

## CHANGES IN STATUS AND ROLE-PLAY: THE MUSICIAN AT THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

RICHARD A. CARLTON

40 Albert St.  
GUELPH ON N1G 1C6  
Canada

UDC: 78.067"17"

Original Scientific Paper  
Izvorni znanstveni rad  
Received: June 6, 2004  
Priljeno: 6. lipnja 2004.  
Accepted: February 15, 2006  
Prihvaćeno: 15. veljače 2006.

### *Abstract — Résumé*

Much has been made of the troubled demise of Mozart and Beethoven, by contrast with the more serene longevity of »Papa Haydn«. This follows from the perspective of the Romantic period: the struggling, unappreciated, youthful genius! Yet, conflict such as that between Mozart and the Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg is more than the opposition of a proud patriarch toward a headstrong, arrogant employee. At the end of the Eighteenth Century, music was moving from the Church and the Court to the salons and new concert halls of a wealthy urban middle class of professionals and merchants. The position of the musician was changing rapidly: the statuses of noble patron and household-servant musician were no longer legitimated by the new norms of individualism and emancipation. This was the age of revolution, as in France

and North America. The rout of aristocratic privilege and the drive to a new system of *achieved* rather than *ascribed* status propelled the musician toward a new position to which society was not yet fully adjusted. Conflicts and career failure were functions of change in the social system rather than shortcomings of personalities.

This discussion carefully defines status and role-theory terms before proceeding with a comparison of brief case-studies: Haydn in contrast with his pupils Mozart and Beethoven. Music is seen to evolve from occasional presentation to the building up of a published repertory for stable groups of performers. The musician plays a new role!

**Key words:** Social status; Role-Play; Haydn; Mozart; Beethoven; Patron; Servant musician

When the author was first taught to write longhand, our teacher required us, first, to sharpen pencils, put new nibs in our pens, fill our inkwells and rule the hitherto blank pages. Later, when I studied manual arts such as carpentry, my cabinetmaker instructor insisted that all the requisite tools be cleaned, sharpened

and put to hand. Such examples will explain why the following thesis in sociology of music must be prefaced by clear theoretical definition of the terms which will be our analytic tools!

The concepts of »status« and »role« have, by now, entered vernacular speech, retaining only weak links to their practical origins in social analysis. Each intellectual tradition, or »theoretical school«, absorbs the basic concepts which take on a new theoretical locus, and new connotations specific to the cognitive bent of their »host« culture. The most elementary terms of role-theory have quite different denotations and connotations when they are employed within Marxist, Functionalist, or Symbolic-Interactionist paradigms. Clear thinking requires precise words; for which reason we will first state the exact meanings which our chosen terms are meant to evoke. What do we mean, below, by »status« and »role«?

Originally, the Latin term *status* meant *position*. One of the legacies of Marxian thought is the exclusively evaluative, ranking implication of the term. More fundamental is the question »position in what«? A social structure! The family is a structure which has the different positions of mother, father, child, grandparent, and so on. Each is a status within the structure. A business enterprise will have a structure, within which the CEO, the Sales Manager, the foremen and the labourers all have distinct positions. Each position has some level of comparative prestige. Each is a status. It does not really make sense to enquire whether one has *more* position than another! Each plant in your garden has a distinct and different position. Can one have »more« position than others? We prefer to use the term »prestige« to identify this honoric ranking, reserving status as a tool for analysing the structure of a social space. Of course, each status has its own level of prestige and its distinct function in the division of social labour.

It is not surprising that the writer should turn to one of his teachers, the late Everett Hughes, for a practical definition of status:

Status is here taken in its strict sense as a defined social position for whose incumbents there are defined rights, limitations of rights, and duties. See the *Oxford Dictionary* and any standard Latin lexicon. Since statuses tend to form a hierarchy, the term has — since Roman times — had the additional meaning of rank. [HUGHES, AJS, vol. L, p. 353]

Each social position is defined by both rights and obligations which, in turn, rise from the initial division of social labour within the structure. Parents and children have reciprocal rights and obligations within the structure of the family: the child's right to nurture is matched by the obligatory care of the parent; while the authority of the parent is paired to the dutiful obedience of the child.

