Hambridge, Katherine. “Catching Up and Getting Ahead: The Opera House as Temple of Art in Berlin c. 1800”. In *The Oxford Handbook of the Operatic Canon*. Edited by Cormac Newark and William Weber. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

The anomaly of eighteenth-century operatic life in Berlin during the reign of Friedrich II (Frederick the Great, r. 1740–1786) is by now a classic example of early canonic practices. As John Mangum has detailed in his essay in the present volume, the king’s patronage of a very small group of composers (in particular, Carl Heinrich Graun and Johann Adolph Hasse for *opera seria*), and his perpetuation of their music in performance even after the composers’ deaths or departures from the court was a highly unusual manifestation of the monarchical use of culture for display and communication: instead of spectacular novelty, aging uniformity – or, as Christoph Henzel calls it, the *Berliner Klassik*.[1] This Prussian peculiarity left a distinctive mark on musical practice and discourse in the city, even after the king’s death; the resonances of Friedrich II’s reign could still be heard at the turn of the century as, two Friedrichs later, Berliners self-conciously reflected on their city’s operatic present and future.

The influx of new operatic repertory from abroad following the establishment of the Nationaltheater in 1786 by Friedrich Wilhelm II (for German-language theater, including translations) only increased as the Parisian theater scene expanded and developed in the wake of the French Revolution. The organization of genres and theaters in Berlin, however, remained constant until 1806. Friedrich Wilhelm III, crowned in 1797, chose to maintain the tradition of *opera seria* at the Unter den Linden Opernhaus for the Carnival season only (mid-December to the end of January); tickets were free but almost all of them were distributed to the nobility, military and high-ranking administrators. The Nationaltheater, meanwhile, hosted everything else all year round for paying audiences: a wide range of

This is not the final version

genres and vintages, from Christoph Willibald Gluck's opera *Iphigenia in Tauris* (the German translation of *Iphigénie en Tauride*, 1779) to Pierre Gardel's pantomime farce *Die Tanzsucht* (originally *La dansomanie*, 1800). This state of affairs was discussed with some anxiety by music critics: as a legacy of Friedrich II's policies, they thought, the city had continued to lag behind theatrical developments in other European capitals, with audience taste curiously polarized between old and new, and the theatrical infrastructure unsuited to guiding the assessment of new repertory's worth.[2]

Several strands of this anxious discussion about the state of Berlin's operatic landscape had significant canonic implications. First, in response to the arrival of contemporary works after the death of Friedrich II, the repertory associated with the monarch was subject to a new aging process: critics attempted to redefine its status and value as relative and historical, rather than universal, and to move their aesthetic criteria beyond the court's previous conservatism. This in turn motivated the anointing of a new (old) operatic model: Gluck, whose operas arrived in Berlin from Paris and Vienna on average 23 years "late," having been forbidden at Friedrich II's court.[3] Lastly, music critics speculated about the best way of organizing repertory and institutions to maintain works of enduring value in performance. Following slightly circular reasoning, this was both to allow audiences to discern worth and, once it had been discerned, to preserve the "worthy" works from the pollution of ephemeral stage pieces. These discursive interventions and tendencies in Berlin revealingly foreground the changing dynamic between monarchical authority, audience taste, institutional structures, commercialism, and the role of the critic in the early nineteenth century; as a direct consequence of Berlin's "behindness," I will argue, the city's critics expressed a precocious desire to create an operatic canon.

Facing the past

This is not the final version

Berlin's musical "behindness" was diagnosed for the readership of the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* (*AMZ*) in 1800 in a well-known letter "Über den Zustand der Musik in Berlin" ["On the situation of music in Berlin"]. Remarking on the difficulty of describing a city so full of contradictions, the anonymous writer judged it to be "vielleicht der einzige Ort in Deutschland, in welchem Sie noch immer, neben den wärmsten Verehrern der modernen Musik, die eifrigsten Verfechter des ältern Geschmacks finden" ["perhaps the only place in Germany in which one still finds, alongside the warmest admirers of modern music, the most zealous champions of the old taste"]. The opposition between partisans of the old and the new was not itself uncommon, but the *AMZ* correspondent, apparently himself a Berliner, suggested that it was necessary to go back 20 to 30 years to explain why it was particularly pronounced in Berlin: Friedrich "der Grosse" had directed taste so singularly through the performance of operas by Graun and Hasse "dass ihr Einfluss noch jetzt sehr sichtbar bleibt" ["that their influence remains very apparent even now"].[4] The presence of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach and theorists such as Johann Philipp Kirnberger and Carl Friedrich Christian Fasch apparently contributed to the phenomenon; new developments in Vienna and other German lands were ignored by the court until the change of monarch, when the new repertory – here exemplified by Gluck, Johann Gottlieb Naumann, Johann Friedrich Reichardt, Mozart and Salieri – became fashionable. The result, the correspondent concluded, was that while Berlin could claim to be Germany's first city with respect to the Enlightenment, it was "in Hinsicht auf Musik noch etwas zurück" ["from the perspective of music still rather behind"].[5]

Friedrich II's tastes had not dictated everything that went on in the city, of course; the growing salon and concert culture was more responsive to fashion, and, as Mangum has shown, new stage repertory reached Berlin through touring companies. Indeed, Matthias Röder has suggested that it was partly to distinguish himself from this growing commercial, novelty-oriented musical sphere that Friedrich maintained his pre-existing repertory of *opera*

This is not the final version

seria later in his reign. The perpetuation of old repertory at court, however, also perpetuated its status within public culture, given that many sought to imitate court life to garner prestige. And this had lasting effects: Friedrich's promotion of non-contemporary repertory prefigured "the notion that – in order to be a cultured member of society – one would have to have a knowledge of music of past decades":[6] hence the continuing interest in the music of J. S. Bach noted by the *AMZ* correspondent, and cultivated by performances in salons and at the Singakademie.[7]

Five years after the *AMZ* letter, the effects of Frederician conservatism were also remarked on by Reichardt, who had worked as Kapellmeister from 1775 until 1794. In his opening article for the *Berlinische Musikalische Zeitung*, he identified the "Einseitigkeit" ["partiality"] that the king had cultivated, and which became characteristic of Berlin musical life, as the "Schule des reinen Satzes und des ernsten Styls" ["school of the pure phrase and serious style"] of the Bachs, the Grauns, the Bendas, Fasch and Quantz, as well as the theories developed by Kirnberger, Marpurg, Agricola and Krause. In Reichardt's account, this had been succeeded by "Italian" operas by himself, Bertoni, Naumann, Alessandri, Gluck, Righini and Himmel, and a range of "Romantic" instrumental works – advances that challenged Berlin's music critics "den erweiterten Gesichtspunct aufzuhellen, und die oft bunt durcheinander laufenden Genres zu fixiren" ["to shed light upon the broadened perspective, and to pin down the genres, which often blended into each other in motley fashion"].[8]

