

Stefan Keym

The Role of Intercultural Transfers in the Invention of “Classical Music” in Early Nineteenth-Century Leipzig

When asked by Wolfgang Amadé Mozart how he would manage his first trip to London without any knowledge of a foreign language, Joseph Haydn is said to have answered that his music was understood “throughout the world”.¹ If music were in fact a universal language (as many people assume), its transfer from one cultural area to another would not require a “translation”, and transfers of music would thus be of secondary interest for research. Indeed, the concept of intercultural transfers, being developed by Michel Espagne and Michael Werner since the 1980s,² has been adopted rather slowly by musicologists and primarily in the field of opera,³ where questions of translation (in the literal sense of the word) of plots and meanings are essential.

The history of music – or at least of Western art music – is usually told as a transnational narrative. In contrast to the history of literature, its system of periodization is more or less the same for most European countries. Thus, the method of comparing seemingly homogenous national units, which was the main point of criticism expressed by the pioneers of intercultural transfer theory, is of less importance here than in literature or general history. However, the “universal character” of music did not prevent musicologists from thinking mainly in national categories or from using nationalist rhetoric. In fact, claiming a worldwide “hegemony” of a certain nation for each specific historical period has been very common ever

1 A. C. Dies, *Biographische Nachrichten von Joseph Haydn*, Vienna: Camesina, 1810, p. 75: “Meine Sprache versteht man durch die ganze Welt”.

2 M. Espagne and M. Werner, “Deutsch-Französischer Kulturtransfer im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert”, *Francia* 13 (1985), pp. 502–510; M. Espagne, *Les Transferts culturels Franco-Allemands*, Paris: PUF, 1999.

3 Cf. A. Jacobshagen, *Opera semiseria: Gattungskonvergenz und Kulturtransfer im Musiktheater*, Stuttgart: Steiner, 2005; A. Münzmay, *Musikdramaturgie und Kulturtransfer: Eine gattungsübergreifende Studie zum Musiktheater Eugène Scribes in Paris und Stuttgart*, Schliengen: Argus, 2008.

since Franz Brendel's ground-breaking "History of Music in Italy, Germany, and France" (1852).⁴ The same can be said about the diffusionist category of *influence* as well as for the widespread conviction that cultural products "intrude" or "conquer" other countries due either to the efforts of their producers or to their inherent qualities and persuasiveness.

Thus, the rediscovery of foreign or transnational roots of a musical concept that is usually considered "purely" German or Italian may hold significant potential for musicology. A careful analysis of the different aspects of such an intercultural transfer – the motivations and needs of those actors who adapted the concept, the modifications the concept underwent in the course of its appropriation, and the debates about this process⁵ – can help overcome deep-rooted stereotypes and lead to a better understanding of hidden cultural connections in music history.

Recent studies have shown that the implementation of a foreign musical concept in a particular cultural area does not happen per se, or automatically, as it might seem upon first glance.⁶ There are, in fact, at least two main obstacles. First, a lack of institutional infrastructure can make it difficult to mount regular performances of musical genres that require extensive personnel, such as operas or symphonies. Overcoming such a deficit is a question not only of money but also of time because independence from foreign guest musicians requires the aspiration towards founding one's own orchestra or vocal ensemble. In order to secure continual financial support and manpower for such an endeavour, one must also build a public and cultivate its taste. This leads to the second obstacle: new musical concepts are often met with strong resistance, with aesthetic and ideological reservations based on deep-rooted listening conventions. This is a problem that was faced by not only the advocates of twentieth-century avant-garde music, but also promoters of a type of theatre performance in which the entire text is sung, as in Italian opera, which took a long time to be accepted by the French, English, or German publics. And listening for a whole evening to purely instrumental music – as is the norm in twentieth-century symphonic concerts, chamber concerts, or piano recitals – was rather boring for many music lovers in earlier times – even

4 F. Brendel, *Geschichte der Musik in Italien, Deutschland und Frankreich*, Leipzig: Hinze, 1852.

5 For the different steps of intercultural transfer analysis, see M. Middell, "Kulturtransfer und transnationale Geschichte", in: M. Middell (ed.), *Dimensionen der Kultur- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für Hannes Siegrist zum 60. Geburtstag*, Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2007, pp. 49–69, at pp. 53–58.

6 Cf. S. Keym, *Symphonie-Kulturtransfer: Untersuchungen zum Studienaufenthalt polnischer Komponisten in Deutschland und zu ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit der symphonischen Tradition 1867–1918*, Hildesheim: Olms, 2010.

in Germany, which is often regarded as the origin of a “serious” music culture founded upon instrumental music.⁷

However, the roots of the symphony and the so-called classical style are found not in Germany, but in Italy. Admittedly, what was called a *sinfonia* there in the early eighteenth century was a rather small orchestral composition with an overall duration of less than three minutes. Its function was to announce the beginning of an opera and to indicate to the noisy public that it should turn its attention to the spectacle. It was a very long way from these small pieces to the colossal late nineteenth-century symphonies of Anton Bruckner or Gustav Mahler, which, lasting more than 90 minutes, constitute the main (and sometimes even the only) act of symphony concert programmes today.

The growth of the symphony was linked to its emancipation from opera: in the course of the eighteenth century, the symphony became an independent instrumental genre of concert music. However, this development did not happen in Italy, its country of origin, but in other places where more modern social conditions facilitated the participation of the bourgeois class that initiated the rise of public concerts. This was especially the case in huge metropolises such as London and Paris. The most famous concert series of the eighteenth century, one that became a forum for new symphonies, was the *Concert spirituel* in Paris (which unfortunately was dissolved in 1790 after the French Revolution). The French capital was also the centre of symphonic music publishing at that time, and since musical culture in Paris was already extremely cosmopolitan, composers from Italy, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Bohemia saw their symphonies performed and published there. The evolution of the genre of the symphony was thus triggered by intercultural transfers from the very beginning.