When we look into the status of the musician, it will be evident that diverse social organizations such as church or court have differently defined the position of the musician. It should also be noted that, at different periods of societal evolu-

tion, the positions of composer, performer or instructor may be separate or combined, according to changes or increase in the division of labour. As duties and obligations evolve, so the status changes.

»Role« is more of a social-psychological perception. In filling any status, the social actor is surrounded by the expectations of others who exercise positive or negative reinforcing sanctions. The music master can be authoritarian or permissive in fulfilling the obligations of his position, but must face the rewards and punishments available to his employer and pupil role-senders. There is always a range of behaviours within the prescriptions and proscriptions of a given status. Role-play is the personal, creative acting out of expectations by the incumbent of any status. Now, let us retreat to the Eighteenth Century, to see how the rights and duties of the musician changed so rapidly and completely.

The last half of the Eighteenth Century was a period of rapid social change, in which we find the sources of mutation for musical organizations and personnel. Building on Robert Redfield's ideal type of the »folk« society, [REDFIELD, A.J.S. 1947] anthropologist Horace Miner describes, for us, a set of interrelated factors which — together — bring about a total societal transformation: individualism, secularism, urbanism, impersonalism and bureaucratic structure. Any one of these may be altered, forcing adaptation on the others, so that an urbanized, open society replaces the isolation of an uncritical, illiterate, traditional society based on kinship and an economy of status rather than achievement. Responding to Oscar Lewis' criticism of his typology between two »ideal types«, Miner emphasizes the critical role of *individualism* in the move from a »folk« society to an »urban« social structure. »Does [Lewis] ... mean we should cease to consider individualism and competition as specifically related to other aspects of urban life? It may also mean that we need to know and in what circumstances individualism is systematically related to other systems than the urban«. [MINER, A.S.R., 1952, p. 534] Miner does not propose »individualism« as an adequate or sufficient cause for the move to a secular, competitive, urbanized society, but his attention suggests that this is one of the evident and observable indices of the rural to urban transition. Researchers have described increasing individualism through the Eighteenth Century.

»Religion, philosophical systems, science, the arts, education and the social order, all were to be judged by how they contributed to the well-being of the individual«, says music historian Donald Grout of the Eighteenth Century. [GROUT, 1980, p. 449]

In his overview of Western Society from the Renaissance to the present, subtitled »500 Years of Western Cultural Life«, the celebrated humanist Jacques Barzun highlights emerging individualism as a core shift:

So far in this story, events and ideas have suggested three themes: PRIMITIVISM, INDIVIDUALISM and EMANCIPATION. The first and last, audible in Luther's proffer of Christian liberty ... succeeded in putting an end to the West's unity of belief. It

also foreshadowed the third theme, INDIVIDUALISM, not as a political or social right, but as an assumption behind the proliferation of sects, themselves a result of the individual's untrammelled relation to God.

[BARZUN, »From Dawn to Decadence«, 2000, p. 43]

Immediately, Barzun turns to »Humanism« as another equally powerful ideal increasing the consciousness and strength of emergent individualism. »Humanitatis, that is, the studies it involved, opened a vista on the goals that could be reached on earth: individual self-development«. Noting the introduction of secularism with humanism, Barzun traces the continuing evolution of scholarly humanists out of the earlier men »of good letters«.

... the Humanists liberated the impulses that fuel INDIVIDUALISM, the desire that goes beyond the awareness of one's talents and demands room to develop them. The good society fosters Pico's sense of endless possibility. Individualism thus works towards EMANCIPATION, the modern theme par excellence. [BARZUN, *ibid.*, p. 60]

Above, Barzun has noted that individualism as a personal ethos did not immediately appear as a social or political right. Yet, by the end of the Eighteenth Century, there had been the Emancipation of America, the French Revolution, and the wresting of control over succession, by Parliament, over the English monarchy, now also greatly reduced in power. In this era of rapid social change, the church and court settings for music were drastically altered, the status of Kapellmeister dissolving in favour of the new position of the touring virtuoso performer and the independent marketing of compositions, by subscription. Such mass-marketing presumes the printing of music, as the printed book had created a new reading public and the possibility of idea-formation on a societal scale. Technology, now jarred from arithmetic to geometrical progression, becomes a facilitating or »threshold« causal variable, a *sine qua non*. Music travels through technology, the growth of which becomes exponential through the reciprocal dynamics of innovation in both instrumentation and experimentation. As music travels, it reaches new listeners; the musician is affected by the new consumption and by fresh consumers of his music!

