did so in the past, what is communicated and for what purpose, and finally how the ‘message’ of a work changes, if it does, over time.”<sup>16</sup> The fact that this East German discourse was carried out under a Marxist banner meant that it could be rejected out of hand by West Germans, as they did not accept its basic premise.<sup>17</sup>

The writings from postwar, divided Germany that have had the greatest impact on Anglo-American scholarship are those of Carl Dahlhaus. As James Hepokoski reminds us, “At the heart of the Dahlhaus project was an effort to keep the Austro-German canon from Beethoven to Schoenberg free from aggressively socio-political interpretations.”<sup>18</sup> During these Cold War

years, it was “Dahlhaus’s intention to shelter the German Romantic canon”—with which Hanslick was largely preoccupied—“from ideology critique.”<sup>19</sup> Hanslick’s hermeneutic descriptions of music—be they poetic, sociopolitical, or even nationalistic—fit less comfortably in this system than a discussion of the formalist aspects of *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*.

With the end of the Cold War in 1989 came the translation of much of Dahlhaus’s output into English, and the establishment of the field of “New Musicology.” In the wake of these seismic shifts, a host of scholars were intent on finding ways in which to reconnect the Germanic repertoire of the long nineteenth century with its social context, and to forge alternatives to the Dahlhaus system. Susan McClary was one of Dahlhaus’s sharpest critics, observing a disparity in his output. In *The Idea of Absolute Music*, she writes, Dahlhaus “painstakingly delineates [a] history whereby a social discourse was appropriated and redefined first by romantic mystics and then by objectivists.” Yet in his *Nineteenth Century Music*, she claims, he continues to respect the prohibitions of that tradition of objectivity, in that “he practices only structural analysis on instrumental music and scorns those who would venture into hermeneutic studies of symphonies.”<sup>20</sup>

McClary ascribes this disparity to a philosophy that in 1993 still regulated “much of musicology, blocking all but the most formalistic approaches to criticism.”<sup>21</sup> Yet her own writings at that point continued to be regulated by the very philosophy to which she referred: on the one hand she rescues Brahms from his reputation as a composer of absolute music, and on the other she disregards Hanslick’s own hermeneutic discussion of Brahms’s compositions, instead labelling him the “chief polemicist for the absolutists.”<sup>22</sup> McClary goes one step further than Dahlhaus here: where Dahlhaus envisaged Hanslick’s concept of “absolute musical art” to be dissolved “from functions, texts, and programs as pure instrumental music,” McClary interpreted it, via Dahlhaus and Roger Scruton, to be “self-contained, innocent of social or other referential meanings.”<sup>23</sup>

Constantin Floros shared this disinclination to allow Hanslick’s writings be understood and interpreted on their own terms. The hermeneutic bent of Floros’s writings is all the more pronounced when pitted against Hanslick’s “doctrine of Brahms as a prototype of the ‘absolute’ musician.”<sup>24</sup> Floros charges Hanslick with “simply ignor[ing] the considerable share of the poetic and autobiographic in the work of [Brahms].”<sup>25</sup> Although Anne Shreffler’s analysis of East and West German musicological writings during the Cold War is sharp and lucid, she too promotes only a formalist reading of Hanslick’s aesthetic output, grouping him with a number of German theorists who have little in common with Hanslick’s critical oeuvre: “From Hanslick to Riemann, many theorists, including Schenker, have sought to reduce the content of music to the relationships between notes, labelling its expressive content as something ‘external.’”<sup>26</sup> The trajectory of Hanslick studies in the late twentieth and early

twenty-first century, therefore, is such that it charts Hanslick from being the opponent of program music, to being opposed to extramusical adjuncts, to one who conceives of music being hermetically sealed off from its expressive content and cultural context.