Both Reichardt's and the *AMZ* writer's accounts portray a city in the process of transition, of adjusting to a norm abstracted from other urban centres. This appears to have involved both an adjustment to new repertory, and a repositioning in relation to the old. The prestige of the repertory associated with Friedrich II did not disappear overnight: that is evident in the delicacy with which the two articles approach the subject. Indeed, Graun and

This is not the final version

Hasse were retained as aesthetic models long after their works (already longer-lived than their authors) disappeared from the stage. As Henzel has shown, Graun was enshrined in the new curtain at the Opernhaus in 1788, along with Sophocles, Euripides, Seneca, Shakespeare and Metastasio, even though his works were no longer performed there; likewise, he was described in Ernst Ludwig Gerber's lexicon of composers in 1790 as "the model of a classical composer;"[9] Graun's works seem to have been preserved for even longer in a pedagogical canon.[10] But there was one composer from the Frederician coalescence identified by Reichardt whose musico-theatrical works were still produced in Berlin. While Graun and Hasse's *opere serie* were consigned to the library, Georg Benda's German-language *Singspiele* and melodramas continued to be performed at the Nationaltheater, and this survival in performance prompted critics to confront the aging of the musical style.

Benda (1722–1795) had never been a court composer for Friedrich II, but held a position as violinist in the monarch's *Kapelle* between 1742 and 1750; his brother Franz served the king as a violinist from 1733 until his death in 1786. Benda's career was largely spent at Gotha (1750–1778), and his stage works arrived in Berlin with the touring troupes of Heinrich Gottfried Koch and Carl Theophil Döbbelin at the Theater in der Behrenstraße: the melodramas *Ariadne auf Naxos* and *Medea* in 1776; and the *Singspiele Der Jahrmarkt*, *Julie und Romeo* and *Walder* in 1778, 1779 and 1780 respectively. *Walder* appears never to have been repeated, but the four other works remained in the repertory at the Nationaltheater into the second decade of the nineteenth century. The melodramas were especially useful as vehicles for star performers, whether local or visiting, as they were largely performed by one actor: Benda's *Pygmalion* (1779), for example, recevied its Berlin premiere in 1797 to showcase the talents of the Nationaltheater's director, August Wilhelm Iffland, who would give 24 performances of it in the city until his death in 1814.[11]

This is not the final version

The continued survival of these throwbacks to the time of Friedrich II – with whom Benda was associated stylistically as well as temporally by Reichardt – was increasingly seen as anachronistic.[12] A performance of *Pygmalion* in January 1805, for example, prompted the *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung* reviewer to call for a new musical setting, because "Wir sind seit Benda ziemlich fortgeschritten" ["We have progressed somewhat since Benda"].[13] At the end of the year, Julius von Voss dwelt more extensively on the aging of Benda's *Ariadne* in the same journal, on the occasion of a guest performance by the Dresden actress Madame Hartwig:

> Es kann in einer Zeit ein Kunstwerk mit Recht berühmt seyn und in einer andern mit Recht als unbedeutend betrachtet werden. Es kommt dabei auf die Fortschritte an, welche die Kunst selbst in der zwischenliegenden Periode machte. Vorzüglich gilt das von der Musik, der eilendsten unter ihren Schwestern […] Dreißig Jahre, die Benda's Ariadne zählt, werden hier demnach schon ein wesentlicher Zeitraum.[14]
>
> [It is possible for an artwork to be justifiably famous in one age – and in another justifiably to be considered insignificant. It depends on the progress that the art itself has made in the intervening period. That applies to music particularly, who among her sisters hurries the most […] The thirty years that Benda's *Ariadne* has lasted are therefore already a significant period.]

To Voss, *Ariadne*'s age showed in Benda's use of "trivial" tone-painting effects (such as roaring lions and beating hearts) and in the absence of the variety and expression of more

This is not the final version

recent music. Only the harmonic effects, which he significantly described as "auf bleibendere Gesetze gestützt" ["built on more lasting laws"], retained their power.

Voss's extreme sensitivity to the historical contingency of compositional styles and value judgments might point to an emerging historicist mindset. Certainly, a comparable awareness of historical origin began to be used by critics to argue in *favor* of retaining older works in performance. When Benda's *Julie und Romeo* (1776) – "ein altes ächtes deutsches Kunstwerk" ["an old, genuine, German work of Art"] – was performed at the Nationaltheater in 1804 after an absence of four years, the Berlin correspondent for the *Zeitung für die Elegante Welt* reported audience enthusiasm and set the dated aspects of the "Erscheinung" ["apparition"] against its historic importance:

> Seine Ariadne und Medea sind unsterbliche Werke, und einzig in ihrer Art, denen oben benannte Oper dreist an die Seite gesetzt werden darf. Er war einer der ersten deutschen Komponisten, der schon mit so vieler Wirkung die Blasinstrumente anwandte, und sich bestrebte, den Dichter durch seine rührende Melodien und seinen kräftigen starken Ausdruck treu wiederzugeben […] Hat sich auch der Künstler in seinen Werken hier und da zu sehr den gebräuchlichen Formen seiner Zeit angeschmiegt […] so bedenke man, daß er einer der Ersten deutschen Theaterkomponisten war, und stelle das große Meisterhafte diesen Flecken entgegen.[15]
>
> [His *Ariadne* and *Medea* are immortal works, unique among their kind, and the above-named opera may be ranked alongside them with confidence. He was one of the first German composers who used wind instruments to such effect, and who strived to render truly the poet through his moving melodies and his

This is not the final version

> powerfully strong expression […] if the artist has also clung excessively to the common forms of his time here and there in his works […] one should keep in mind that he was the one of the first German theater composers and his shortcomings should be weighed against his mastery.]