Against this historical background, this chapter mainly seeks to address the following question: How did the symphony, a genre of Italian origin that underwent broad, international dissemination in the eighteenth century, come to be seen as a particularly German concept in the nineteenth century? Traditional musicology has a rather simple answer to this question: the achievements of three geniuses, the composers of the so-called Viennese classicism (Haydn, Mozart, and Ludwig van Beethoven), elevated the symphony to such a high level that their specific vision for the genre inevitably became the norm for all other composers in the world who dared to write a symphony after them. It is not my aim to deny the importance or the artistic merits of these three composers. However, I would

7 Cf. D. Gramit, *Cultivating Music: The Aspirations, Interests, and Limits of German Musical Culture, 1770–1848*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

like to show that the story was not so simple and that many other actors, aims, and needs were involved in the canonization of this “classical music” and its transfer to other areas. In fact, things went rather the other way around: the Viennese repertoire was first transferred and then canonized.

The evolution and international spread of symphonic music culture is one of the most extensive and fascinating processes of intercultural transfer in modern music history (together with the spread of Italian opera and of Anglo-American popular music).⁸ In this process, the city of Leipzig played a central and distinct role. How was this possible when the new music repertoire emerged some 600 kilometres away, in Vienna – the traditional residence of the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, where Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven composed their major works? How did their music gain such importance for Leipzig’s musical life to the point where people there strongly identified with it and where the city’s concert culture later became the model for many other cities in Germany and beyond?

* * *

It is important to keep in mind that Leipzig was never a seat of royal or ducal power (such as Vienna, Dresden, Berlin, or Paris). It was a bourgeois commerce city famous for its fairs. In the eighteenth century, Leipzig became the centre of the German book trade and production.⁹ As trade increased, a central place for storing the bulk of the book copies was needed. Since the German Empire did not have an actual capital, this choice was made according to practical considerations. Leipzig was chosen over Frankfurt am Main because the former was not only a commerce city but also the home of an important university, founded in 1409. Around 1800, Leipzig became the centre of music publishing as well: it was the first German city in which several important music publishing houses were able to successfully coexist.¹⁰

It was not only traders of music who were interested in Leipzig’s musical life. Since opera was the main musical status symbol of the aristocracy and of the courts of many German princes (including Dresden, the capital of Saxony), Leipzig’s bourgeoisie specialized in concert music. Beginning in 1743, merchants started sponsoring regular concerts called the Kaufmannskonzert (the traders’

8 Cf. S. Keym and M. Meyer, “Musik und Kulturtransfer”, in: *MGG Online*, ed. by Laurenz Lütteken, 2020, <https://www.mgg-online.com/article?id=mgg20115&v=2.0&rs=mgg20115>.

9 T. Fuchs, “Buchhandel und Verlagswesen”, in: D. Döring et al. (eds.), *Geschichte der Stadt Leipzig*, vol. 2, Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2016, pp. 234–271, at pp. 255–271.

10 S. Keym and P. Schmitz (eds.), *Das Leipziger Musikverlagswesen. Innerstädtische Netzwerke und internationale Ausstrahlung*, Hildesheim: Olms, 2016.

concert), which took place in the hall of an inn called Zu den Drei Schwanen. In 1781, these concerts were reorganized and institutionalized at the Gewandhaus, an ancient public building where cloth and textiles had been stored and sold.¹¹ The concerts were organized on a voluntary basis by an executive board of 12 city dignitaries (traders, bankers, lawyers, and professors) who engaged an orchestra, singers, and a conductor. Similar concerts began to emerge elsewhere, but the number of 20 concerts per year and the uninterrupted existence of this concert series, continuing up until the present, was unique.¹²

This extraordinary institution needed a large repertoire of works, especially symphonic works for orchestra. The same need existed for the publishers who were closely connected with the Gewandhaus’s concerts (some of them members of its executive board). Since 1762, the firm Breitkopf had published catalogues with a large number of symphonies that could be copied by hand on demand.¹³

However, most of these symphonies had to be imported from other regions. The history of this genre was linked to the rise of a new musical style, the galant style,¹⁴ which emerged in Italy in the early eighteenth century and was transferred to areas further north in a series of waves. In the second half of the century, the most modern stream of this style arrived first in the southern regions of Germany, including Austria (then part of Germany); Bavaria; and Mannheim, the capital of the Palatinate. (The court at Mannheim hosted one of the most famous orchestras from the 1750s to 1780, at which point the court was transferred to Munich.)

Thus, Leipzig’s music institutions imported a great amount of symphonic music from the southern parts of Germany, beginning in the second half of the eighteenth century. However, the appropriation of the new southern repertoire did not come without problems. In fact, local music experts had serious reservations. At that time, Germany was still divided between the Protestant north and the Catholic south. Though originally a confessional divide, the border also represented a stark cultural and mental rift. The north was strongly influenced by French rationalism and the Enlightenment. Treatises on aesthetics and taste in music and other arts emerged mainly in the north. Also, most of the early German music journals were located there. However, this region remained rather conservative in its musical taste.

11 C. Böhm, *Neue Chronik des Gewandhausorchesters*, vol. 1, Altenburg: Kamprad, 2018.

12 M. Thrun, “Konzertstadt Leipzig als kulturelle Autorität. Leitbild und unnachahmliches Muster inmitten des 19. Jahrhunderts”, in: H. Loos (ed.), *Musikstadt Leipzig. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte*, Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2019, pp. 81–141.

13 B. S. Brook (ed.), *The Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue, 1762–1787*, New York: Dover, 1966.

14 D. Hertz, *Music in European Capitals: The Galant Style, 1720–1780*, New York: Norton, 2003.

Consequently, the new symphonic music from the south was often severely criticized by northern music experts.¹⁵ In Leipzig, Johann Adam Hiller, director of the Kaufmannskonzert and collaborator of the publisher Breitkopf, edited a weekly music journal in which he expressed his indignation about the “strange mixture of style, of the serious and the comic, of the sublime and the humble” found in the symphonies by Viennese and Mannheim composers like Haydn, Leopold Hofmann, Carl Ditters von Dittersdorf, or Anton Fils.¹⁶ This mixture did not conform to the rationalist principle of “unity of expression” originally demanded of arias. Most northern critics focused on vocal music and thus had general doubts about the sense and logic of purely instrumental music. A further aspect that, in their eyes, diminished the value of the new repertoire was the strong link between the galant style and the Italian opera buffa. For example, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, second son of Johann Sebastian Bach, called it “the comic style” and claimed that it was empty, filling only the ears without moving the heart.¹⁷ Another cause of annoyance was the close relationship between the new style and dance music, especially the integration of the minuet into the symphony by Viennese and Mannheim composers.¹⁸ The most vociferous critic of the new style was King Frederick II from Prussia, who claimed that contemporary Italian composers and their followers wrote “like pigs”.¹⁹ Thus, the new music did not match the aesthetic expectations of the northern critics. Or, to put it the other way round, the alleged aesthetic and technical “failures” of the new repertoire seemed to prove anew their own deep-rooted prejudices against southern German music, such as a general “emptiness and thoughtlessness”²⁰ and lack of “higher culture and scientific taste”.²¹

In order to cope with this apparent dilemma between the constant need for new symphonies from the south and the strong aesthetic reservations against them

15 Cf. K. Winkler, “Alter und neuer Musikstil im Streit zwischen den Berlinern und Wienern zur Zeit der Frühklassik”, *Die Musikforschung* 33 (1980), pp. 37–45.