To give our discussion concrete illustration, we offer two »case studies«, one at the middle, and another at the end, of the Eighteenth Century. We shall consider the Kapellmeister status of Joseph Hayden, and the entrepreneurial, independent status sought by his pupil, Mozart, only a decade or so later. These descriptive sketches will enable us to both identify and exemplify some of the determinants of the musician's status, since we will look at the same formative factors in each of the two cases: What are the totality of duties and the corresponding authority attached to the music-maker? Who determines what music shall be composed or

performed? What individuals or groups monitor role-performance, and reward or punish the musician? What controls remuneration and job-security? What is the expected sequence of positions (i.e. career) over a life's work?

Forkel is quoted by Raynor as affirming that »there were more than 340 composers working in the German-speaking Europe of 1784 ... the majority of these musicians were in court employment, craftsmen composers«. [RAYNOR, 1972, p. 290] We know that the »new« Italian style in concerti, sinfonie and opera was much in vogue. Many German, French or Bohemian musicians adopted Italian-sounding pseudonyms, or translations of their real names, in order to secure posts more readily. Franz Joseph Hayden was probably the last, and certainly the greatest, of those musicians who became *household servants* to direct a court musical establishment, the status we wish to examine more closely. The last Prince under whom Hayden was to serve, Nicolaus II, abandoned Eszterháza and kept court mainly in Vienna, with the minimal requirement of annual masses from his Kapellmeister, after 1790. This liberated Hayden, who moved into the new role of the travelling performer and musical entrepreneur; but this novel status occupied only his final years; our interest is in the Kapellmeister role which busied Hayden for some thirty years, made him the most famous composer on the Continent, and allowed his innovations to set the patterns of the sonata structure, the Symphony, and the String Quartet through the ensuing classical-romantic continuum. Our popular image of the inspired composer writing for posterity in poverty and obscurity is a Romantic legacy of the Nineteenth Century, leading us to deplore the servitude and dependence of a musical »great« such as Hayden; but this ignores the many real advantages of the Court position, which Hayden perceived and exploited.

In parentheses, within the line of our thesis, we digress to explain our spelling of Hayden's name. The birth certificate at Rohrau Church shows the »en« spelling, as do the manuscripts for his first symphonies (on display at Eszterháza) and his final will, made only days before his death (on display at his home in Vienna). Since the composer chose this way to spell his own name, we have adopted it instead of the more usual *Haydn* (for which the author has found no explanation)!

The court composer, working to order and satisfying set tastes, was simply an upper servant. He might, as Joseph Haydn apparently did, become a favoured upper servant ... a Kapellmeister ... a little higher up the social scale, but the conditions of service had not altered since the Renaissance. He was expected not only to supervise the music of the Kapell, but also was responsible for the discipline, behaviour and manners of its subordinate members and for their appearance always correctly dressed in uniform. He was expected to see that instruments were properly kept and maintained, and that the library of music, scores and instrumental parts was kept in order ... Whatever he wrote was the property of his patron and could not be published or distributed to anyone else without his patron's consent ... he could not accept commissions from anyone else unless his patron allowed him to do so. [RAYNOR, 1972, p. 291]

Care of expensive musical instruments included the tuning of keyboard instruments by the Kapellmeister himself. Such were the musical duties of Hayden as Kapellmeister, although some restrictions on outside commissions and publications were later relaxed. We must note, first, that he was not entirely free to write whatever he chose, at a time he selected. All his composing tasks were »occasional« music, requested by the Prince for specific Court events. Once, when asked why he had never written any quintets, Hayden replied by stating what he must have thought obvious: »Nobody has ordered any«. [RAYNOR, 1972, p. 290]

Hayden's prestige ranked with that of the major-domo, the wine steward or the court painter — a »very superior class of house officers who managed the Prince's estates and finances«. [RAYNOR, 1972, p. 30] Each morning and afternoon, Hayden was required to appear in the Prince's antechamber, in his full livery and wig, to await any instructions for new music or performances. The Prince would decide on his requirements for the entertainment of his noble guests, the musical instruction of his family, his personal musical hobby of the baryton, or the important occasions of worship for name-days, weddings, and anniversaries. We know a great deal about Hayden's duties, because his contract with the Prince survives. [See CHAILLEY, p. 87ff].