Benda's continuing prestige on account of his historical significance, in this case for a reviewer at a journal covering the varied interests of "fashionable" society, also emerges from reviews of the 1806 performance of *Das Blumenmädchen* by Friedrich Rochlitz and Friedrich Benda (son of Georg's brother Franz): Friedrich Benda is aggrandized by the honor accorded to the older Benda brothers and their association with the court of Frederick the Great, with *Julie und Romeo* described as "musterhaft" ["exemplary"], and his own composition as a perpetuation of the Kirnbergerian "reinen Satz" ["pure style"].[16]

The explicit association with the era of Frederick the Great, and the importance of Georg Benda to narratives of German and Prussian music history seemed thus for a time to outweigh the anachronism of the musical language. The vocabulary of "immortality" was increasingly used with a sense of historical relativity, with pieces valued for their importance as national heritage (with "national" used for both German and Prussian), rather than for their timeless aesthetic worth.[17] When singer Gertrud Elisabeth Mara gave a concert in Berlin in 1803, she played to the local significance of Frederician music programming the aria "Mi paventi il figlio indegno" from Graun's *Britannico* (1751).[18] Naturally, however, such musical memorialization had its limits. The justification of the survival of Benda's works, or the brief revival of a Graun aria, contrasts sharply with the dismissal of a French piece previously performed during Frederick's reign: *Die drey Pächter* (music by Nicolas Dezède) was in 1809 "zu veraltet, um viel zu interessiren" ["too old-fashioned to be of interest"].[19]

This is not the final version

Nevertheless, *Der Jahrmarkt* received its last performance in 1809;[20] *Julie und Romeo* in 1819. *Pygmalion* received another 15 performances before giving up the ghost in 1835; after over ten years' absence, *Medea* and *Ariadne* were revived in Berlin one last time in 1832 and 1833, in response to new arrangements by one Herr Ritter von Stengel in Munich.[21] In 1839, the *Preußische Provinzial-Blätter* described them in 1839 as "vergessen" ["forgotten"].[22] Benda's prestige as a founding father of German opera, a member of the Prussian school surrounding Frederick the Great, and an exponent of the "reinen Satz" continued to keep his name alive within scholarly circles, but could not support the performance of his musico-theatrical works.[23]

Renewing the canon

If the appreciation of older stage music became nuanced with a sense of relative or historical significance, that is not to say that the idea of timeless and universal aesthetic standards was no longer applied to older works still performed. In Berlin around 1800 this was true above all for Gluck's operas.[24] In 1798, the *Jahrbücher der Preußischen Monarchie* held Gluck's *Iphigénie en Tauride* to represent the pinnacle of operatic achievement, stating that "so lange Glucks *Iphigenie*, Shakespears *Hamlet* und *Lear* und Lessings *Minna* sich noch auf der Bühne zeigen, sind Oper, Tragödie und Lustspiel gerettet" ["as long as Gluck's *Iphigénie*, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and *Lear* and Lessing's *Minna* appear on the stage, then opera, tragedy and comedy are saved"].[25] The appearance of a piano reduction of Gluck's *Iphigenia in Tauris* in 1812 was greeted no less hyperbolically by the *Zeitung für die Elegante Welt*, which described it as an "ewig klassisch bleibenden Meisterwerke" ["a masterpiece that remains eternally classical"].[26]

As both Reichardt and the *AMZ* correspondent suggested in their accounts of Berlin in 1805 and 1800 respectively, Gluck was a late arrival in Berlin, having been rejected by

This is not the final version

Friedrich II. His earliest introduction to the city came at the hands of music professionals rather than the court, in three French-language concert performances of *Iphigénie en Tauride*, *Iphigénie en Aulide* and *Alceste*, organised by Johann Carl Friedrich Rellstab across 1787–1788. A German concert performance of *Iphigenia in Tauris* followed in 1795, in the series of "Liebhaber-Konzerte" organised by Ernst Benda and Carl Ludwig Bachmann, with a staged performance in German at the Nationaltheater the same year; it took another decade before Berlin saw German-language performances of *Armide* (1805), *Orpheus und Euridice* (1808), and *Iphigenia in Aulis* (1809). The Opernhaus, meanwhile, produced the Viennese version of *Alceste* in 1796 and 1804 as part of the Carnival *opera seria* performances. The delay in staged performances, even after the death of Friedrich II, Henzel has suggested, was down to the lack of suitable singers at both houses; at the same time, it is clear that Gluck was no particular priority for the new king.[27]

Gluck does seem to have been a priority for music critics and professionals, however. In addition to organising concert performances, eminent Berliners such as Karl Spazier, Rellstab, Carl Zelter and Reichardt published articles and pamphlets in support of Gluck, and arguing for his significance for Berlin. The Bohemian Gluck was thought to offer an alternative to the outdated Graun and Hasse operatic tradition, and one, moreover, that could be appropriated for the local and national problem of German(-language) opera.[28]

The suitability of Gluck's works as "grosse deutsche Oper" rested on the familiar double-edged sword of German musical nationalism.[29] One the one hand, his operas were increasingly celebrated as part of a national tradition. The first Nationaltheater performance of a Gluck opera (*Iphigenia in Tauris*) was greeted with the gratitude of the *Vossische Zeitung* for showing that "Germany" too could have a national opera;[30] by the poorly attended 1808 premiere of *Orpheus und Euridice*, the tone was even more ecstatic, with the opera heralded as one of several "Monumente deutscher Kunst" ["monuments of German

This is not the final version

art"] by "der deutsche Orpheus Gluck" [Gluck the German Orpheus"], and performed as a memorial to the "Andenken dieses großen deutschen Künstlers" ["memory of this great German artist"].[31] On the other hand, according to the critics, Gluck's superiority as a German artist owed much to the way he had avoided the limitations of national styles by a universalizing synthesis: not only of Italian and French opera, but also of German chararacteristics, whether German instrumental writing, German models of dissonance, or Handelian vocal writing and harmony.[32]

The "age" of Gluck's music seems to have been inaudible to critics in the first few decades of performances in Berlin, even when it was remarked upon. A review of the premiere of *Orpheus und Euridice*, for example, ended with the complacent observation that a "sicherer Beweis von dem Genie des Komponisten" ["definitive proof of the genius of the composer"] lay in the fact that the opera was written in Italian in Vienna in 1764, and that "nach fast einem halben Jahrhundert macht sie noch eine allgemeine Sensazion" ["after almost half a century it still creates a popular sensation"].[33] *Armide* too was described as a "classical" work, which deserved to remain Berlin's favourite opera for a long time, since "das wahre Schöne bleibt ewig schön" ["the truly beautiful remained eternally beautiful"].[34]

The critics may have had a transparent agenda in their promotion of Gluck, but his operas do indeed appear to have been popular in the city, albeit some more than others. *Armide* enjoyed 54 performances from its premiere in 1805 to 1813; *Iphigenia in Tauris*, 42 between 1798 and 1813; *Orpheus*, three (1808); and *Iphigenia in Aulis*, three (1809–1810).[35] As some critics admitted, this popularity was partly due to spectacular productions (the Berlin stage was one of the largest in German lands), talented performers, and a well-trained orchestra directed by a Gluck enthusiast, Bernhard Anselm Weber.[36] It was also increasingly perpetuated by the royal adoption of Gluck as ceremonial repertory; Eric Schneeman has argued that the Hohenzollerns used performances of Gluck operas to mark dynastic occasions