16 “das seltsame Gemisch der Schreibart, des Ernsthaften und Comischen, des Erhabenen und Niedrigen [...] in ein und eben demselben Satze” (J. A. Hiller, *Wöchentliche Nachrichten und Anmerkungen die Musik betreffend* 3 (1768), p. 107).

17 C. P. E. Bach, Interview with M. Claudius, quoted in: H.-G. Ottenberg, *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach*, Leipzig: Reclam, 1982, pp. 199–200.

18 C. Spazier, “Über Menuetten in Sinfonien”, *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* 1 (1792) 12, pp. 91–92.

19 J. F. Reichardt, *Der lustige Passagier. Erinnerungen eines Musikers und Literaten*, Berlin: Aufbau, 2002, p. 169.

20 On Haydn, “das Leere, das Gedankenlose” (*Hamburgische Unterhaltungen* 7 (1769), p. 270).

21 On Mozart, “wenig höhere Cultur und wenig, oder vielleicht gar keinen wissenschaftlichen Geschmack” (*Berlinische musikalische Zeitung*, 14 September 1793, p. 127).

in the north, the publisher Breitkopf developed a dual strategy. Whereas composers from Prussia and Saxony still clearly prevailed in *Raccolta delle migliore sinfonie di più celebri compositori di nostro tempo, accomodate all'clavicembalo* (1761/62), a prestigious collection of 24 symphonies arranged for piano by Hiller, the more extensive catalogues of symphonies traded by Breitkopf in manuscript copies already offered a predominantly southern German and foreign repertoire.²² Apparently, Leipzig's concert public appreciated this repertoire as well. The proportion of southern works in the Gewandhaus's concerts was very high from the beginning (under the direction of Hiller), increasing from 40 out of 60 symphonies in the first season in 1781/82 to 46 out of 48 ten years later, when almost all of them came from Vienna. Only 5 out of 191 symphonies performed in the 5 seasons singled out in table 1 stemmed from composers who spent some time in Leipzig (Friedrich Christoph Gestewitz, Johann Georg Hermann Voigt, Christian Gottlob August Bergt, Friedrich Schneider, and Friedrich Ernst Fesca). The concert repertoire continued to change quickly; only Haydn and Mozart remained present from the 1780s up to 1820, reaching the peak of their popularity around 1800 before being overtaken by Beethoven.

In contrast to other arts, a general canon of classical works in music had never existed before this point (the few local exceptions include church compositions by Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina at the Vatican chapel; some operas in Paris by Jean-Baptiste Lully, who served as a classical national composer in the decades after the “Grand Siècle” and some oratorios by George Frederick Handel in England). Music played in concerts and opera houses was primarily by contemporary, living composers. This custom began to change around 1800 for several reasons, many of which were strongly linked to the general political and social needs in Germany.²³

22 The *Raccolta* contained only six southern symphonies (by Georg Christoph Wagenseil, Leopold Mozart, Ignaz Holzbauer, and Leopold Hofmann); cf. C. Hust, *Gründlich und mit Geschmack gesetzt. Untersuchungen zur Sinfonie im “nördlichen Deutschland” um 1790*, Göttingen: Hainholz, 1790, p. 277 and pp. 485–489.

23 Cf. W. Weber, *The Great Transformation of Musical Taste: Concert Programming from Haydn to Brahms*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008; L. Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.

Table 1: Comparative chart of the symphonic repertoire of five concert seasons at the Gewandhaus of Leipzig

Season	1781/82	1791/92	1801/02	1811/12	1821/22
Concerts	22	24	22	21	23
Composers	20	12	12	15	10
Symphonies	60	48	39 (+ 9 NN)	21	23
Symphonies by Viennese composers (first: total number)	32: Vanhal 10, Haydn 9, Dittersdorf 7, van Swieten 2, Pichl 2, Gassmann 1, Mozart 1	42: Haydn 11, Koželuh 9, Pichl 5, Pleyel 4, Wranitzky 4, Gyrowetz 3, Hoffmeister 3, Mozart 2, A. Zimmermann 1	33: Haydn 13, Mozart 9, Gyrowetz 4, Beethoven 3, Hoffmeister 2, Wranitzky 2	12: Beethoven 3, Haydn 3, Mozart 3, Eberl 1, Pixis 1, Struck 1	15: Beethoven 6, Mozart 3, Eberl 2, Haydn 2, Ries 2
from the rest of Southern Germany	8: Rosetti 2, J. Schmitt 2, Stamitz 4	4: Rosetti 4	2: André 1, Kirmair 1	1: Rortte 1	1: André 1
from Northern Germany	14: Gestewitz (L) 1, Naumann (DD) 7, Schuster (DD) 2, Wolf (WE) 2, Neruda (DD) 1, Zinck 1	2: Hodermann 1, Naumann 1	1: J.G.H. Voigr (L) 1	6: C. Braun 1, Bergt (L) 1, Ebell 1, A. Romberg 1, B. Romberg 1, Schneider (L) 1	4: B. Romberg 1, Fesca (L) 1, Spohr 2
from other areas	6: J.C. Bach (I/GB) 5, van Maldere (F) 1	–	3: Clementi (I/GB) 1, Kraus (D/SW) 1, Rode (F) 1	2: Wilms (D/NL) 1, Kraus (D/SW) 1	3: Clementi 3

Since the second half of the eighteenth century, a rising wave of patriotism due to the political division of the German Empire into multiple principalities found a major source of expression in the field of culture (a phenomenon later called “Kulturnation” by historian Friedrich Meinecke). This patriotic movement was strengthened in the wake of the French Revolution, culminating in the wars against Napoleon Bonaparte and during the French occupation and annexation of German territory. In the field of literature, the yearning for German national classics that could stir national pride,²⁴ thus compensating for the political desperation, was fulfilled at that time by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and Friedrich Schiller in Weimar. This holds true even if Goethe never saw himself primarily as a national poet, having coined the term “Weltliteratur” to signify an international, eternal canon to which he could aspire, placing himself on the same level as Dante Alighieri, William Shakespeare, or Miguel de Cervantes. Goethe and Schiller came from the southern regions of Germany, but they were Protestants and eventually settled in the north-central region, in Weimar, not far from Leipzig.