All the music produced, as the property of the Prince, could be made available to other courts only as a courtesy offered by the Prince himself. If a work of Hayden's was to be performed outside the Eszterházy Court, this was a »courtesy« of the Prince which must exhibit the excellent quality of his musical establishment; honour was at stake. When Hasse wrote to Hayden from Vienna, to complement the vocal setting of the *Seven Last Words*, and to request a performance in Vienna, Hayden was most concerned that the presentation should show the best standards of the Eisenstadt Kapelle. In turn, he wrote to the Prince, requesting leave to go to Vienna together with the cellist Weigl, his soprano wife, and the tenor Friberth. Hayden must have been concerned with the offering of his own work before the respected Hasse, but he is clearly solicitous about the honour of his Prince.

Opera was high in court fashion, so that in addition to the composition of operas »on demand«, so to speak, Hayden was regularly producing new operas, which he had to prepare, cast with singers, and often augment with additional or replacement arias. Hayden mounted some seventy-five operas beyond the twenty he composed himself. There was an opera house on the palace estate, burned but rapidly rebuilt. Eszterháza became an opera centre to rival the court theatre at Schönbrunn. The Empress Maria Theresa attended opera at the Eszterház court and then declared that if she wanted to hear opera she would have to visit Eszterháza. Surely, this is exactly what the Prince hoped for with a visit from his ruler!

When the aged Kapellmeister Werner had died in 1766, Hayden moved from his original position of assistant to full Kapellmeister, now with the added duties

of the chapel. His great reputation across Europe started with admiring guests at the Court (whether in residence in Vienna, Eisenstadt or Eszterháza) but came mostly through manuscripts smuggled to publishers wishing to capitalize on his reputation. In some instances, this illicit marketing was the unfaithful undertaking of those designated to deliver manuscripts. It was at the request of the King of Naples that Hayden composed chamber works for the *lyra organizzata* in 1786, as well as several later Notturmi.

The Neapolitan king must have been appreciative, because he did offer Hayden a post at his court, *after* the death of the Eszterházy Prince. Such an offer could not have been made while the Hungarian Prince was still alive, without a severe break in protocol and a serious personal offence. The Kapellmeister was an important display of Court Prestige, guarded against »theft«. When he had a good and widely-reputed craftsman in his employ, the noble was determined not to suffer loss or the humiliation of employment by a rival. The Saxon Count Thun had in his employ the most renowned horn player in Europe, a musician whose training had been paid for by the Count himself: the Bohemian Jan Václav Stich. That musician left the Court without permission and then fled to the Realms of the Emperor. The Count sent soldiers after him with instructions to break his front teeth, so that he might not lend his skill to any rival court. Stich changed his name to the Italianized Giovanni Punto, and continued to concertize on travels, once with Beethoven as his accompanist! [TUCKWELL, 1980] In a similarly ruthless manner, Prince Eszterházy is supposed to have ordered a magnificent ornate iron gate built as the entry focus for his front courtyard at Eszterháza (it can be seen there today) and then allegedly repaid the creator by having him blinded, so that he might never again make a comparable gate. Not only do these anecdotes tell us of the possessive pride of the Nobility, but they alert us to a growth in the more independent thinking of skilled artisans beginning to break with the old pattern of servitude and lifetime loyalty to a princely employer.

Hayden's response to the »household servant« status enabled him to exploit the great possibilities of his musical establishment with relish rather than resentment. First, Franz Josef was a sincere Catholic, who saw his talent as a gift from God, well rewarded by the appreciation of his noble employer and court audience. Over many of his manuscript pages of composition, he wrote exclamations of honour or thanks: »In Nomine Domini«, »Laus Deo«, or an invocation to the Virgin Mary. Once, when told that a musician of his talent should have a splendid palace with coach and horses, and the great men of the world to be his companions, he responded with shocked simplicity: »I had a hard time when I was young; but now I have a comfortable house, three or four courses for dinner every day and a good glass of wine. I can afford to dress decently and to hire a coach whenever I need one. I have met kings and emperors who have said flattering things about me, but I would not choose such people for my friends. I prefer friends of my own



