

Summer 2014

# Joseph Haydn (?): Attribution and Reception

Robert B. Wrigley

*University of Puget Sound*, [rwrigley@pugetsound.edu](mailto:rwrigley@pugetsound.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/summer\\_research](http://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/summer_research)



Part of the [Musicology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Wrigley, Robert B., "Joseph Haydn (?): Attribution and Reception" (2014). *Summer Research*. Paper 228.  
[http://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/summer\\_research/228](http://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/summer_research/228)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Sound Ideas. It has been accepted for inclusion in Summer Research by an authorized administrator of Sound Ideas. For more information, please contact [soundideas@pugetsound.edu](mailto:soundideas@pugetsound.edu).

## Joseph Haydn (?): Attribution and Reception

Robert Wrigley

In the eighteenth century, copyright protection as we know it today was essentially nonexistent. Consequently, publishers had little reason to respect the rights of the author (particularly in an age where the composer was often considered less important than the performer)<sup>1</sup> and fraud was rampant. One favorite ruse was to publish new music by unknown composers under big names, whose music would sell better and command a higher price.<sup>2</sup> Being almost certainly the most popular composer of the late 1700s, it is no surprise that Franz Joseph Haydn fell victim to this ruse quite often: to take just one example, Bruce C. MacIntyre has catalogued no fewer than 167 mass settings wrongly attributed to Haydn, compared to just 14 authentic settings.<sup>3</sup> Hence, it has been one of the principal tasks of Haydn scholars to sort out the mess, determining which of the works are truly by Haydn and which are not (and if not, who they are by). This was a particularly central concern in the decades since World War II, though

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Peter Burkholder, Donald Jay Grout, Claude V. Palisca, *A History of Western Music* (New York, W. W. Norton, 2010), 323-325, 662. At the time the composer was seen much more as a servant, a craftsman turning out what the performer needed than as an artist (this was perhaps most acutely felt in opera, with its prima donna megastars). In some cases, the composer's name would not even appear on a program. Even in instrumental music, on the published title page the dedicatee's name was sometimes in larger print than the composer's. See Mark Evan Bonds, "Replacing Haydn: Mozart's 'Pleyel' Quartets," *Music and Letters*, 88, no. 2 (May 2007): 218-220.

<sup>2</sup> This is not the only reason that works are misattributed—on one occasion Haydn himself apparently committed fraud on his English publisher William Forster by sending him a set of three piano trios, two of which were in fact by his student Ignaz Pleyel. See Alan Tyson, "Haydn and the Two Stolen Trios," *The Music Review* 22, no. 1 (1961): 21-27. Tyson argues that out of two contemporary accounts of the affair, the most likely is that Haydn, presented with a lucrative offer but without sufficient time to compose new music, sent in Pleyel's music as his own. Incorrect attributions may also arise through laziness of some copyists, or honest mistakes of more reliable copyists. See also Rita Benton, "A Resumé of the Haydn-Pleyel 'Trio Controversy' with Some Added Contributions," *Haydn-Studien* 4, no. 2 (1976-80): 114-117.

<sup>3</sup> Bruce C. MacIntyre, "Haydn's Doubtful and Spurious Masses: An Attribution Update," *Haydn-Studien* 5, no. 1 (March 1982): 42-43. The composers of these spurious settings who have been positively identified cover a wide chronological range, from Johann Joseph Fux to Anton Diabelli. The resultant stylistic differences are thus comparable to the stylistic differences present within Haydn's authentic masses. His last six masses, composed in celebration of the Princess Esterhazy were heavily influenced by his symphonic experiments, differentiating them from his earlier masses in more traditional style.