Influenced by the philosophy of Immanuel Kant and his notion that beauty was “purposiveness without purpose”²⁵, they propagated the aesthetic concept of artistic autonomy: art should be an end in itself. The popularity of this concept has been interpreted as a reflection of – and compensation for – the desire of the German bourgeois for political autonomy.²⁶ It also proved very helpful for the revaluation of instrumental music: its remoteness from the world and from any particular meaning, which, hitherto had been considered a defect (especially from a rationalist and moral point of view), now became its most important asset.²⁷

German music experts had always been convinced that their nation had a special talent for instrumental music. However, as long as this genre was considered inferior to vocal music, it could not be a source of cultural pride. The revaluation and rise of instrumental music were thus of great use for the German patriotic movement. And while, conversely, patriotism was important for the success of the genre, it was not the only factor.²⁸

24 This need is clearly expressed in an anonymous article about monuments of German composers: “Monumente deutscher Tonkünstler”, *AmZ* 2 (1800), col. 418–423.

25 Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgment* (*Kritik der Urteilskraft*, 1790), § 11 („Zweckmäßigkeit ohne Zweck“).

26 H.-W. Heister, *Das Konzert. Theorie einer Kulturform*, Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen, 1983, pp. 74–82.

27 C. Dahlhaus, *Die Idee der absoluten Musik*, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1978; M. E. Bonds, *Absolute Music: The History of an Idea*, Oxford: OUP, 2014, pp. 98–111.

28 Cf. C. Applegate, “How German is it? Nationalism and the Idea of Serious Music in the Early

After its founding in 1798 in Leipzig, the *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (*AmZ*) quickly became the main public forum for debates on the new aesthetics of music as well as on the musical canon and stylistic requirements of the symphony. It was the first music journal in history that survived more than a couple of years (it existed up until 1848 and was broadly distributed, not just in the German lands). Musicologists have often treated this periodical as a purely aesthetic treatise.²⁹ Admittedly, *AmZ* editors announced in the first issue that they wanted to do something for “the scientific in music”; however, they justified Leipzig’s pre-eminent position for the mission by claiming that the Saxon city was already “a sort of centre, assembly point and staple for all literary goods in Germany – in scientific as well as in mercantilist regards”.³⁰ It should not be overlooked that the *AmZ* was published by Breitkopf & Härtel, the main music publisher in Leipzig. Undoubtedly, Gottfried Christoph Härtel, who had taken over the Breitkopf publishing house in 1796, pursued his own commercial agenda with this periodical. On the one hand, the *AmZ*, with its broad network of more than 130 correspondents in 50 different places, permitted him to keep up to date on new trends in the musical world in Germany and abroad.³¹ On the other hand, the *AmZ* proved a powerful and effective propaganda machine for influencing public opinion on music. Its toolbox included advertisements and reviews of newly printed music (from Härtel’s own firm and from his colleagues and competitors) as well as articles instructing the readers about the basic principles of music.

The publishing house Breitkopf & Härtel specialized primarily in instrumental music for several reasons. First, there was a rapidly growing clientele for this music, especially for piano music, as both works originally composed for the instrument and reductions of symphonic music were in high demand. Second, there was a large circle of German composers producing instrumental works, whereas operas continued to be created mainly in Italy and Paris. Finally, Breitkopf & Härtel profited from the local advantage of the presence of the Gewandhaus’s concerts in Leipzig, where they could try out and rehearse new manuscripts of

19th Century”, *19th-Century Music* 21 (1998) 3, pp. 274–296; S. Pederson, “A.B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German National Identity”, *19th-Century Music* 18 (1994) 2, pp. 87–107.

29 Cf. S. Horlitz and M. Recknagel (eds.), *Musik und Bürgerkultur. Leipzigs Aufstieg zur Musikstadt*, Leipzig: Peters, 2007, pp. 4–9, especially the “Vorwort” by W. Seidel.

30 “das Wissenschaftliche in der Musik”; “eine Art Mittelpunkt, Sammelplatz und Stapelort für alles Literarische in Deutschland [...]”, sowohl in eigentlich wissenschaftlicher, als auch in merkantilistischer Hinsicht” (“Noch einige Worte der Redakteure an das Publikum”, *AmZ* 1 (1798), col. 3–4).

31 Cf. M. Bigenwald, *Die Anfänge der Leipziger Allgemeinen Musikalischen Zeitung*, Sibiu: Schmidt, 1938 (this doctoral dissertation is still worth reading because it is based on sources that were lost during the Second World War).

orchestral scores sent to them. Therefore, it is no surprise that the *AmZ*, as Breitkopf & Härtel’s journal, became the main advocate of new instrumental music, with the symphony at the forefront. Emphasizing the special German gift for the symphony became one of its leitmotifs. In 1805, D. Hohnbaum even maintained that Germany held the first place among all nations in music in general, thanks to the “heroes and suns” Mozart and Haydn.³² And, in 1813, in the heyday of the patriotic liberation movement against Napoleon, Ernst Ludwig Gerber announced that Germany was the “one and only seat” of the symphony, which he praised as “the non plus ultra of most modern art”.³³

One of the most significant documents for the merging of commercial, patriotic, and aesthetic aspects in the *AmZ* is an anonymously published essay in favour of printing full scores of symphonies (in Germany, prior to this time, the genre was printed only in parts and in piano score). The text begins by stirring the patriotic pride of German readers, claiming that it was their country that had offered the symphony to the whole world as the “highest and most brilliant peak of modern instrumental music”.³⁴ The author argues that the genre has become the yardstick of musical perfection in general, even for opera and church music. Just as the quality of an orchestra can only be fully measured when it is playing a symphony, so can the public only demonstrate its ability to understand and enjoy modern serious music via this genre. Consequently, it seemed absolutely necessary for musicians and music lovers alike to possess the great masters’ symphonies in the form of a printed full score – as a sort of “treasure providing lifelong joy and also education”.³⁵ Certainly, the article did not miss the opportunity to include an advertisement, actually printed by Breitkopf & Härtel, of a symphonic orchestral score: Haydn’s Symphony no. 103.