Winding the clock back three decades to Patricia Carpenter, a former pupil of Schoenberg, hers seems like a lone—if sage—voice in the wilderness. She is one of the few critics of *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* to recognize both Hanslick's intellectual debt to German Idealism and the expressive resonance of his book in her warning that "inconsistencies in Hanslick's dogma are enhanced if it is forced into a formalist mold; for him, art is expressional. Music is mere form, but not only form; it is also expressive of musical ideas."<sup>27</sup>

*Rethinking Hanslick: Music, Formalism, and Expression* introduces a paradigm shift to Hanslick studies. Taking its cue from Carpenter, it aims to redress the manifold misreadings of Hanslick outlined above. Such an approach would not be possible without the pioneering work of a number of scholars over the past three decades. Geoffrey Payzant has had a profound impact on how we understand Hanslick's thought, both through his revised translation of *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* and in his numerous essays.<sup>28</sup> Dietmar Strauß continues apace with the crucial task of publishing the *Sämtliche Schriften*, which follows on his pivotal publication of a scholarly, annotated edition of the aesthetic monograph.<sup>29</sup> Without this vital endeavor, current Hanslick scholarship would be severely impoverished. David Brodbeck's analysis of the nuances and complexities of liberalism in Vienna in the closing decades of the nineteenth century is incisive, and his teasing out of changing conceptions of German identity, from something rooted in culture to something rooted in ethnicity, provides a much-needed critical frame of reference for future studies related not only to Hanslick, but also to a range of German and Czech artists.<sup>30</sup> Kevin C. Karnes's 2009 monograph gives cogent consideration to Hanslick's role in the formative stages of the discipline of musicology in *fin-de-siècle* Vienna, a topic that is profitably taken up again in Nicholas Cook's *The Schenker Project*.

The present volume aims to build on the scholarship published in recent years, and to forge an avenue in Hanslick studies that considers not only his aesthetic monograph, but also the critical and autobiographical writings. The essays contained in this volume embrace ways of thinking about Hanslick's writings that are outside of the polarities that marked earlier discussion of his work. This book encompasses the variety of political, cultural, social, and musical issues that may have influenced Hanslick's aesthetic judgment; it seeks to investigate how Hanslick's critical writings document aspects of the changing social context of *fin-de-siècle* Vienna; it probes the nature of the relationship between Hanslick's critical writings and his aesthetic theory; it examines the extent to which Hanslick reveres expression in music; and it traces the legacy of nineteenth-century German philosophy in his critical writings.

The essays in this volume are arranged thematically. Part 1 analyses Hanslick's rules of engagement with a musical work. James Deaville conducts an investigation into the reception history of Hanslick's aesthetic and critical writings, providing a comprehensive assessment of Hanslick's changing role as a music critic and aesthete in German-speaking Europe from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. Fred Everett Maus negotiates the intricacies of Hanslick's complex theories on the art of listening by comparing Hanslick's approach in the 1854 monograph to that in his critical writings, arguing for a fourfold relation between composer, music, Hanslick as listener, and the reader of his essay. Felix Wörner's close analysis of the 1877 response to *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* by Ottakar Hostinský is one of the first English-language considerations of the work of this important figure. Wörner attempts to reconcile Hanslick's position concerning the beautiful in music with Richard Wagner's concept of the "Gesamtkunstwerk," and Hostinský's concomitant attempt to reshape the dichotomy between form and content in music. Anthony Pryer broaches the ontological quagmire surrounding the concepts of form and content in music by assessing the influence Hanslick's legal training had on his aesthetic judgment, concluding that this training impinged strongly on Hanslick's views about what might be counted as admissible evidence in a debate on musical beauty.