station«. [ROBBINS-LANDON, 1972, p. 28] This man was genuinely humble, but also realistic. His contract forbade undue intimacy with the musicians who would have to respect his detached technical authority. He was not a »social climber«, and must, indeed, have recognized his own achievement as substantial social mobility. A rural wheelwright's son, he had risen to a respectable position at court with a wide reputation. From childhood illiteracy he had attained skill in Latin, fluency in Italian, and a little French and English as well as German. With intermittent help, he had basically taught himself composition from Fux' textbook and the study of others' scores. Of his relative isolation from the Viennese centre of musical activity, Hayden said: »As conductor of an orchestra, I could make experiments, observe what strengthened and what weakened an effect, and thereupon improve, substitute, omit, and try new things; I was cut off from the world, there was no one around to mislead and disturb me, and so I was forced to become original!« [GROUT, 1980, p. 484]

In our own century, many composers would not risk composition of a large orchestral work, outside of a specific commission, with little hope of ever having it performed. Even on a grant for composition, a musician would be reluctant to spend years on a piece of music he would probably never hear or be able to publish. He might well envy Hayden's servitude which gave him an admiring orchestra of his selected players, available to »try new things«, before altering or omitting. The Austrian's familiarity with the taste of his noble employer and his court audience also made it simpler to meet — and with talent — exceed expectations. This was so in all areas, where Hayden had his small but select group of singers for opera or chapel. Further, his tasteful and intelligent patron also wanted to hear »new« things: the early symphonies of Sammartini were brought to court and conducted by Hayden. Only the resources of a wealthy prince could arrange the copying and transport of new music to a seasonal court residence. Hayden's »isolation«, then, was not so complete. Even the baryton trios written for the prince's personal recreation, became a musical challenge resulting in worthwhile pieces and developing skills evident in the piano trios.

He had thirty years' time in which to learn his art to perfection, trying out every new idea that struck him, working day by day with his little orchestra, with his singers — for thirty years accumulating quietly, without nervous haste, an immense treasure of artistic experience. Even yet, there is no complete collection of his innumerable compositions.

[LEICHTENTRITT, 1938, p. 175]

Hayden accepted his intermediate court status with humility rather than resentment, and took advantage of the rich opportunities to explore composition in all genres; he exploited what have later appeared as *disadvantages* to more individualistic contemporary 'achievers'.



It is surely useful to summarize concisely the main elements of the musician's status as a Kapellmeister: [1] composer and arranger of music on specific occasional commission, [2] performer of music as conductor or instrumentalist, [3] librarian for the orderly retention of all scores, both secular and sacred, [4] custodian of all instruments, [4] personnel manager for the recruiting and discipline of all persons in the musical establishment, [5] periodic commissions for work outside the court as a courtesy extended by the noble employer, [6] a perceived stable sequence of positions to be held over a lifetime, i.e. a »career«.

»Individualism« was identified, above, as the leading edge of massive social change which swept across Europe in the late Eighteenth Century. Among Hayden's many brief pupils, both the younger Mozart and Beethoven resisted the status of servant, breaking with the pattern of Kapellmeister to pursue the status of independent itinerant performers and marketers of their compositions, not only to the nobility, but to the new wealthy urban mercantile and professional classes. Where Hayden's late English fling in this role did indeed make him wealthy, his pupils both came to impoverished ends. The market structures for this musical lifestyle were not yet in place. Beyond that, Mozart's weak health (most likely worsened by his uncomfortable and exhausting childhood tours) and Beethoven's growing deafness did curtail their keyboard performing careers. It may not be out of the way to compare this early entrepreneurial activity with today's pop and rock marketing. Profits come largely from the sale of recordings, but each new release is accompanied by an »album tour« featuring songs from the new record or CD. The concerts, held in the most massive venues available, together with T-shirt and logo marketing ensure wide familiarity with the new recording, as does 'saturation' playing on pop radio. Mozart would have envied such a massive presentation of self by mass media; he had to work at it one concert at a time.