A much more famous text, and at the same time a more subtle example of propaganda, is the extensive review that novelist and composer Ernst Theodor Amadeus Hoffmann wrote in 1810 for the *AmZ* on Beethoven’s Symphony no. 5 in C Minor. The first part of this well-known article is a manifesto for romanticism, strongly supporting the new conviction that “genuine music” was music

32 D. Hohnbaum, “Gedanken über den Geist der heutigen deutschen Setzkunst”, *AmZ* 6 (1805), col. 397–402.

33 E. L. Gerber, “Eine freundliche Vorstellung über gearbeitete Instrumentalmusik, besonders über Symphonien”, *AmZ* 15 (1813), col. 457–458.

34 “der höchste und glänzendste Gipfel der neueren Instrumentalmusik” (“Merkwürdige Novität”, *AmZ* 8 [1806], col. 616–622, at col. 616).

35 “hier hat man einen Schatz dafür, an dem man auf Lebenszeit Freude und auch Belehrung finden kann!” (*ibid.*, col. 621).

without words – purely instrumental music – and that Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven were the three great geniuses in this field, whereas other composers, such as Dittersdorf (who had dared to combine pure music with a narrative programme), should be banned from concert programmes and forgotten forever.³⁶ The second part is one of the first detailed analyses of a symphonic work, using numerous music examples. It is not surprising to note that Beethoven's Symphony no. 5 was published by Breitkopf & Härtel. Thus in spite of its importance as an aesthetic manifesto, Hoffmann's review was also a tool of commercial propaganda. Admittedly, Hoffmann did not live in Leipzig but in Berlin, and his text was somewhat more radical in its romantic enthusiasm than the mainstream of the *AmZ* articles.³⁷ But his review was published anonymously and thus seemed to represent the general opinion of the journal.

The editor-in-chief of the *AmZ* was Johann Friedrich Rochlitz. He had sung in the choir of the St Thomas Church as a boy and then studied theology at Leipzig University. More a writer than a musician, Rochlitz became a main actor and the principal commentator of the appropriation process of the new Viennese repertoire in Leipzig. This process was coupled with an ambitious programme to develop new "scientific" and historical reasoning with regard to music, especially in light of its recent evolution in Germany and its relationship to the development of the "general spirit of the time".³⁸ The main goal was to make music an essential part of the broad neo-humanistic project of aesthetic education (*Bildung*) propagated by Goethe, Schiller, and their followers (Rochlitz was a friend of Goethe).

Rochlitz's first task in this respect was the nostrification of Mozart. Just as many other northern critics, he initially felt repelled by what he called the mixture of the sublime and bizarre in the works of this composer, properties that often tasted like "tar and sulphur".³⁹ In order to familiarize northern *AmZ* readers with the master, who suffered an untimely death, Rochlitz published some anecdotes from his life. For example, he reported in detail Mozart's one and only visit to Leipzig in 1789, when he had appeared to be deeply impressed by a Bach motet

36 *AmZ* 12 (1810), col. 630–642 and col. 652–660, especially col. 631–633 (Hoffmann's article "Beethovens Instrumentalmusik", published in 1814 in his collection *Kreisleriana*, is a slightly altered version of this text).

37 For example, F. Rochlitz in 1808 even worried about the fact that instrumental music seemed to have become more important in Germany than vocal music (*AmZ* 10 (1808), col. 203).

38 F. Rochlitz, "Vorschläge zu Betrachtungen über die neueste Geschichte der Musik", *AmZ* 1 (1799), col. 625–629.

39 F. Rochlitz, *Blicke in das Gebiet der Künste und der praktischen Philosophie*, Gotha: Perthes, 1796, pp. 95–96.

performed by the St Thomas choir; Rochlitz even claimed that Mozart’s turn to a more serious contrapuntal writing in his last works (the *Requiem* and *The Magic Flute*) might have been caused by this healthy influence of musical culture from the north, especially that found in Leipzig.⁴⁰ This permitted him to place Mozart, just like Haydn, at the pinnacle of the “heroes and leaders” of contemporary German music.⁴¹

In its first years, the *AmZ* continued the dual strategy that had been pursued in Breitkopf’s earlier symphonic repertoire policy: while dedicating more and more lines to the appropriation of the southern repertoire, the journal still officially revered some older composers from the north. Accordingly, composers such as Johann Sebastian Bach, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, Carl Heinrich Graun, Johann Adolf Hasse, and Johann Abraham Peter Schulz were among those featured on the covers of the yearly volumes of the journal. The *AmZ* even reprinted an illustration by a northern Bach enthusiast who had emigrated to London, August Friedrich Christoph Kollmann: it depicts modern German composers as rays of the sun with Johann Sebastian Bach at the centre (in the context of a propaganda text in favour of Haydn’s symphonies and against Italian opera).⁴² In reality, Bach’s works were seldom played and hardly appreciated in Leipzig at that time. The centre of the cult around him consisted of a small elitist circle in Berlin. It was not until 30 years later that Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, educated in Berlin, would reimpose Bach to Leipzig.

In a large retrospective *AmZ* article published in 1800 on the historical evolution of German music in the eighteenth century, southern German music was condemned for having long been a mere “colony” of Italy, with Haydn and Mozart as rare exceptions.⁴³ In his judgment of the present state of music in Germany, the anonymous author wavered between patriotic pride and traditional northern scepticism, calling it a “time of fermentation”.⁴⁴ Five years later, Gerber was still warning about ungratefully forgetting the merits of earlier northern German composers, such as Hasse, Graun, Georg Anton Benda, Hiller, Schulz, and other great artists, in the midst of the growing glorification of Haydn and especially

40 F. Rochlitz, “Anekdoten aus W. G. Mozarts Leben”, in: *AmZ* 1 (1798), col. 117.

41 “Helden und Führer” (Rochlitz, “Vorschläge”, col. 628).

42 *AmZ* 2 (1799), col. 103–104.