Part 2 is concerned with issues surrounding liberalism in Vienna and the shifting goalposts of societal order. Margaret Notley has described elsewhere the basic aspects of the liberal worldview as "pro-German sentiment, antagonism toward the Catholic Church, and profound distrust of anti-intellectual trends."<sup>31</sup> Viennese liberalism also shared common traits with European liberalism of the time such as a belief in progress and the promotion of scientific methods.<sup>32</sup> Hanslick, Brahms, Theodor Billroth, Max Kalbeck, and Gustav Dömpke were among the intellectual elite of Viennese liberalism, with Hanslick and Ludwig Speidel serving as music and theatre critics respectively for the *Neue Freie Presse*. In their writings, these figures both constituted and contested liberalism, each providing their own individualized response to it. This section teases out the nature of Hanslick's response in this regard. Both Dana Gooley and Chantal Frankenbach explore the role of dance in Hanslick's aesthetics in relation to his liberal outlook. Gooley embarks on an exploration of the overlap between art-genre, social hierarchy, and liberal ideology in Hanslick's reviews and essays on Johann Strauss Jr. (Strauss II), whose compositional trajectory both mirrors and challenges the liberal ideology that underpins Hanslick's criticism. Chantal Frankenbach's discussion of Hanslick's response to dance forms and their changing generic designations extends beyond the Strauss family to the work of Johannes Brahms. She juxtaposes Hanslick's attitude to dance in *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* and in the critical writings, uncovering incongruous attitudes on women, the relationship between pleasure and reason, and the triumph of appearance over reality, all of which she sets against the backdrop of Vienna as a *fin-de-siècle* city of paradoxes. David



Brodbeck and Nicole Grimes both investigate Hanslick's reviews of the composers who inhabited the same German liberal circles as the critic in Vienna. Brodbeck explores Goldmark's reception by Hanslick across a range of genres. In particular, he considers the issue of "Jewish Orientalisms" in Goldmark's music, which made it difficult for Hanslick, at times, to hear the composer's music as fully German, as the output of one who was fully acculturated. Brodbeck offers us a means of understanding the paradox created when one German liberal describes the music of another in terms of non-German ethnic essentialism. Grimes turns to Hanslick's writings on Brahms, the composer he considered to be quintessentially German. She suggests that it was their shared German liberal values that made Hanslick amenable to understanding the cultural, religious, and political context of Brahms's "musical elegies," a group of works composed between 1868 and 1883—a period coinciding with the ascendancy of a modern form of liberalism in Vienna—that are intimately connected to the turn-of-the-century New Humanism espoused by a group of early nineteenth-century German poets including Goethe, Schiller, and Hölderlin.

Issues of Germanness and *Bildung* extend to literary, gender, and social contexts in Part 3. Here, the merits of Hanslick's autobiography—which has too often been read solely for its personalized impressions of individual composers—are reassessed by Lauren Freede in relation to their rich cultural context. In describing the cultural life around him in nineteenth-century Vienna, Hanslick was also describing the process whereby a national view of music developed that married a belief in music as sublime and apolitical with the conviction that it simultaneously manifests a politically constructed nation. Freede argues, therefore, that Hanslick's *Aus meinem Leben* contributes to a wider dialogue about the centrality of music to Austro-German society, and charges Hanslick with recognizing the contribution of music toward the establishment of a national identity and culture. Bound up with this is a social discourse on gender. Marion Gerards contends that the movement for women's emancipation was one of the most socially and politically rousing topics debated in Vienna in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Although Hanslick never overtly acknowledged this movement in his writings, Gerards suggests that the pervasiveness of these debates was such that they impacted on writings and reflections on music, and went hand in hand with a controversial discussion about "natural" gender qualities. She explores Hanslick's understanding of music in the context of this social discourse, and examines the implications this had for his position on the role of music in the nation. Nina Noeske focuses her analysis of Hanslick's gender designations on the organism metaphor. As such, she addresses the broader question of the metaphorical connections between the "healthy" and the "unhealthy" organism in writings on music. Noeske argues that Hanslick viewed the musically beautiful as a healthy—and preferably male—organism, and understood physicality and feelings to be feminine attributes. She shows that, according to Hanslick, it is



not only women who are less well suited to genuine artistic activity (on account of their naturally weaker constitution), but also the representatives of the so-called New German School.