of course some scholars have been concerned with it from the beginning.<sup>4</sup> Concern over attribution has died down in scholarship recent years: A 1998 volume of essays entitled “Haydn Studies” contains not a single essay concerned with matters of attribution<sup>5</sup>, and Melanie Lowe’s summary of current musicological trends in Haydn research allows little room for authentication.<sup>6</sup> Even when a recent piece of scholarship does address issues of authenticity, it is typically a secondary topic.<sup>7</sup> To some degree, of course, this may be attributable to a certain amount of success. Many pieces which would have been considered doubtful fifty years ago have been conclusively attributed to either Haydn or to a particular one of his contemporaries. Many, but not all. Quite a few works were still defying definite attribution after the heyday of authenticity studies had passed; there would still seem to be work to be done. Why, then, has this field of study lapsed in recent decades? I will return to this question after having given my survey of authenticity studies.

Concurrently with this decline in authenticity studies has been a surge in a branch of musicology known as reception history. This field of study focuses on how views of a composer’s music have changed from his time to ours. Bearing the authenticity question in mind, this leads us to the realization that, a composer’s reception being dependent on what is conceived to be their *oeuvre*, Haydn’s reception is influenced by questions of authenticity. That is to say, as our beliefs about the true content of Haydn’s *oeuvre* evolve, his reputation as a composer will be affected by those beliefs. Particularly in light of John Spitzer study concerning “Mozart’s”

---

<sup>4</sup> Johann Breitkopf, for example, of the legendary publishing firm Breitkopf and Härtel, expressed concern over the difficulty of making correct attributions when compiling his thematic catalog. Jens Peter Larsen, “Problems of Authenticity in Music from the time of Haydn to Mozart,” in *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style*, trans. Ulrich Krämer. (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988), 125.

<sup>5</sup> Dean Sutcliffe, ed. *Haydn Studies* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998).

<sup>6</sup> Melanie Lowe, “After Haydn Year 2009,” *The Journal of Musicology* 27, no. 1 (Winter 2010): 1-8.

<sup>7</sup> See George Kennaway, “Haydn’s (?) Cello Concertos, 1860-1930: Editions, Performances, Reception,” *Nineteenth-Century Music Reviews* 9 (2012), 177-211, and Dwight Blazin, *Michael Haydn and “The Haydn Tradition.” A study of Attribution, Chronology, and Source Transmission*, Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 2004.

Sinfonia Concertante for Winds, K. 297b, it becomes clear that authenticity and reception are thoroughly interdependent.<sup>8</sup> As such, a reevaluation of both the results provided by authenticity scholarship, and the limitations of its methods, using the insights of reception history becomes necessary. This paper will first give an overview and commentary on the authenticity debate, and then proceed to explore how it has affected the reception not only of Haydn, but of the composers whose works were wrongfully attributed to him.

One group of works, a set of six string quartets known as Opus 3, has provided the focus of more authenticity researches than any other doubtful works—several such studies will be referenced below. First, I think it will prove helpful to give an overview of some of the relevant information about the set.

In 1777, a Paris publisher, Bailleux, first brought out the set as Haydn's Op. 26. In the early nineteenth century, Haydn former pupil Ignaz Pleyel, turned from composer to piano maker and music publisher, decided to bring out a complete edition of all of Haydn's string quartets. He included the set, changing the opus number to three, apparently on the belief that, from a stylistic point of view, they must precede the Op. 9 set of quartets. All subsequent editions of Haydn's quartets have been based on Pleyel. However, other documentary evidence is weak—the quartets are not in the *Entwurf-Katalog* (a catalog of Haydn's works which the composer compiled himself), and no manuscript copies of these quartets survive—a situation which, if Op. 3 were genuine, would be unique in Haydn's quartet *oeuvre*.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> John Spitzer, "Musical Attribution and Critical Judgment: The Rise and Fall of the Sinfonia Concertante for Winds, K. 297b," *The Journal of Musicology* 5, no. 3 (Summer 1987): 319-356. Spitzer, comparing many different critical reviews of the piece, by authors of varying opinions on its authorship, comes to the conclusion that those who believed the work to be genuine Mozart considered it have far greater merit than those authors who believed it to be spurious, or at least doubtful.