43 “Bemerkungen über die Ausbildung der Tonkunst in Deutschland im achtzehnten Jahrhundert”, *AmZ* 3 (1801), col. 277–278, note 1. According to Bigenwald (M. Bigenwald, *Die Anfänge der Leipziger AmZ*, p. 93), this important article often attributed to Johann Karl Friedrich Triest was by G. Tolev (Dresden).

44 *Ibid.*, col. 443.

Mozart. Gerber compared the revolutionary and brilliant art of the latter with Icarus's flight (highlighting the perils for those who try to follow) and with extraordinary delicacies spoiling the taste of the public for ordinary and healthy food.⁴⁵ Even in the heyday of patriotic uprising, the *AmZ* still observed a strong divide between northern and southern Germany, "at least in the domains of science and art", drawing a line between "more spiritual education, more seriousness and perseverance" in the north and "more fire, energy and life" in the south. The journal advocated a national fraternization of the two camps based on the mutual appropriation of characteristics and assets (once again referring to the example of Mozart's last works and speculating about the advantages the late Haydn might have gained for his oratorios from a stay in the north).⁴⁶

On the other hand, the *AmZ* contributed greatly to confirming and justifying on a theoretical level the dominance of the new Viennese repertoire in concert life. This aim of appropriation and explicit nostrification is already apparent in the first volumes, where expressions such as "our great Haydn" or "our father Haydn" are used.⁴⁷ Since one of the most important aims of the *AmZ* was to prove that Germany as a whole was the home and centre of the symphony, the journal had to pay more and more attention to the new Viennese repertoire. The authors of the journal went to great lengths to convince their readers that this new music, though differing so much from the older northern style, in fact confirmed the eternal rules of unity and logic on a deeper level.⁴⁸

Christian Friedrich Michaelis, a lecturer of philosophy at Leipzig University, even referred to this new music in adapting Kant's concept of aesthetic autonomy to music and dispelling reservations expressed by the northern German philosopher about the art of sounds in general (for Kant, music was closer to culinary consumption than to culture).⁴⁹ Michaelis's colleague, professor Amadeus Wendt,

45 "geblendet und begeistert [...] verdarben wir durch die ungewöhnlich zusammengesetzten Leckerbissen und haut-gout-Gerichte den Geschmack an gewöhnlicher gesunder Hausmannskost" (E. L. Gerber, "Nachtrag zu den [...] Gedanken über den Geist der heutigen deutschen Setzkunst", *AmZ* 7 (1805), col. 571–578, at col. 573).

46 "eine höchst fatale Grenz- und Demarcationslinie zwischen Nord- und Süddeutschland, wenigstens was Wissenschaft und Kunst betraf"; "mehr geistige Bildung, mehr Ernst und Beharrlichkeit [...] mehr Feuer, Kraft und Leben" ("An die nord- und süddeutschen Tonkünstler und Kunstgenossen", *AmZ* 16 (1814), col. 434–436).

47 See *AmZ* 1 (1799), col. 309; *AmZ* 3 (1801), col. 410.

48 "Einige Ideen über die ältere und neuere Compositionsart", *AmZ* 20 (1818), col. 649–653 and 665–673.

49 Kant, *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, § 53: „mehr Genuß als Kultur“. C. F. Michaelis still confirmed Kant's opinion (C. F. Michaelis, "Ueber den Rang der Tonkunst unter den schönen Künsten",

who was also a member of the Gewandhaus’s executive board, finally coined the term *classical period* in 1836 for the “cloverleaf” formed by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven.⁵⁰ In the end, Leipzig writers contributed greatly to the general canonization of the Viennese symphony, which, though initially a local elitist phenomenon (a *Sonderweg* in music), finally became the international norm for the genre, driving out all other local variants. In fact, the three Viennese composers were the first to have remained in the musical canon since their own lifetime up to today.

Breitkopf & Härtel soon became aware of the commercial potential of this process of canonization. In the first volume of the *AmZ*, they were already advertising the publication of the complete editions of the works of Haydn and Mozart.⁵¹ They began to publish expensive editions of the complete works by the so-called classical composers. Other music publishers, such as the Bureau de Musique (a firm founded by the Viennese composer Franz Anton Hoffmeister and the Leipzig organist Ambrosius Kühnel in 1800, which later became C. F. Peters), also discovered the new market and advertised their “patriotic plan” to “offer to the admirers of genuine music the classical works of our German, universally recognized fathers of music, as monuments to the honour of German art”.⁵²

In this competition, Breitkopf & Härtel had one decisive advantage: the close alliance with the Gewandhaus. Since 1805, Rochlitz was a member of the Gewandhaus’s executive board and was responsible for the concert programmes. The board had a large say in the programmes, especially regarding the choice of the symphonic works, because the Gewandhaus’s *Kapellmeister* (conductor) conducted only the vocal works (up to 1835, purely orchestral pieces were led by the first violin). The benefits of the alliance between Breitkopf & Härtel, the *AmZ*, and

AmZ 2 (1799), col. 183–186); on musical autonomy, see C. F. Michaelis, “Ein Versuch, das innere Wesen der Tonkunst zu entwickeln”, *AmZ* 8 (1806), col. 673–683 and col. 691–696.

50 A. Wendt, *Über den gegenwärtigen Zustand der Musik besonders in Deutschland und wie er geworden ist*, Göttingen: Dieterich, 1836, p. 3.

51 “Intelligenz-Blatt No. 14”, *AmZ* 1 (1799).

52 Announcement of subscription for the complete edition of Haydn’s string quartets, published in June 1801 in several journals, quoted in: A. Beer, *Das Leipziger Bureau de Musique (Hoffmeister & Kühnel, A. Kühnel): Geschichte und Verlagsproduktion (1800–1814)*, Munich and Salzburg: Katzbichler, 2020, p. 744: “Unserm patriotischen Plane gemäß, nach welchem wir den Verehrern ächter Musik die classischen Werke unserer deutschen überall anerkannten Väter der Tonkunst als Denkmäler zur Ehre Deutscher Kunst, wie auch zum Nutzen werdender Künstler in eleganten und zugleich wohlfeilen Ausgaben liefern wollen”; cf. A. Beer, *Musik zwischen Komponist, Verlag und Publikum. Die Rahmenbedingungen des Musikschaffens in Deutschland im ersten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Tutzing: H. Schneider, 2000, pp. 260–265.

the Gewandhaus were reciprocal in nature, since Rochlitz inserted more and more detailed reports on the Gewandhaus's concerts in the journal.