While Hanslick is today best remembered for his role in the aesthetic struggles around the “New German School”—particularly concerning Liszt, Wagner and Brahms—his career as a critic spanned more than half a century. He lived well into the Viennese *fin-de-siècle* with its explosive mixture of grandeur and decadence, encountering a younger generation of composers. This period of Hanslick’s life, which has hitherto received scant attention, is addressed in Part 4. Timothy R. McKinney explores the reciprocal, if fraught, relationship that existed between Hanslick and Hugo Wolf, who both pursued careers as critics and composers. McKinney takes as the centerpiece of his study Wolf’s setting of Eduard Mörike’s *Abschied*—an irony-soaked account of an encounter between artist and critic—and traces the interaction between the critical mood of the authorial voice (Wolf’s) and the voice of the critic (Hanslick’s). David Larkin turns to the compositions of Richard Strauss and Dvořák who, partly by renewing the genre of program music, prompted a return to Hanslick’s earlier critical battlefields. Theorizing Hanslick’s response to program music, Larkin considers the disparity in Hanslick’s responses not only to the work of these two composers, but also to their various categories of program music. Ultimately, it is the treatment of tonal syntax that Larkin deems to be central to Hanslick’s judgment of their symphonic poems. By comparison, David Kasunic finds that Hanslick treated his one-time student Gustav Mahler’s early music with surprisingly indulgent consternation. Although Mahler would seem an unlikely candidate for Hanslick’s critical forbearance, Kasunic reveals that in his reviews of Mahler’s orchestral songs and First Symphony in 1900, Hanslick grapples with the aesthetic, generic, and formal challenges that these works pose, rather than dismissing them out of hand. He argues that Hanslick sought to carve out a distinctly non-Wagnerian aesthetic space for Mahler, and explores the kinship of composer and critic in the context of the anti-Semitic outbursts in Vienna around 1900.

Together these essays speak to the significance of Hanslick’s contribution not only to studies in music, but also to the aesthetics and philosophy of music, as well as looking anew at broader sociopolitical issues. It is hoped that the volume will provide readers with an engaging and deepened understanding of the work of this powerful figure in nineteenth-century musical life. Geoffrey Payzant wrote with wonderful wit of the categories of creatures whose response to music Hanslick considered to be inadequate. These included “elephants, spiders, enthusiasts, women and Italians.”<sup>33</sup> As was the case with Hanslick’s output, *Rethinking Hanslick: Music, Formalism, and Expression* proposes to challenge and provoke, yet also to enrich and enlighten. It is aimed at audiences and listeners, readers and thinkers, connoisseurs and amateurs. In the spirit of Hanslick, we encourage all who read these pages to take leave of the company

of elephants and spiders and, along with the authors contained herein, “to be agreeably led astray.”<sup>34</sup>

### Notes

1. For full details of the various editions, and a definitive version of the text that collates all of the changes, see Eduard Hanslick, *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen: Ein Beitrag zur Revision der Ästhetik der Tonkunst*, vol. 1, ed. Dietmar Strauß (Mainz: Schott, 1990) (hereafter cited as *VMS*).

2. Geoffrey Payzant, “Translator’s Preface,” in Eduard Hanslick, *On the Musically Beautiful*, trans. Geoffrey Payzant (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1986), xiii (hereafter cited as *OMB*).