<sup>9</sup> Alan Tyson and H.C. Robbins Landon, "Who Composed Haydn's Op. 3?," *The Musical Times* 105, no. 1457 (July 1964): 506-07.

## Authenticity

Two alternate methods have traditionally been recognized by musicologists for authenticating doubtful works of Haydn (later in this essay I will explore a third method which often comes into play, but which is generally kept quiet). The first method is to use external or documentary evidence which supports Haydn's authorship. Thematic catalogues are one method used—a thematic catalogue generally contains the first few bars of the first movement of a given work, known as an “incipit.” Two catalogues are particularly useful in determining authenticity—those prepared by Haydn himself or under his direct supervision. There is the *Entwurf-Katalog*, which is extremely reliable but incomplete and the *Haydn-Verzeichnis*, which was made by Haydn's copyist Johann Elssler, which is more comprehensive than the EK but contains more errors.<sup>10</sup> The presence of a work in one of these catalogs, though, is not absolute proof of authenticity: by the end of his life his memory was often faulty and, considering the incredible size of his *oeuvre*, he cannot be blamed for having trouble recalling all the works of his youth. Beyond the thematic catalogues, original autographs of the work in question are generally considered sufficient proof of authenticity (this is not always ironclad either; composers have on many occasions been known to copy out works they wish to study). Other methods used include the study of watermarks on the paper to determine if it is a sort of paper that Haydn used, bearing in mind the dates he is known to have used it, and the examination of the composer's correspondence to discover if Haydn made reference to the work in question.<sup>11</sup>

One type of external evidence that is sometimes used which I find suspect is resemblance—if a theme from a disputed work is strongly similar to a theme from an

---

<sup>10</sup> James Webster, “External Criteria for Determining the Authenticity of Haydn's Music,” In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Jens Peter Larsen, Howard Serwer, and James Webster, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981): 75-76.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

authenticated work, scholars will often take such likenesses as potential evidence of authenticity, apparently on the assumption that Haydn was reworking previous material for a new medium.

The problems with this are obvious. There is nothing to prevent another composer from borrowing a theme from Haydn (or vice versa, for that matter); a study of thematic references of one composer by another would fill (indeed, has filled) volumes.<sup>12</sup> Beyond that, such references may arise merely by coincidence.<sup>13</sup> That said, thematic resemblances are only occasionally used, and generally with a much more convincing documentary evidence to back them up.

However, external evidence is often insufficient or even wholly nonexistent. At such times musicologists turn to internal or “stylistic” evidence, which involves studying the disputed work in question and seeing if it has musical characteristics either uniquely Haydnesque or characteristics which Haydn never used. This is a tricky and complicated business. To begin with, Haydn’s style changed over time—his Op. 33 set of quartets, from 1781, are vastly different from his Op. 20 set from nine years earlier, or his Op. 76 quartets from 1797. Moreover, youthful composers may not have had enough experience to have developed a uniquely personal style. At least one major Haydn scholar, Karl Geiringer, has actively claimed that as “works of the young Haydn are very similar to those of other composers, and by no means superior in quality. In such cases stylistic evidence is...of no value.”<sup>14</sup> Yet it is precisely Haydn’s early period that contains the great majority of the doubtful works—documentation is much better for the last few decades of Haydn’s life. Beyond change over time, it cannot be assumed that

---

<sup>12</sup> See, for example, Christopher Reynolds, *Motives for Allusion*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2003.

<sup>13</sup> Does anyone seriously believe the opening theme of the *Eroica* is a reference to Mozart’s *Bastien und Bastienne*? J. Peter Burkholder has suggested that the resemblance between the two themes is (at least partially) due to their derivation from a common source. I do not know that I find his argument convincing, but in any case, Beethoven is not *directly* referencing Mozart. See J. Peter Burkholder, “Musical Borrowing or Curious Coincidence?: Testing the Evidence.” Talk given at the American Musicological Society Meeting, November 5, 2010.