Originally, propaganda for Leipzig's musical life had not been an important aim of the *AmZ*. In an introductory note addressed to the readers, the editors had even admitted that music played in Leipzig might seem rather unimportant in comparison to that music in Berlin, Vienna, Prague, and Dresden.⁵³ In the first years, the *AmZ* dedicated more space to reports from some of these cities (especially Berlin and Vienna),⁵⁴ which were royal or imperial residences with important opera houses.

However, a few years later, Rochlitz would begin to publish comprehensive lists of the repertoire played in the past season at the Gewandhaus⁵⁵ and later even the complete programme of each subscription concert.⁵⁶ This was meant to be a useful model for concert institutes elsewhere, "for the benefit of music and of its friends".⁵⁷ He informed the readers about the "well-thought plan of the venerable institution", which entailed "the most careful choice of excellent works from all times, nations and schools" and followed the principle of presenting only "the really good" in high quality and continually.⁵⁸ He also pointed out that the Gewandhaus no longer presented only new works (as had been the custom) but preferred to repeat the great masterworks that merited being listened to "again and again".⁵⁹ This concentration on a rather small canon of masterpieces also had practical and economic advantages because, in the early years of the institution, several of the Gewandhaus's musicians were not professionals but students from the university. Later, the musicians' main occupation and source of income would be to play at the opera. Finally, Rochlitz insisted that all symphonies be presented at the Gewandhaus in their entirety, whereas orchestras elsewhere often played

53 "Noch einige Worte der Redakteure an das Publikum", *AmZ* 1 (1798), col. 3.

54 In the first volume of the *AmZ*, only one column was devoted to the "weekly Thursday's concerts" at the Gewandhaus (*AmZ* 1 [1799], col. 425).

55 Cf. *AmZ* 4 (1802), col. 233–243; *AmZ* 7 (1805), col. 213–218; Cf. E. Reimer, "Die Leipziger Symphonie-Rezeption im Spiegel der 'Allgemeinen musikalischen Zeitung (1800–1830)'" in: Horlitz and Recknagel (eds.), *Musik und Bürgerkultur*, pp. 132–150.

56 Cf. *AmZ* 12 (1810), col. 929–935; Cf. *AmZ* 15 (1813), col. 25–33.

57 *AmZ* 13 (1811), col. 265; *AmZ* 18 (1816), col. 273.

58 "seinem wohlwogeneren Plane treu, dies achtungswürdige Institut vornehmlich durch sorgfältigste Auswahl von vorzüglichen Werken aller Zeiten, Nationen und Schulen"; "Man gebe nur, auch dem gemischten Publikum, das wahrhaft Gute, gebe es wahrhaft gut, gebe es anhaltend" (*AmZ* 10 [1808], col. 231–232).

59 *AmZ* 6 (1804), col. 542–543.

only single movements of a symphony or distributed them all over the concert.⁶⁰ Thanks to Rochlitz, *AmZ* readers (among them, Goethe, Beethoven, and many others) increasingly became convinced that the Gewandhaus really was a model of musical taste, competence, and practice, especially in the field of the symphony (Beethoven called Leipzig “the tribunal for music”).⁶¹

A special case that illustrates this opinion-forming and trend-setting role of the Gewandhaus and the *AmZ* was the early reception of Beethoven’s Symphony no. 3, the *Sinfonia eroica*.⁶² This work, which was revolutionary in terms of both complexity and sheer proportion (it has almost the same duration as two average symphonies combined), had received a rather mixed response at its first performances in Vienna. Thanks to Rochlitz, *AmZ* readers throughout Germany and beyond were kept well informed on the great efforts that Leipzig took in welcoming and appropriating this extraordinary work in an adequate manner. Even before its first performance there, Rochlitz published in the *AmZ* a technical analysis of the *Eroica*.⁶³ The orchestra dedicated additional (and unpaid) rehearsal time and prepared a manuscript of the full score of the work.⁶⁴ These practices were unusual at the time, as was the distribution of special programme notes to the audience at the premiere, which included a characteristic description of each movement and, more importantly, of the intended emotional effect.

Besides the quality of the performance of the work, which was played again twice in the same season, Rochlitz also stressed the dignified and competent behaviour of the public: according to his report, “the best-educated friends of art in the city”, who attended the concert in extraordinary large numbers, received the work “in solemn suspense and dead silence” before expressing “well-founded enthusiasm” at the end.⁶⁵ This devotional attitude of the public was also an important element of the new culture of serious symphonic concerts. Hitherto, this solemn approach had been mainly reserved for church services, whereas eighteenth-century opera and concert publics were often rather noisy (for example,

60 *AmZ* 18 (1816), col. 279; Cf. Heister, *Das Konzert*, pp. 435–437.

61 Beethoven to Breitkopf & Härtel, 6 May 1811, quoted in: N. Kämpken and M. Ladenburger (eds.), *Beethoven und der Leipziger Musikverlag Breitkopf & Härtel*, Bonn: Beethoven-Haus, 2007, p. 31.

62 Cf. M. Erb-Szymanski, “Das Leipzig des Friedrich Rochlitz. Die Anfänge der musikalischen Kanonbildung und der klassisch-romantischen Musikästhetik”, in: Horlitz and Recknagel (eds.), *Musik und Bürgerkultur*, pp. 42–81, at 64–66.

63 *AmZ* 9 (1807), col. 321–322.

64 *Ibid.*, col. 497–498.