As noted above, the position of the musician changes as part of a larger cultural shift, most broadly to an emergent individualism and achievement-oriented reward system. Yet, more specifically to a change in the employing institutions, the audience and the technology. Whereas the Renaissance had involved noble amateur audiences who could sight-read and sing as an after-dinner entertainment (hence the madrigals and part-songs), the Kapellmeister to an ecclesiastical or secular court wrote for the liturgy but also for the entertainment of employers and friends, of known tastes. Music was »occasional«, that is composed or adapted to be performed at a specific event, with little expectation that it might ever be performed at any later date. The »market« changed with the rising consumer power of wealthy secular urbanities, a new »public« which could be reached with public concerts or engraved printed scores. Fully established, this meant the rise of new technologies of print and transport, of permanent musical organizations such as orchestras or opera companies, using the new venues of large urban concert halls or opera houses by the middle of the Nineteenth-Century. For the musician this entailed writing for unknown and distant audiences, for the permanent in-print

repertory, for *posterity* as opposed to one specific occasion. Such a lasting repertory presumed the emergence of print-survival in libraries and publishing copy houses, from which stable performing groups might draw, on demand. The end of the Eighteenth Century shows only the first inching toward this new musical complex, with its new roles for composers, publishers, librarians, performers and audiences. The first to break with the old Kapellmeister pattern did not find the necessary new supportive organizations and positions already in place, but leapt, rather, into a sparsely-populated occupational territory, in danger of financial ruin and historical obscurity. The musician risked being swallowed by time and market forces!

Living just before the actual outbreak of revolution, Mozart, not Beethoven, was the first supreme genius born into a feudal society who dared to be freelance, seeking a livelihood and even securing friends from both the aristocracy of birth and the professional people and the mercantile citizens of Salzburg and Vienna.

[HUTCHINGS, 1976, p. 11]

Among other influences, two factors account for much of Mozart's independent disdain for noble service. First, the child prodigy had toured all Europe exhibiting his abilities in sideshow, charlatan-like »tricks«, winning the dotting approval of kings, the empress, and the astonished adult nobility. On later visits, he found himself of much less interest or even unremembered; some bitterness was clearly associated with this. Amadeus' father, Leopold, devoted his whole life and energy to the promotion and exhibition of his son's extraordinary musical abilities, but not solely for the hoped-for rewards of money and a better life-style. Leopold believed that his son was the living illustration of German-speaking competence, even superiority, in an occupational field dominated by the Latins who held all the highest musical posts in the Empire. Such positions monopolized the chief commissions such as opera — positions to which Leopold and Amadeus might merely aspire in their exclusion. One biographer describes »Mozart's consciousness of being a German and resenting the deference given to writers, architects, painters and musicians from the Latin countries«. [HUTCHINGS, 1976, p. 10] Mozart's childhood as a much-praised touring virtuoso gave him a good opinion of his own abilities, an opinion shared by history but not eliciting honour from all at the time. Deference was the *sine qua non* of the Kapellmeister role. »Merely to be directly in the ruler's service was to reflect his pride and require deference«. [HUTCHINGS, 1976, p. 11] The young, unhappy Mozart was not given to deference, but remained conscious of his relatively low assigned status in any noble establishment, by contrast with his earlier, feted, child guest status. »All the ladies lost their hearts to the little fellow«. [MARTINEAU, 1907, p. 285]

The example most commonly cited to show such feelings is the correspondence from Wolfgang to Leopold during the younger Mozart's stay in Vienna with

the court of the Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg. Amadeus would show deference but expected to be honoured, himself. He rails at the status assigned him in the Archbishop's household: »We lunch about twelve o'clock ... Our party consists of two valets ... the controleur, the two cooks and my insignificant self. By the way, the two valets sit at the top of the table, but at least I have the honour of being placed above the cooks. ... A good deal of silly, coarse joking goes on at the table, but no one cracks jokes with me, for I never say a word. ... As soon as I have finished my lunch, I get up and go off«. [ANDERSON, 1988, p. 393] Even more informative is the passage, later in the same letter, where the young man chaffs at his inability to sell his talents outside the Court: »I must wait and see whether I shall get anything. If I get nothing, I shall go to the Archbichop and tell him with absolute frankness that if he will not allow me to earn anything, then he must pay me, for I cannot live at may own expense«. Obviously, Mozart is already attracted by what he perceives as a »market« within which he could hope to sell both his composing and performing skills! He is torn between the two positions we have described: the security of payment in a court appointment, and the lure of a large income in the new opportunity to present himself in performance as a keyboard virtuoso while marketing his music with the subscription of the urban elite to underwrite publishing costs. His longing to be a free entrepreneur soon prompts him to leave the service of the Salzburg court. His letter to his father on the 9th of May says that »I am no longer so fortunate as to be in Salzburg service. Today is a happy day for me«. [ANDERSON, 1988, p. 401] An earlier letter at the end of April gives a verbatim account of his verbal conflict with Archbishop and his departure. [ANDERSON, 1988, p. 400] In a very early edition of Groves [1907] Russell Martineau gives a clear, detailed account of his final rupture in court service which thrust Mozart into a new and very different status, *the autonomous marketer of his own music-making*:

The Archbishop did not allow Mozart to play alone in any home but his own ... He was often addressed in that household as »Gassenbuber« (low fellow of the streets) ... he was determined not to remain in a position where he had such indignities to endure. ... The Archbishop, detested by the nobility and above all by the Emperor Joseph, did not receive an invitation to (the summer residence of the court) and in his disgust determined to leave Vienna. The household was to start first, but Mozart, »the villan, the low fellow« was turned out of the house before the others. ... at his next audience, he was greeted with »lump«, »lausbube« and »fex« (untranslatable terms of abuse). None of his servants had treated him so badly, continued the Archbishop. »Your Grace is dissatisfied with me, then?« said Mozart. »What! You dare to use threats? (using all the time the contemptuous *Er*) Fex! I will have nothing more to do with such a vile wretch«. »Nor I with you«, retorted Mozart, and turned on his heel. ... In the ante-chamber, Count Arco, the high-stewart, addressed him as »Flegel«, (clown) »Bursch«, (fellow) and kicked him out of the room. Mozart then wrote to his father: »I hate the Archbishop almost to a fury!«

[MARTINEAU, 1907, p. 293]

Both Mozart and the Archbishop are presenting themselves in positions which are neither reciprocal nor mutually recognized. Each saw the other's *role-play* as antagonistic, resulting in mutual animosity. Each negatively sanctioned the violation of his own expectations.

It is important to note that there is no longer the humble acceptance of a servant's position, but the musician's aggrandized self-perception as one worthy of respect and deference to himself. But, beyond the prestige factor, there is also a growing awareness of some autonomous possibility for the musician to work outside the court setting, in an open market. Such is the crucial shift in the status of musicians at the end of the century.

Musical administration of the court and chapel had enlarged and differentiated the role of Kapellmeister from that of a theatre director. Opera was now everywhere the fashion of the courts, and a basis for invidious comparisons. This new theatre role was paradoxically envied and sought by Mozart, since it would have given him opportunities to write and produce both singspiels and dramas — the focus of his personal musical aspirations: a paradox, given his detestation of the court status system.

Occasional music is vanishing as compositions are absorbed into a printed repertory for home, concert hall or theatre. Importantly, this entails recognition that the composer is writing for an audience he does not know, and which may not even yet exist. Mozart's publishing activities suggest an awareness of this, but the author cannot locate any verbal recognition. Yet, if we turn to Beethoven, we find what may be the first explicit statement of any composer *writing for posterity*, a new perception!

Like Mozart, Beethoven claimed to have learned little in his studies with Hayden, although both clearly learned much from Hayden's music. What Beethoven certainly did not absorb from Hayden was the older master's humble dedication to service of both his art and his employer. Beethoven was proud and sanguine in his relations with others, including his patrons:

Traces of self-sufficiency and even arrogance — faults almost universal among young and successful geniuses — are unquestionably visible. ... Adequate firmness of character had not been acquired in early years. ... No one can read without regret his remarks upon certain persons with whom at this very time he was upon terms of apparently intimate friendship. »I value them only by what they do for me«. He speaks of using them »only as instruments on which I can play when I please«.