This is not the final version

(such as birthdays) as a way of projecting continuity with the eighteenth-century *ancien régime*.[37]

Little contemplated at the time, however, was that the adaptations that Weber had made to Gluck's operas, most commonly the addition of ballets, might have contributed to their favourable reception: it was of course the callous approach to the "original" text in Berlin that E. T. A. Hoffmann criticised so furiously in his short story "Ritter Gluck."[38] But Weber's additions – two ballets were added to *Orpheus und Euridice* in 1808, for example – were an important concession to local taste, according to Schneeman: indeed, both the *Vossische Zeitung* and the *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung* openly approved of Weber's additions to *Iphigenia in Aulis* for the 1809 premiere.[39] That the popularity of Gluck's operas may have rested on their adaptation is suggested above all by the reception of a performance of the "original" 1762 version of *Orfeo* in Italian at the Opernhaus in 1821. The performance (rather like the Italian-language performances of *Alceste* in 1797 and 1804 at the Opernhaus) failed to find favor with the public: the *AMZ* reported that, despite excellent performances, "die veraltete Form einiger Musikstücke, und die nicht allgemein verstandene Sprache (die italienische)" ["the old-fashioned form of some of the musical pieces, as well as the not generally understood language (Italian)"] meant that only two performances were given;[40] and, according to a review in the *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung*, the lack of adaptation was responsible for members of the audience hissing throughout.[41] Tellingly, when forced to confront the audible age of the work, critics often relied on the relativizing gesture seen with Benda: the claim for past significance. The same *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung* review, for example, hailed Gluck as having been responsible for the "Revoluzion der dramatischen Musik" ["revolution in dramatic music"].

The canonical implications of the rhetoric surrounding Gluck in Berlin around 1800 clearly existed without the framework of *Werktreue* that would later inform A. B. Marx's

This is not the final version

acclamation of the composer in Berlin in the 1820s, and perhaps all the more powerfully so.[42] By contributing to the operas' popularity, the adaptation to local tastes enabled a strong local tradition of Gluck performance that worked in symbiotic relationship with Gluck's pan-European stature: Gluck was important in Berlin because of his international stature; Gluck's popularity in the city, and adoption by and then association with the Hohenzollern dynasty, led to the conceptualization of this repertory as in some way indigenous, which in turn sustained its popularity and motivated local claims for its international importance. Thus while Gluck's operas were disappearing from the stage in other cities in the 1830s, including Paris, they remained in Berlin: indeed, Berlioz claimed that in the 1840s, Gluck could no longer be heard anywhere but Berlin.[43]

Gluck's canonic status seems at least in part bound up with Prussia's eighteenth-century operatic history. The promotion of Gluck by the city's musicians in the 1790s was motivated by the suppression of the composer by Frederick the Great and the desperate search for a plausible national operatic model in the wake of Graun and Hasse. The popularity of Gluck's operas may be partly explained by Berliners' relative overexposure to outdated *opera seria*, to audience's higher tolerance levels or commitment to older operatic repertory: certainly, the age of the repertory seems to have been part of its appeal to the Hohenzollern dynasty in the early nineteenth century, keen to shore up their links to Friedrich der Grosse. Thus the Berlin reception of Gluck could in some ways be interpreted as a symptom of its behindness. But when Marx in 1824 claimed that "Gluck hat, wenigstens in seinem deutschen Vaterlande, keine treuern Verehrer, als das musikalische Publikum von Berlin" ["Gluck has, at least in his German fatherland, no truer admirers than the musical public of Berlin"], one begins to wonder whether in sustaining its Gluck tradition, Berlin wasn't behind in 1800 so much as ahead.[44]

This is not the final version

Canonic infrastructures

That Gluck *did* enjoy general popularity with audiences at the Nationaltheater in the early years of the nineteenth century was often celebrated (with relief) by critics at the start of their reviews. An 1808 review of *Iphigenia in Tauris*, for example, remarked that the theater-going public had improved in the fourteen years the work had been on the Nationaltheater stage, having learnt to honor Gluck's "edle, hohe Wahrheit" ["noble, high truth"], and would still visit the thirtieth and fortieth performances of his operas in great numbers, while for some operettas there were empty seats even at the third or fourth performance.[45] In 1806, it was "jederzeit ein Triumph des guten Geschmacks" ["always a triumph of good taste"] when the opera was performed.[46] In similar refrains in the 1790s, the sense of threat that is implied by the later overstatement is sometimes openly articulated, as in 1798:

> So viel man auch über die Opernwut auf deutschen Bühnen und unter dem deutschen Publikum, besonders über die grotesken und abentheuerlichen Gestalten die von der Donau her immer wunderbarer und toller erscheinen, klagen mag, so gewährt es doch eine angenehme Hoffnung, wenn man seit drei oder vier Jahren Glucks Iphigenie auf dem Berlinischen Nationaltheater perenniren und oft und immer bei vollem Hause vorgestellt sieht.[47]
>
> [As much as one may complain about the opera-rage on German stages and among the German public, and particularly about the grotesque and bizarre figures from the Danube that appear ever more wonderful and fantastic, when one sees Gluck's *Iphigenia* persist on the Berlin Nationaltheater [stage] every three or four years, and always performed to a full house, it gives us nonetheless a pleasant hope.]

This is not the final version

Gluck was not the only new theatrical import in Berlin after Friedrich II's death and the establishment of the Nationaltheater, in other words. French repertory, and particularly the "bizarre figures from the Danube" (Viennese popular theater, such as Philipp Hafner and Wenzel Müller's 1793 *Das Neusontagskind*) overwhelmed North German *Singspiele*. In fact, the terms of this critic were somewhat prophetic: from 1801, the Berlin stage would be overrun by Karl Friedrich Hensler and Ferdinand Kauer's *Die Nymphe der Donau*, parts one, two, and three, receiving 56, 41 and four performances respectively between 1801 and 1809. Among the many voices raised in protest was that of Julius von Voss, in the *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung*: ever one to take the long view, his intervention was not directed against the "popular" in general, as some were, but against the degeneration in popular material that the "Donaunymphen" represented, compared to what Döbbelin had been prepared to produce in Berlin 30 years previously.[48]

At stake, of course, was the growing influence of popular opinion over programming, given the reliance of the Nationaltheater on ticket sales: in a word, commercialism. Although the Nationaltheater was still officially a royal theater rather than a private institution, royal subsidy accounted for only 10 percent of the budget, and with the appointment of August Wilhelm Iffland in 1796, full control of repertory and censorship had been passed to the director.[49] Iffland was obliged to balance the books, a fact acknowledged with varying degrees of resignation. One reviewer of the second *Nymphe*, for example, bitterly concluded that without this "beloved operetta," the box office would "unfehlbar errorem in calculo finden" ["inevitably find *errorem in calculo*"].[50]