65 “die gebildetsten Kunstfreunde der Stadt”, “feyerliche Spannung und Todtenstille”, “wohlbe-gründeter Enthusiasmus” (*ibid.*).

during the famous concerts at the court of Mannheim, people used to stand at tall tables, drink tea, and play cards).⁶⁶

Rochlitz's continuous praise of the Gewandhaus's concerts and its public obviously had some impact on the public itself, encouraging the identification of Leipzig's bourgeoisie with its concert institution. This identification was much stronger than with the new local opera theatre, founded in 1817. The theatre was rented out to a commercial director who, during his mandate, was responsible for the programme alone, whereas at the Gewandhaus the leading bourgeois families could exert significant influence over the orchestra and its programme via the executive board. The Gewandhaus's concerts were also a means of social distinction: almost all the seats in the hall were occupied by the town's richest families, who had the special privilege of holding life-long subscriptions, which were passed down from one generation to the next.⁶⁷ Many of the members of the Gewandhaus's executive board were also members of exclusive clubs, Masonic lodges, and the city council.⁶⁸ By cultivating symphonic music at the Gewandhaus, the bourgeois high society of Leipzig distinguished itself not only from aristocratic opera culture in capitals such as Dresden or Berlin but also from lower, poorer, and less educated classes. Thus, symphonic music illustrated in a particularly clear manner how *Bildung* (an Enlightenment concept originally meant as an aspiration for all mankind) became a symbol of social distinction.⁶⁹ On the other hand, the growing identification of the leading bourgeois families of Leipzig (and elsewhere) with a commitment to "serious" music (which was reinforced through the practice of inviting famous musicians who, aside from the public concert performances, took part in semi-private music activities in the salons as well)⁷⁰ also contributed to the rise of social status among musicians.⁷¹

66 On this paradigmatic shift, see S. O. Müller, *Das Publikum macht die Musik. Musikleben in Berlin, London und Wien im 19. Jahrhundert*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014, pp. 217–259. In fact, Rochlitz's account is decisively earlier than all sources quoted by Müller.

67 Cf. Thrun, "Konzertstadt Leipzig", pp. 94–100; cf. A. Pieper, *Music and the Making of Middle-Class Culture. A Comparative History of Nineteenth-Century Leipzig and Birmingham*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

68 Cf. M.-E. Menninger, *Art and Civic Patronage in Leipzig, 1848–1914*, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1998, pp. 50–60, pp. 231–232, and p. 261.

69 Cf. Müller, *Das Publikum macht die Musik*; cf. U. Tadday, *Die Anfänge des Musikfeuilletons: der kommunikative Gebrauchswert musikalischer Bildung in Deutschland um 1800*, Stuttgart: Metzler, 1993, pp. 11–27.

70 M. Gerber, *Zwischen Salon und musikalischer Geselligkeit. Henriette Voigt, Livia Frege und Leipzigs bürgerliches Musikleben*, Hildesheim: Olms, 2016.

71 Cf. Applegate, "How German is it?", pp. 274–296; cf. Gramit, *Cultivating Music*, pp. 12–26.

Thus, the Gewandhaus’s concerts were characterized by a paradoxical situation as people outside Leipzig were kept well informed by the *AmZ* while inside the city it became increasingly difficult to gain access to the concerts. Nevertheless, the *AmZ* succeeded in convincing the music public in Germany and beyond that they should follow this model and establish corresponding concert series with a similar programme privileging the classical canon.⁷² Even court orchestras, which continued to exist in the German lands up until 1918 (and generally engaged the best musicians), established subscription concert series after the Leipzig model.⁷³ In Vienna, public concerts developed more slowly because, as an imperial residence, it was full of rich aristocrats who engaged their own musicians or even orchestras, thus providing stark competition for bourgeois concert life. A concert hall specifically meant for public concerts was not inaugurated until 1831, and continually held philharmonic concerts first started in 1842. Also, music criticism emerged later than that in Leipzig due to a strict system of censorship.

One of the most remarkable aspects of this case of intercultural transfer is the fact that it happened without the presence of any famous composer in Leipzig.⁷⁴ It was not until 1835 that the situation changed significantly, when the appointment of Mendelssohn as *Kapellmeister* of the Gewandhaus finally provided the *Musikstadt* (music city) Leipzig with a prominent face. Mendelssohn, who had been educated in Berlin by Carl Friedrich Zelter, the friend and music advisor of Goethe, represented a new stage in the process of appropriation of Viennese music: he was the first northern German composer to succeed both in completely adopting the principles of the classical style and in developing a clearly recognizable style of his own. His approach consisted of combining the classical style with new romantic trends and elements of the older baroque style from Bach and Handel and thus strived towards a synthesis of northern and southern features from across three epochs. He was seconded by Robert Schumann, who also lived a long time in Leipzig, strengthening Leipzig’s position as the centre of German discourse on music by founding the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*. Their followers formed what is sometimes called the Leipzig school of composition, which dominated the city’s Conservatory of Music, founded in 1843. Together with the ever-expanding business of music publishing houses (which did not reach its peak until 1900), the conservatory

72 The *AmZ* praised itself for having stirred enthusiasm over Beethoven’s music in the whole of Germany and abroad (*AmZ* 31 [1829], col. 721).

73 Cf. Thrun, “Konzertstadt Leipzig”, pp. 106–115.

74 In the preface to the *AmZ*, the absence of famous musicians in the town was even interpreted as an asset for the music journal and for music criticism in general (*AmZ* 1 [1798], col. 4).

played the main role in attracting musicians from all over the world to Leipzig, thus transferring the principles of the new musical classicism across the globe.⁷⁵

In summary, the history of the invention of classical music is an impressive example of the mechanisms of intercultural transfer. It was a result of not only the sheer quality of Viennese music but also a very particular conjunction of needs and trends elsewhere: the needs of Leipzig's bourgeois society for cultural identification and distinction (as citizens of Leipzig and as German patriots), the aesthetic trends towards a classicist autonomy of the arts and romantic enthusiasm about wordless music, the striving of musicians towards a higher social status for themselves and their art within the general movement of *Bildung*, and last but not least the commercial aims of Breitkopf & Härtel and other music publishers.

As a bourgeois commerce city, Leipzig was especially suited for intercultural transfers. One might cynically say that, just as the city had become rich in the late Middle Ages by trading precious furs from Eastern Europe, it later became the centre of music commerce and education in Germany and beyond by trading precious Viennese music. However, it is important to stress that this commercial success merged with social needs and (in the first half of the nineteenth century) with aesthetic trends. Thus, research on intercultural transfers helps us to arrive at a better understanding of how the Viennese symphonic repertoire, composed under cultural and social conditions that were rather different than those of the bourgeois symphony concert, became – nolens volens – the core of musical classics and a means for the rise of the *Musikstadt* Leipzig.

75 Cf. S. Keym, "Leipzig oder Berlin? Statistik und Ortswahlkriterien ausländischer Kompositionsstudenten um 1900 als Beispiel für einen institutionsgeschichtlichen Städtevergleich", in: S. Keym and K. Stöck (eds.), *Musik in Leipzig, Wien und anderen Städten im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig: Gudrun Schröder, 2011, pp. 142–164.