3. “Das Wesen der Musik ist aber noch schwerer in philosophische Kategorien zu bannen als das der Malerei, weil die entscheidenden Begriffe ‘Form’ und ‘Inhalt’ in der Musik nicht standhalten wollen, der Trennung sich widersetzen. Will man der reinen Instrumentalmusik einen bestimmten Inhalt vindizieren, (—in der Vokalmusik liefert ihn das Gedicht und nicht die Musik—) so müßte man die kostbarsten Perlen der Tonkunst über Bord werfen, denen niemand einen von der Form trennbaren ‘Inhalt’ nachzuweisen oder auch nur herauszufühlen vermag. Andererseits ist es, wie ich wohl einsehe, ein mißverständlich Ding schlechtweg von der ‘Inhaltlosigkeit’ der Instrumentalmusik zu sprechen, was auch meiner Schrift die meisten Gegner erweckt hat. Wie ist in der Musik beseelte Form von leerer Form wissenschaftlich zu unterscheiden?” Eduard Hanslick, *Aus meinem Leben*, ed. and with an afterword by Peter Wapnewski (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1987), 155 (hereafter cited as *AML/W*).

4. *Ibid.*, 150.

5. “Ich hatte natürlich die Absicht, meine Abhandlung ‘Vom Musikalisch-Schönen’ mit der Zeit zu einer eigentlichen Ästhetik der Tonkunst zu erweitern und auszuführen. Daß jene Schrift nur eine Art Skizze oder Unterbau bedeute, war mir ebenso klar, als daß ihr negativer polemischer Teil den positiven, systematischen an Umfang und Schärfe überrage. Aber eine vollständige, systematische Ästhetik der Musik—das ist ein Unternehmen, welches ungeteilte Arbeitskraft und unzersplitterte Konzentration des Denkens erfordert.” *Ibid.*, 153.

6. For details, see Kevin C. Karnes, *Music, Criticism, and the Challenge of History: Shaping Modern Musical Thought in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 58.

7. Although Hanslick resigned from the *Neue Freie Presse* in 1895, he wrote occasional reviews right up until the time of his death.

8. “Dieser geistige Gehalt verbindet nun auch im Gemüth des Hörers das Schöne der Tonkunst mit allen andern großen und schönen Ideen. Ihm wirkt die Musik nicht bloß und absolut durch ihre eigenste Schönheit, sondern zugleich als tönendes Abbild der großen Bewegungen im Weltall. Durch tiefe und geheime Naturbeziehungen steigert sich die Bedeutung der Töne hoch über sie selbst hinaus und läßt uns in dem Werke menschlichen Talents immer zugleich das Unendliche fühlen. Da die Elemente der Musik: Schall, Ton, Rhythmus, Stärke, Schwäche im ganzen Universum sich finden, so findet der Mensch wieder in der Musik das ganze Universum.” Hanslick, *VMS*, 171. Cited in Dahlhaus, *The Idea of Absolute Music*, trans. Roger Lustig (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 28.

9. Mark Evan Bonds, "Idealism and the Aesthetics of Instrumental Music at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 50, nos. 2–3 (1997): 415. See also, Bonds, *Music as Thought: Listening to the Symphony in the Age of Beethoven* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

10. Nicholas Cook, *The Schenker Project: Culture, Race and Music Theory in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 50. Along similar lines, see Charles Youmans, *Richard Strauss's Orchestral Music and the German Intellectual Tradition: The Philosophical Roots of Musical Modernism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 11.

11. Hanslick, *VMS*, 171.

12. Eduard Hanslick, *Vienna's Golden Years of Music*, trans. Henry Pleasants (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950).

13. Celia Applegate, "What Is German Music? Reflections on the Role of Art in the Creation of the Nation," *German Studies Review* 15 (1992): 21–32.

14. James Hepokoski, "The Dahlhaus Project and Its Extra-Musicological Sources," *19th-Century Music* 14, no. 3 (1991): 222.

15. Anne Shreffler, "Berlin Walls: Dahlhaus, Knepler, and Ideologies of Music History," *Journal of Musicology* 20, no. 4 (2003): 500.

16. *Ibid.*, 504.

17. *Ibid.*

18. Hepokoski, "The Dahlhaus Project," 222.

19. *Ibid.*, 225.