Also at stake, and developing hand in hand with the rhetoric of the "popular," was the fear of its effect on the public's good taste and and on the status of "nobler" repertory. These concerns, common enough in themselves, had a distinctively local flavor, namely the anxiety

This is not the final version

that Berlin was particularly unsuited to allow for such distinctions of taste and quality to be developed or articulated. A critic in the *Eunomia*, for example, chose not to object to the second *Nymphe* in itself, but rather that it appeared on the same stage as *Hamlet*, *Wallenstein* and *Iphigenia*, from which it appeared to be drawing people's attention.[51] It was to the "bunt durcheinander laufenden Genres" ["genres blended into each other in motley fashion"] that Reichardt had alluded in his 1805 report, suggesting that Berlin's zealous critics must rise to the challenge of "pinning down," or distinguishing the range of "beautiful" and "debauched" repertory.[52] And Reichardt had already remarked on this particular issue for the Berlin critics ten years earlier. Celebrating the Parisian theatrical scene, where different genres appeared in different institutions, he claimed that this separation taught the public to be discriminating:

> Da lernt das Publikum bald den forschenden, erfinden, und ächt komponirenden Künstler, vom nachahmenden und zusammensetzenden Arbeiter, […] die Kunst von der Künstelei, ein ächtes Kunstwerk vom gefälligen Kunststück, unterscheiden, und jedes nach seinem Gehalte würdigen.[53]
>
> [There the audience soon learns to distinguish the researching, inventing, and genuinely composing artist, from imitative and composing workers […] art from artifice, a genuine artwork from a pleasing piece of art, and to value each according to its content.]

Here again one might detect the sense that Berlin is behind. Not only was the city catching up with repertory played elsewhere for years (such as Gluck), but it was also ill-adapted to host

This is not the final version

the new range of repertory in a manner that cultivated audience discernment: Berlin's theatrical infrastructure was out of date compared to that of Vienna or Paris.

The coexistence of Viennese smash hits and the new "große Oper" at the Berlin Nationaltheater did not disturb everyone, of course: indeed, a number of critics reacted against other critics' alarm, either with ridicule, reassurance or both.[54] In an extraordinary defense of public opinion in 1803, Friedrich Werthes in *Eunomia* argued that "durch die Kasse herrscht das Publikum als Souverain, und zwar mit allem Rechte" ["through the box office the audience rules as sovereign, and moreover with good reason"].[55] Critics were unable to change the short-term or long-term success of a piece:

> "Gute Stücke werden entweder bewundert und genossen, und wenn alle Recensenten der Welt ihr: Erbärmlich! ausschrieen, oder werden leer, nachdem die Neugier gestillt ist – und wenn all Preussen über den Beweisen ihrer Klassicität schwitzten; schlechte werden besucht, wenn fortwährend in ihnen etwas zu sehen, zu lachen oder zu weinen ist, oder werden ohne Barmherzigkeit ausgepocht, und wenn die Kritiker sich auch über ihrem: Schlecht! oder: Vortrefflich! heiser schrieen.[56]
>
> [Good pieces are either admired and enjoyed – even if all the reviewers of the world cry out "Pathetic!" – or become empty after curiosity is satisfied – even if all Prussia were sweating over the proofs of their classicism; the bad ones will be attended, if there is constantly something to see, to laugh at or to cry about, or will be booed without mercy, whether the critics shout themselves hoarse with "bad" or "excellent."]

This is not the final version

Nor, in Werthes' opinion, were the efforts or anxiety of the critics even justified: he had full confidence that a "wahrhaft gutes Stück" ["truly good piece"] would endure by itself, whether immediately or via later appreciation, while the "erschlichenen" ["devious"] triumph enjoyed by bad works would not last long.[57]

If Werthes' equanimity was not universal, other commentators agreed that critical intervention was insufficient to solve the problem of the range of repertory in the Nationaltheater. Two full-length articles in the Berlin press were devoted to a thorough consideration of possible solutions on the level of Berlin's theatrical institutions. Like Reichardt in the articles cited above, both writers perceived the Berlin set-up to be out of date and unsuited to the development of public taste, and suggested a far-reaching reorganisation.

These two articles, one anonymously published in *Eunomia* in 1803 (after Werthes' contribution), and one in the *Jahrbucher der preußischen Monarchie* (prompted by a performance of Antonio Sacchini's *Oedip zu Colonos* in 1798), have to be seen in the context of specific discussions about the role of *opera seria* and the Carnival as state representation.[58] By the reign of Friedrich Wilhelm III, Prussia was the only major state in German-speaking lands with an Italian opera house, the Kurfurst having shut the Munich equivalent in 1787.[59] The king had himself considered abolishing the tradition of *opera seria* as part of a cost-cutting drive begun in 1797, but while the royal *opera buffa* troupe that played at the Charlottenburg and Potsdam palaces was disbanded, both Röder and Henzel have suggested that *opera seria* at the Opernhaus was not seriously in doubt until after the Napoleonic invasion in 1806, on account of its prestigious connection with Friedrich II.[60] Even so, the king's economizing, which at the Opernhaus included repeating operas, and his restyling of the court as "modest and economical" contributed to a wider perception of the anachronism of the Opernhaus Carnival tradition. As Röder has detailed, both the *Jahrbucher der Preußischen Monarchie* and the *Berlinische Monatschrift* published significant articles in

This is not the final version

1799–1801 highlighting the unpopularity of the restricted performance times, the restricted access (there were few tickets left open to the public), the discrepancy between the situation in Berlin and elsewhere, and the mismatch between the new monarch and the older tradition.[61] That the King repeated operas, as the *AMZ* article in 1800 had noted with dismay, meant that the Opernhaus was not even fulfilling the function of introducing new operas to the public, nor was the monarch exerting himself as a cultural leader in his choices: something Frederick the Great had not been accused of, even when he repeated operas by dead composers. For all that the relatively modest habits of Friedrich Wilhelm III were in general admired and appreciated by the public, it is hard not to hear disappointment in the *Zeitung für die Elegante Welt*'s 1803 report on the "Prospects for this year's Carnival in Berlin," where the operas were described as "von todten und abwesenden Komponisten" ["by dead or absent composers"] – apparently all the easier to adapt to large ballet scenes – and the selections interpreted as a "gute ökonomische Idee" ["good economic idea"].[62] The repertory that actually materialized in 1804 – *Rosamunda* by Reichardt and *Medea* by Naumann – left the reporter similarly unimpressed: "something beautiful, to be sure, but nothing new."[63]