[THAYER, 2001, p. 108]

Hayden was well aware of Beethoven's talent, but cared little for his conceit and headstrong approach to composition. When visits from Beethoven grew infrequent, Hayden used to enquire of him to his musical friends: »How goes it with our Great Mogul?« [THAYER, 2001, p. 108]

As all know, Beethoven went his own way in instrumentation and modification of musical forms, not all his works drawing immediate approval. Cartoons of the period even showed Beethoven hammering a spike into a listener's ear, much as they did later with Wagner. The Bonn composer showed some of his string quartets (Opus 59) to the violinist Radicati, seeking technical advice on fingering. »Surely, you do not consider these works to be music?« Radicati responded. Beethoven: »Oh, they are not for you, but for a later age«. [WECHSBERG, 1959] There we have it! Music written *for posterity*, a wholly new conception.

Music is no longer the function of the Church or the noble secular court, but the entertainment for a new urban mercantile »lesser nobility«. As the musician has been liberated from his role as servant to the Patron, the music itself has been released from occasional performance: a »repertory« is available in a new »market«, transcending time and locality. Proof of this transcendence is the fact that we have been inquiring about music written long before either the author, or his readers, were born! Central to all the changes we have described is the radical transformation of the *status* of the musician and *emancipation* as observed earlier by Barzun.

#### REFERENCES

- ANDERSON, E., *Letters of Mozart* (Rev. 1988), MacMillan Publishing, London, 1988.
- BARZUN, J., *From Dawn to Decadence*, Harper Collins, New York, 2000.
- CHAILLEY, J., *40,000 Years of Music*, Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, New York, 1964.
- GROUT, D., *A History of Western Music* (3rd Edit.), McLeod Ltd., Toronto, 1980.
- HUGHES, E. C., Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 50, 1954.
- HUTCHINGS, A., *Mozart: The Man*, Schirmer Books, New York, 1976.
- LEICHTENTRITT, H., *Music, History and Ideas*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1938.
- MARTINEAU, R., *Mozart* (entry in *Groves Dictionary*), Norwood Press, Mass., Vol. 3, 1907.
- MINER, H., The Folk-Urban Continuum, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 17, 1952.
- RAYNOR, H., *A Social History of Music* (Vol. 1), Taplinger, New York, 1972.
- REDFIELD, R., The Folk Society, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 52, 1947.
- ROBBINS LANDON, H. C., *Haydn*, Faber and Faber, London, 1972.
- THAYER, A., *Life of Beethoven*, The Folio Society, London, 2001.
- TUCKWELL, B., *Notes on Giovanni Punto* to accompany EMI 37781 (Horn Concerti) 1980.
- WECHSBERG, J., The Budapest [String Quartet], *New Yorker Magazine*, 1959.

*Sažetak*PROMJENE U STATUSU I ULOZI:  
GLAZBENIK KRAJEM OSAMNAESTOG STOLJEĆA

Mnogo je toga rečeno o problematičnim smrtima Mozarta i Beethovena za razliku od mirne dugovječnosti »tate Haydna«. Sve je to proizašlo iz perspektive romantičkog razdoblja: vojujućeg, nepriznatog, mladenačkog genija! Pa ipak, sukob poput onoga između Mozarta i princa nadbiskupa od Salzburga bio je više nego suprotstavljanje ponosnog patrijarha tvrdoglavom i arogantnom namješteniku. Na kraju prosvjetiteljskog stoljeća glazba se kretala od Crkve i dvora prema salonima i novim koncertnim dvoranama bogate urbane srednje klase slobodnih zvanja i trgovaca. Položaj glazbenika brzo se mijenjao: statute plemenitog pokrovitelja i glazbenika kućnog sluga više nisu opravdavale nove norme individualizma i emancipacije. Bilo je to doba revolucija kako u Francuskoj tako i u sjevernoj Americi. Poraz aristokratskih privilegija i poriv prema novom sustavu *postignutog* a ne više *naslijeđenog* statusa tjerala je glazbenika prema novome položaju za koji društvo još nije bilo potpuno prilagođeno. Sukobi i promašaji u karijeri bili su funkcije promjena u društvenom sustavu a ne nedostaci osobnosti.

Ova rasprava pažljivo određuje status i pojmove teorije uloga prije nego što će se baviti usporedbom kratkih istraživanja pojedinih slučajeva Haydna nasuprot njegovim učenicima Mozartu i Beethovenu. Za glazbu se smatra da se razvijala od prirodnog predstavljanja to izgradnje tiskom objavljenog repertoara za čvrste skupine izvoditelja. Glazbenik je zaigrao novu ulogu!