<sup>14</sup> Discussion following H.C. Robbins Landon, “Problems of Authenticity in Eighteenth-Century Music,” *Instrumental Music: A Conference at the Isham Memorial Library, May 4, 1957*, ed. David G. Hughes, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1959, 50.

Haydn's style was the same across all genres—it would be ill-advised to stylistically authenticate keyboard divertimenti, for example, on the basis of symphonies. This can be a major obstacle if there are too few undoubtedly authentic works in a given genre. Moreover, stylistic evidence cannot be conclusive—it cannot eliminate all other possible composers from consideration (this is less of a problem in cases where possible authorship is confined to a small number of known composers). Perhaps the greatest weakness of stylistic authentication is its inherent subjectivity; it is dependent not only on the scholar's vast knowledge of the music of the time period, but on his or her musical sensitivity.

The third method I spoke of above is not officially condoned by the musicological establishment; even when it is mentioned (rarely) it is roundly condemned. Nevertheless it makes its presence felt in at least a great many authenticity studies. To my knowledge, it has no official name; for lack of a better term, I will designate it the “argument from merit.” This holds that if the doubtful work in question is musically high-quality it must be (or at least is far more likely to be) by Haydn and that conversely if it is artistically poor it must be by one of Haydn's contemporaries.<sup>15</sup> Read again the quotation of Geiringer given above. He assumes that the intrinsically superior quality of Haydn's later work is a decisive factor in its identity. Such assumptions are a commonplace in authenticity research but are a fallacy for at least three reasons:

First, think of the composers, virtually unknown a century ago, who have made a revival—Vivaldi, Gesualdo, even Handel (until recently only a small portion of Handel's oeuvre

---

<sup>15</sup> The situation is comparable to one which has arisen in scholarship on the Renaissance composer Josquin des Prez. See Paula Higgins, “The Apotheosis of Josquin des Prez and other Mythologies of Musical Genius,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 57, no. 3 (Fall 2004), 443-510. Higgins argues that an ideological belief in Josquin's transcendent genius—itself a concept which did not emerge until the early Romantic period—has been a prime factor in causing musicologists to doubt the authenticity of even some of his most beloved works on the basis of supposed mistakes in their writing. I do not believe the situation in Haydn studies is so ideologically motivated, but it still constitutes a logical fallacy.

was widely known, including virtually none of the operas). Beyond them, music history is filled with “one-work men,” composers whose outputs may be vast but neglected except for one or a few recognized masterpieces (Bizet, with *Carmen*, and Orff, with *Carmina Burana* seem prime examples). We cannot assume that a work lacks merit merely because its composer lacks recognition. Second, even great composers are capable of turning out hack work. As Barry S. Brook argued, few sensitive musicians today would believe *Wellington’s Victory*, Op. 91 the work of Beethoven or the Flute and Harp Concerto, K. 299 the work of Mozart if they didn’t know better on documentary grounds.<sup>16</sup> Third, musical quality is a highly subjective measure, which, as Spitzer has shown, can be influenced by preconceived notions of authenticity.

An additional problem arises in that the argument from merit is inextricably linked with intuitive stylistic judgment. As long as scholars, no matter how knowledgeable of their subject, or self-conscious of their analytical technique they may be, attempt to judge the style of a work, their considerations of its merit will inevitably contaminate their results. For this reason, in addition to the other problems with stylistic analysis, many scholars have strongly cautioned against the use of stylistic evidence except where documentary evidence is entirely insufficient.<sup>17</sup>

In response to this opinion, several scholars attempted to create a system of stylistic analysis which would be objective and reliable. This method was dependent on what may be called “hidden signifiers,” elements of style which are not particularly obvious on the surface. The argument is that while different composers might imitate those elements of each other’s

---

<sup>16</sup>Barry S. Brook, “Determining Authenticity through Internal Analysis: A Multifaceted Approach (with Special Reference to Haydn’s String Trios). In *Joseph Haydn: Proceedings of the International Haydn Conference*, ed. Eva Badura-Skoda, (Munich: G. Henle, 1986), 552.