For many of the writers concerned with the future of the Opernhaus, selling tickets to Carnival performances, or expanding performances beyond Carnival seemed necessary to adapt the institution to the demands of Berlin in 1800. But the two articles already mentioned had more wide-ranging proposals. The first, from the *Jahrbücher der Preußischen Monarchie* in 1798, began by pointing out that according to the constitution of the Nationaltheater, and its low royal subsidy, the board was obliged to be influenced by the income – and the costs of the simple and noble repertory were usually covered by the revenue brought in by the "colorful and grotesque." Unfortunately, outside Vienna, it was only Italian opera houses that enjoyed the sort of large subsidy that "unabhängig von den Beiträgen des Publikums, ein System für reine Kunst ausführbar machen kann" ["can make a system for pure art

This is not the final version

executable regardless of the contributions of the audience"]. The familiar themes continue: the present virulence of the critics is an attempt to address the current lack of "Bildung" among the audience; the source of the problem is Vienna, where however this repertory plays on the auxiliary stages, and never pollutes the repertory at the Imperial German Court theater. What Berlin needs, therefore, is an auxiliary stage in a different part of the city, where "Publikum und Künstler wüßten mit dem Eintritt in jedes von beiden Häusern, was sie zu fordern" ["audience and artist would know with the entrance fee for each of the two houses what they could demand"]. To the auxiliary theater would be banished popular theater, musical and otherwise; only repertory like Sacchini's *Oedip*, Gluck's *Iphigenia*, Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Lessing's *Emilia Galotti*, Joseph Mario Babo's *Otto von Wittelsbach* and August von Kotzebue's *Menschenhaß* (the last two are perhaps surprising inclusions) would be given at the Haupttheater; "eine gewisse Art des Spiels" ["a certain style of acting"], involving improvised additions and Hans Wurst buffoonery would thus also be excluded from the "Tempel der Kunst" ["temple of art"].[64]

The second anonymous author, in *Eunomia*, was even more ambitious. Regretting that Berlin had only one theater, and that attendance there was erratic, he listed several interrelated problems: first, one always saw the same actors, and few of them were so exceptional that "man sich nicht zuweilen eine Abwechselung wünschen sollte" ["one wouldn't sometimes wish for variety"]. Secondly, the extreme range of repertory brought together ridiculous juxtapositions of serious opera, tragedy, pathetic spectacle and regular comedy with comic operetta, vaudeville and farce. The writer suggested that the range of repertory was an obvious consequence of the need for variety within only one troupe and one theater, but that it produced "schreienden Kontraste" ["screaming contrasts"], and the "ewige Krittelei" ["constant quibbling"] of critics. Nonetheless, among that range, there was a lack of the most important works, such as the operas of Gluck, Sarti, Paer, Righini, Reichardt, and

This is not the final version

Himmel, which were only heard briefly at Carnival, and which then often disappeared forever. At the same time, many satirical works and parodies that were published did not get performed at all. Lastly, he noted, the geographical position of the Nationaltheater was an impediment to those living anywhere but the Friedrichstadt and the Neustadt, being too far and too costly for the numerous inhabitants of Kölln, Berlin and the Königsstadt.[65]

The writer's solution was also to increase the number of theaters, along the model of other capital cities; after all, even Hamburg had three, counting the Altonaer Theater! This was to be achieved by putting to use the Opernhaus, which, like the other writers, this critic felt was wasted by being shut for eleven months of the year. What follows sounds very much like an imaginary operatic museum, with operas "preserved" in performance:[66] new operas and ballets would only be given in Carnival season, and the rest of the year old operas repeated, raising the institution "von einem vorübergehenden Prachtschauspiel, zu einer bleiben Kunstanstalt […] die auf die Kunstbildung Berlins einen höchst wohlthätigen Einfluß haben würde" ["from a temporary theater of splendor to a lasting institution of art […] which would have a highly beneficial influence on the education of Berlin"]. The Nationaltheater would then be free to become a "Tempel des deutschen Geschmacks […] das Muster theatralischer Kunst" ["a temple of German taste […] the model of theatrical art"], in which German heroic opera and operetta, tragedy and comedy could be cultivated without the distraction of farces, vaudevilles and ballets, and the costs associated with the spectacular works. Thus:

> könnten die Künstler nun fest und unverrückt die Kunst ins Auge fassen, und ohne Zerstreuung dem Ziele nachstreben, an dem das Theater, nicht als Belustigung der Sinne, sondern als Tempel der Kunst und Bildungsanstalt der Nation steht.[67]

This is not the final version

> [the artist could now contemplate art steadfastly and undisturbed, and without distraction aspire to the goal: where the theater is not the amusement of the senses, but the temple of art and educational institution of the nation.]

Lastly, the writer proposed a third theater, to be built in "in einem anderen entfernteren Theile Berlins" ["another more remote part of Berlin"], namely somewhere in the Königsstadt, to which a familiar list of popular repertory would be allocated, along with parodies and travesties of the repertory at the Nationaltheater, "Zauber- und Hexenopern," ["magic and witch operas"], small comedies and farces, and comic ballets. After all, "Wie das Weinen, ist das Lachen ein Bedürfniß" ["just like crying, laughing is a necessity"], for both educated and unedecated men – merely incompatible with the repertory of the Nationaltheater.[68]

The attempt at even-handedness is unconvincing, given the language of debauchery, distraction and "pure art" hovering around discussions of the Nationaltheater's repertory, and the proposed geographical position of this third theater. Like the 1798 plan for restructuring, the *Eunomia* article lays out a strategy for materializing the kinds of cultural hierarchies that critics had been trying to impose with their words. In both articles, the "temple of art" maintains the purity of canonical works, and those new works aspiring to canonical status, while ephemeral and spectacular productions are kept apart. The element of museum culture implied in the "temple of art" and in the preservation of canonical works is given fullest expression in the *Eunomia* critic's astonishing plans for the Opernhaus, which for the majority of the year would *only* produce old operas, and mostly *opera seria*. Astonishing, that is, for someone attuned to the expectations and practices of musical life in central Europe c. 1800, rather than c. 2000.

This is not the final version

The anomalous, precocious canonical mentality displayed by some of Berlin's critics is, like the other developments discussed, strongly bound up with Berlin's eighteenth-century operatic heritage. First, the respect for older works that these critics voice, and the importance of an acquaintance with the operatic past to the *Bildung* of the public seems a continuation of a specifically Frederician heritage, as well as a growing tendency that may later be traced more broadly across the nineteenth century in Western European music culture. Second, the particular anxiety of the critics in Berlin c. 1800 seems in part a response to Berlin's uneven development as a capital city and operatic economy, relative to their chosen comparisons. The extreme cultural leadership exercised by Friedrich II, and the form it took, led to the slowing down of operatic fashions in the Berlin Opernhaus; the prestige of Friedrich II, including of his cultural leadership, may have inhibited Friedrich Wilhelm III's modernizing of the Opernhaus, and led to conservative operatic choices (such as Gluck) for dynastic representation into the nineteenth century. This behindness, in a city already aware of its relative provincialism in relation to Paris and Vienna, motivated critics to attempt to fill the vacuum of cultural leadership, or at least to attempt to compete with the commercial interests replacing it: to guide public opinion towards a canon of accepted worth, in order to educate audiences sufficiently to respond to the new influx sensibly.