20. Susan McClary, "Narrative Agendas in 'Absolute' Music: Identity and Difference in Brahms's Third Symphony," in *Musicology and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship*, ed. Ruth Solie (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 327–28.

21. *Ibid.*, 327.

22. *Ibid.*

23. *Ibid.* McClary acknowledges Dahlhaus here, and not Scruton, although her conception of "absolute music" has much in common with the latter. For an excellent analysis of the use of the term "absolute music" throughout music history, and of the disproportionate weight that has been attached to this term in relation to Hanslick's writings, see Sanna Pederson, "Defining the Term 'Absolute Music' Historically," *Music and Letters* 90, no. 2 (2009): 240–62.

24. Constantin Floros, *Johannes Brahms, "Free but Alone—A Life for a Poetic Music"* trans. Ernest Bernhardt-Kabisch (Frankfurt/M: Peter Lang, 2010), 202.

25. *Ibid.*

26. Shreffler, "Berlin Walls," 513–14. The suggestion that Hanslick was a theorist crops up again in McClary's *Conventional Wisdom*, where she writes, "Theorists since the nineteenth-century critic Eduard Hanslick have generally solved the split [between the question of form versus content] by redefining everything as structure—thus the institutional prestige of our graphs, charts, and quasi-mathematical explanations of music." Susan McClary, *Conventional Wisdom: The Content of Musical Form* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 6.

27. Patricia Carpenter, "Musical Form and Musical Idea: Reflections on a Theme of Schoenberg, Hanslick, and Kant," in *Music and Civilization: Essays in Honor of Paul Henry Lang*, ed. Edmond Strainchamps and Maria Rika Maniates in collaboration with Christopher Hatch (New York: Norton, 1984), 408.

28. In addition to *OMB*, see Geoffrey Payzant, "Hanslick, Sams and Gay, and 'Tönend Bewegte Formen,'" *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 40, no. 1 (1981): 41–48; "Hanslick, Heine and the 'Moral' Effects of Music," *Music Review* 49, no. 2 (1988): 126–33;

“Hanslick on Music as Product of Feeling,” *Journal of Musicological Research* 9, no. 2–3 (1989): 133–45; *Eduard Hanslick and Ritter Berlioz in Prague: A Documentary Narrative* (Calgary, AB: University of Calgary Press, 1991); *Hanslick on the Musically Beautiful: Sixteen Lectures on the Music Aesthetics of Eduard Hanslick* (Christchurch, NZ: Cybereditions, 2002).

29. The publication of the critical writings is an ongoing project with Böhlau in Vienna. See the list of abbreviations at the outset of this book for details of the volumes available at the time of writing. Strauß’s edition of *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* is referred to as *VMS* throughout this volume. His second volume, charting the historic-critical response to it, is referred to as Strauß, *VMS/2*.

30. See David Brodbeck, “Dvořák’s Reception in Liberal Vienna: Language Ordinances, National Property, and the Rhetoric of *Deutschtum*,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 60, no. 1 (2007): 71–132; and “Hanslick’s Smetana and Hanslick’s Prague,” *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 134, no. 1 (2009): 1–36.

31. Margaret Notley, *Lateness and Brahms: Music and Culture in the Twilight of Viennese Liberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 15.

32. *Ibid.*, 16–17. See also Carl Schorske, “Politics and the Psyche: Schnitzler and Hofmannsthal,” in *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), 5–10.

33. Geoffrey Payzant, “Elephants, Spiders, Enthusiasts, Women and Italians: Some Byways of Hanslick Research (1982),” in *Sixteen Lectures on the Musical Aesthetics of Eduard Hanslick* (Christchurch, NZ: Cybereditions, 2003), 17–27. Payzant’s list refers broadly to those whom Hanslick considered to respond pathologically, as opposed to intellectually, to music. As many of the essays in this volume attest, we do not endorse Hanslick’s inclusion of the last two categories in this list.

34. *OMB*, 64.