<sup>17</sup>Jens Peter Larsen, “Problems of Authenticity,” 130-134; James Webster, “Relations between the Documentary and the Stylistic Evidence,” In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen et al, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981), 99-102.

style that were most striking they would be unlikely (perhaps even incapable) of imitating minutia such as rates of textural change or articulation.

Jan LaRue was probably the first important figure in this field. At the 1975 Haydn Conference, he gave a brief overview of what he called “activity analysis,” which he would later elaborate on in a book, *Guidelines for Style Analysis*. Briefly noted, activity in harmony, melody, or rhythm is given a certain number of points, which, on a large scale, can demonstrate certain features useful for purposes of authentication. At that conference, LaRue used his method to demonstrate how a movement from the Op. 3 set of quartets was not typical of Haydn’s style. Though LaRue’s methods were in their infancy, later scholars followed in his footsteps.

One attempt, which attempted to achieve objectivity by use of computer analysis programs, was undertaken with regard to the Op. 3 quartets by Daniel L. Brantley as his doctoral dissertation at the University of Iowa in 1977. The results are frankly unimpressive. The computer assigned the quartets unilaterally to either Haydn or Hoffstetter, and no allowance was made for gray area, or for the acute possibility that the quartets (or at least some of them) could have been by another composer entirely.<sup>18</sup> Beyond this theoretical flaw, on a practical level, the alphanumeric coding of musical notation into the computer was extremely complicated leading to an admittedly high number of errors of encoding, which could not necessarily be autocorrected by the computer.<sup>19</sup> In fact, one calibration test, on various slow movements of both Hoffstetter and Haydn, was particularly disastrous: six out of twelve sample movements were misclassified by the program.<sup>20</sup> Considering the date of the attempt though, perhaps time has come for another try—not only are computers far more sophisticated and powerful today than

---

<sup>18</sup> Daniel L. Brantley, *Disputed Authorship of Musical Works: A Quantitative Approach to the Attribution of the Quartets Published as Haydn’s Op. 3*. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1977, 57.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, 39-41, 45.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid*, 70.

they were forty years ago, but a music notation program such as Finale or Sibelius could be used to reliably enter notation into the computer—scores may even be scanned in. With such a method, not only would syntactical errors not occur in the first place but any trained musician could quickly and easily edit for any errors of content.

Perhaps the most important of scholars attempting to achieve objectivity in stylistic analysis was Barry S. Brook, a musicology professor at the City University of New York. His study originated in a Haydn seminar he was teaching at CUNY; on the suggestion of Georg Feder, the seminar undertook the editing of Haydn's string trios for publication in the Haydn Complete Works being brought out by Feder and the Haydn Institute.<sup>21</sup> As an experiment, the seminar played four string trios of varying attributions to an assembly of Haydn scholars and asked them to guess, on the basis of aural impression, which of the trios were genuinely by Haydn—the results clearly showing the unreliability of subjective stylistic analysis (the trio that receive the most votes in its favor was in fact by Leopold Hoffmann).<sup>22</sup> However, documentary evidence was insufficient for the seminar to determine whether some thirty doubtful string trios were in fact by Haydn—they needed a reliable way of determining authenticity from style.

Eleven of Brooks's students at both CUNY and The Julliard School each took a different approach, attempting to examine such factors as texture, linear analysis, harmonic vocabulary, rhythm, and phrase structure from a quantitative standpoint, not always successfully.<sup>23</sup> These were compared among three groups of String Trios—those clearly by Haydn on documentary grounds, those known to be by Haydn's contemporaries, and the doubtful works to see, for each

---

<sup>21</sup> Brook, Barry S. "Haydn's String Trios: A Misunderstood Genre." Brook asked Feder to edit a volume of the *Gesamtausgabe*; Feder, with "a gleam [in] his eye" suggested the string trios.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

<sup>23</sup> Brook, Barry S. "Determining Authenticity through Internal Analysis: A Multifaceted Approach (with Special Reference to Haydn's String Trios). *Proceedings of the International Haydn Conference*. 555

work, whether Haydn's signifiers were present or not. They then compared their findings, and were able to come to definite agreement over all but three of the doubtful string trios.