The reorganization of the theatrical landscape happened neither quickly nor in the manner that these critics had hoped c. 1800. The flight of the royal family from Berlin following Napoleon's defeat of Prussia in 1806 removed the primary function of the Opernhaus in its existing, *ancien régime* form – that of royal display. It was closed in 1807, while the Nationaltheater continued to perform during occupation to audiences of French troops and administrative personnel as well as the locals. After the return of the king, a merger between the two establishments was negotiated; in 1811, the two institutions were united as the Königliche Schauspiele, under the direction of Iffland. From then on, the

This is not the final version

Opernhaus seems to have been used as an alternative venue for the repertory that was produced at the Nationaltheater – German-language performances of all genres – with a slight emphasis on works of established artistic standing, and as the venue for dramatic productions marking state occasions such as royal birthdays. When fire destroyed the Nationaltheater in 1817, all performances were transferred to the Opernhaus, until the opening of the new Königliches Schauspielhaus with *Der Freischütz* in 1821.

The hierarchization of repertory by institutional space was thus decreased rather than increased in first two decades of the nineteenth century. It would take till 1824 for a separate theater for popular repertory to materialize, with the founding of the Königsstädtisches Theater, on the present day Alexanderplatz. The initiative for this "Volkstheater" in part came from the king, Friedrich Wilhelm III having been taken with the possibilities of Viennese theatrical life during the Congress of Vienna. Nonetheless, the Königsstädtisches Theater was a private and commercial undertaking (though with a royal subvention) and subject to significant restrictions as to repertory in order to limit its competition with the Königliches Schauspiele. As a direct result, its repertory was just as mixed as the Nationaltheater's had ever been, making it a predictable target for the self-appointed taste police, A. B. Marx prominent among them.

The infrastructural solutions I have detailed, then, were nothing more than theoretical solutions to problems that aggravated some people more than others. The imaginary museum of the operatic canon remained imaginary in Berlin for many decades – but it was an idea that would increase in power over the course of the nineteenth century, and would eventually align with commercial interests (in the sense of canonical works being bankable), rather than being asserted against them, as here. What this moment in Berlin gives us, however, thanks to the extreme self-consciousness of the critics, is an insight into the concerns and motivations that shaped canonic discourse in North German lands, at a time when the canon was scarcely

This is not the final version

beginning to emerge: in the explicit disputation of cultural authority, musical *Bildung*, and the urge to assemble and preserve national operatic heritage, Berlin may have been anomalous c. 1800, but its precocious example would eventually become nothing less than paradigmatic.

---

[1] The longevity of this "coalescence" of composers has led Christoph Henzel to designate the repertory of the Graun brothers and Hasse the *Berliner Klassik*, on account of its stylistic coherence and its continuing prestige in the nineteenth century. Christoph Henzel, *Berliner Klassik: Studien zur Graunüberlieferung im 18. Jahrhundert* (Beeskow: Ortus Musikverlag, 2009).

[2] This discourse reflected wider anxieties about Berlin's place in world history, and its need to "catch up." See Matt Erlin, *Berlin's forgotten future: City, history, and enlightenment in eighteenth-century Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 26.

[3] This calculation is based on the difference between the work's world premiere and the Berlin premiere, regardless of versions or venues (e.g. concert or opera house performance).

[4] "Ueber den Zustand der Musik in Berlin," *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (14 May 1800), 585–585, here 585.

[5] "Ueber den Zustand der Musik in Berlin," 588.

[6] Matthias Röder, "Music, politics, and the public sphere in late eighteenth-century Berlin" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2009), 86–87.

[7] See, for example, Peter Wollny, *Ein förmlicher Sebastian und Philipp Emanuel Bach-Kultus: Sara Levy und ihr musikalisches Wirken* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2010).

[8] Johann Friedrich Reichardt, "Etwas zur Einleitung," *Berlinische Musikalische Zeitung*, 1 (1805): 1–4, here 1–2.

[9] Henzel, *Berliner Klassik*, 20 and 371.

[10] Röder, "Music, politics, and the public sphere," 87.

This is not the final version

[11] *Medea* and *Pygmalion* were also performed unstaged in a charitable "Dramatische Akademie" in 1807: see *Vossische Zeitung* (14 November 1807).

[12] Although he lived into the 1790s, Benda did not write any stage works after 1787.

[13] *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung* (8 January 1805).

[14] "p, "[Julius von Voss], "Den 20ten December: Ariadne auf Naxos," *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung* (24 December 1805). The identification of the review author here, as elsewhere, is the work of Klaus Gerlach as part of the Berliner Klassik project. See his *Eine Experimentalpoetik: Texte zum Berliner Nationaltheater* (Hannover: Wehrhahn, 2007).

[15] "Berlinisches Nazionaltheater," *Zeitung für die Elegante Welt* (20 September 1804), 902.

[16] "p," "*Vossische Zeitung* (19 July 1806); *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung* (19 July 1806).

[17] The *AMZ* still simply described Benda's melodramas as "unsterblich, so lange echte Musik noch etwas gilt" ["immortal, as long as real music counts for something"]: "Nachrichten," *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (1 October 1806), 11–15, here 13.

[18] Henzel, *Berliner Klassik*, 20. The wider German significance of Benda and Graun was acknowledged outside of Prussia too, The *AMZ* published a visual representation of North German musical heritage as the sun in 1799, with Benda as one of the rays surrounding an inner core containing J. S. Bach, Graun, Haydn and Handel: "Anekdoten," *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (30 October 1799), 102–104, here 104.

[19] "Nachrichten aus Berlin," *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (12 April 1809), 443–445, here 443.

[20] In its later, two-act version, *Der Dorfjahrmarkt.*

[21] See Wolfgang Schimpf's index of performances in *Lyrisches Theater: Das Melodrama des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988).

[22] Friedrich August Gotthold, "Ueber des Fürsten Anton Radziwill Kompositionen zu Göthe's Faust," *Preußische Provinzial-Blätter* 21 (1839): 354–392, here 359.

This is not the final version

[23] Thus Benda, along with Schweizer, Mozart, and Winter, is celebrated by the *AMZ* in 1821 for bringing "ächt deutsche Oper" ["genuinely German opera"] to the stage: "*Rodrigo und Zimene*," *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (13 June 1821), 413–418, here 418.

[24] Mozart too comes in for something of this ilk, but his treatment in the Berlin press is less consistent – and according to the *AMZ* correspondent, his music was little performed around 1800. In fact, in 1806 *Idomeneo* gets treated rather like *Ariadne*, with one reviewer seeking to explain the outmodedness of the music in the context of its original setting: *Vossische Zeitung* (5 August 1806).

[25] "M," "Von deutschen Oper und über Glucks Iphigenia in Tauris," *Jahrbücher der Preußischen Monarchie* 2 (1798): 36–46, here 36.

[26] "Melos," "Iphigenia in Tauris von Gluck," *Zeitung für die Elegante Welt* (5 October 1812), 1588–1589.

[27] Christoph Henzel, "Zwischen Hofoper und Nationaltheater: Aspekte der Gluckrezeption in Berlin um 1800," *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 50, no. 3 (1993): 201–216, here 204–206.

[28] In Rellstab's introduction to the "Textbuch" for one of his "Konzerte für Kenner und Liebhaber" in 1787, for example, he claimed that Berliners were too used to Graun and Hasse. For discussion of these publications, see Eric Schneeman, "The German reception of Christoph Willibald Ritter von Gluck in the early nineteenth century" (PhD diss., University of Southern California, 2013), 286–291; and Henzel, "Zwischen Hofoper und Nationaltheater," 209.

[29] See for example Bernd Sponheuer, "Reconstructing ideal types of the 'German' in Music," in *Music and German national identity*, ed. Celia Applegate and Pamela Potter (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 36–58.

[30] *Vossische Zeitung* (26 February 1795).

[31] *Vossische Zeitung* (23 April 1808).

This is not the final version

[32] For more on the promotion of Gluck in the Berlin press, see Schneeman, "The German reception"; and Henzel, "Zwischen Hofoper und Nationaltheater."

[33] "Aus Berlin," *Zeitung für die Elegante Welt* (17 May 1808), 631–632.

[34] *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung* (29 October 1812).

[35] Statistics assembled using the Berliner Klassik database, which records performances between 1798 and 1813. See "Berliner Klassik," accessed 3 September 2017, http://berlinerklassik.bbaw.de/BK/theater.

[36] See for example Friedrich Schulz's review in the *Neue Berlinische Dramaturgie* (1 September 1798): 283–288; and that in the *Vossische Zeitung* (23 January 1808).

[37] Schneemann, "The German reception," 117–121.

[38] Ernst Theodor Wilhelm Hoffmann, "Ritter Gluck. Eine Erinnerung aus dem Jahre 1809," *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (15 February 1809), 305–319.

[39] *Vossische Zeitung* (28 December 1809); *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung* (2 January 1810). For a discussion of the Berlin versions of Gluck's operas, see Schneeman, "The German reception," 40–77.

[40] "Nachrichten: Berlin," *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (16 May 1821): 347–350, here 347. Cited and translated in Schneeman, "The German reception," 80.

[41] *Vossische Zeitung* (5 April 1821).

[42] See Schneeman, "The German reception," 171–227.

[43] Hector Berlioz, *Memoirs of Hector Berlioz, member of the French Institute, including his travels in Italy, Germany, Russia, and England, 1803–1865*, trans. and ed. David Cairns (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1969), 448: cited in Schneeman, "The German reception," 26

[44] A. B. Marx, "Ueber Gluck und seine Alceste," *Berlinische Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (7 February 1824), 43–46, here 43.

[45] *Vossische Zeitung* (23 January 1808).

This is not the final version

[46] [Julius von Voss], *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung* (3 April 1806).

[47] "M," "Von deutscher Oper und über Glucks Iphigenia in Tauris," *Jahrbücher der Preußischen Monarchie* 2 (1798): 36–46.

[48] [Julius von Voss], "Die neuen Arkadier," *Haude und Spenersche Zeitung* (29 January 1804).

[49] See Röder, "Music, politics, and the public sphere," 234–235.

[50] *Zeitung für die Elegante Welt* (6 March 1802), 219–221, here 220.

[51] "Königliches Nationaltheater," *Eunomia* 2, no. 1 (1802): 272–282, here 280–282.

[52] Reichardt, "Etwas zur Einleitung," 1–2.

[53] Johann Friedrich Reichardt, "Etwas uber Musik. Zur Einleitung," *Das Berlinische Archiv des Zeit und Ihres Geschmacks* 1 (January 1795), 77–78.

[54] See, for example, "Ueber das Nazionaltheater zu Berlin," *Jahrbücher der Preußischen Monarchie* 2 (1799): 64–67, here 65; and "Z", "Die Nymphe der Donau. Vox populi, vox dei," *Annalen des Nationaltheaters* (6 March 1802), 150–154, here 154.

[55] Friedrich August Clemens Werthes, "Theater," *Eunomia* 3, no. 1 (1803): 73–79, here 75. Werthes (1748–1817) was a dramatist, writer, and translator, acquainted with Goethe and Wieland. He may have been writing to Berlin, rather than as part of it: it is not clear that he ever worked in the city.

[56] Werthes, "Theater," 75

[57] Werthes, "Theater," 74–75.

[58] Röder has discussed the public critique of state ceremony extensively. See Röder, "Music, politics, and the public sphere," 212–232.

[59] Christoph Henzel, *Die Italienische Hofoper in Berlin um 1800: Vincenzo Righini als preussischer Hofkapellmeister* (Stuttgar: Metzler, 1994), 19.

This is not the final version

[60] Henzel, *Die Italienische Hofoper in Berlin*, 20; Röder, "Music, politics, and the public sphere," 263.

[61] Röder, "Music, politics, and the public sphere," 214–215, 263–264.

[62] "Aussichten zum disjährigen Berliner Karneval," *Zeitung für die Elegante Welt* (11 October 1803), 969–970.

[63] "Theater- und Konzertmusik in Berlin," *Zeitung für die Elegante Welt* (3 November 1804), 1053–1054.

[64] "Über die Vorstellung der Oper: Oedip zu Colonos," *Jahrbücher der Preußischen Monarchie* 2 (1798): 209–215, here 209–212.

[65] "Gute Wünsche," *Eunomia* 3, no. 2 (1803): 157–164, here 158–159.

[66] The reference is of course to Lydia Goehr's *The imaginary museum of musical works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), although the absence of *Werktreue* in Berliners' approach to canonization has already been noted.

[67] "Gute Wünsche," 163–164.

[68] "Gute Wünsche," 162–163.

This is not the final version