One of Brook's students, Scott Fruehwald, took what he considered to be the most reliable stylistic determinants of authenticity and used two statistical approaches to apply them not only to the String Trios, but also to many early Haydn works across a broad variety of genres.<sup>24</sup> His first statistical approach is to find quantitative ranges of certain musical attributes such as tessitura, texture, and harmonic change characteristic of Haydn in applicable genres and comparing those ranges to doubtful works. The other method (which he considers more successful) is to make checklists of positive and negative characteristics of Haydn's works (characteristics that appear in, respectively, all or none<sup>25</sup> of Haydn's works) and apply those checklists to doubtful works. I believe this monograph can be considered the zenith of stylistic authenticity research in Haydn scholarship. It applies a highly refined, remarkably objective technique across an impressively broad range of music.

Yet, problems remain. Haydn's quantitative ranges can be quite broad, allowing works by other composers to pass.<sup>26</sup> Fruehwald also sometimes draws conclusions on entire works after having tested only certain movements.<sup>27</sup> When dealing with the string trios Fruehwald notices a special case whereby three trios were found to be spurious that on closer examination he believes genuine. The misattribution occurred because the trios were part of a "previously unknown subtype," that is, they each embodied certain characteristics which most of Haydn's works in the genre avoided, in this case a greater contrapuntal sophistication.<sup>28</sup> Not only does this suggest that

---

<sup>24</sup> Scott Fruehwald, *Authenticity Problems in Joseph Haydn's Early Instrumental Works* (New York: Pendragon Press, 1988), vii.

<sup>25</sup> In practice, Fruehwald occasionally uses characteristics either exceedingly common or exceedingly rare in Haydn, though they may not be absolutely ever- or never-present.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid*, 50.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid*, 85.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid*, 139.

a number of genuine Haydn works from all genres might fail Fruehwald's tests for similar reasons<sup>29</sup> but also suggests a way in which spurious works might pass his tests. There is nothing to prevent Haydn's contemporaries from having their own peculiar "subtypes" whose profiles might have hidden communicators very close to Haydn's. Also, with some exceptions (especially two keyboard sonatas known as the "Raigern Sonatas"), Fruehwald's conclusions seem suspiciously similar to the opinions of major Haydn scholars, the unreliability of whose stylistic intuition was the supposed motive for Fruehwald's analysis.

Ultimately, the quest for objectivity in stylistic analyses is impossible: no matter how objective the quantitative comparison of certain characteristics may be—the choice of which characteristics to examine in the first place is necessarily subjective—who is to say whether harmonic rhythm, or texture, or form is more important? Less philosophically, I believe that Brook and his students, including Fruehwald, have let their enthusiasm for their methods get the better of them. In summarizing the results of the seminar, Brook states "There was almost immediate agreement, positive or negative, regarding twenty of the thirty-three doubtful trios. After discussion and re-examination of the data, differences of opinions were fairly soon resolved for all but three of the remaining works. (After much lengthy discussion, we finally came to provisional decisions about these as well.)"<sup>30</sup> This is quite curious—are they so absolutely confident in their methods that they are unwilling to leave any unresolved questions?

Nicolas Cook has written that musicology in the years following World War II became increasingly concerned with "scientific" methods—a search for objectivity previously considered beyond the bounds of the humanities, largely influenced by the newfound dominance of the

---

<sup>29</sup> Recall that due to his previous experience with Brook's seminar Fruehwald was especially familiar with the string trios. He might not be as capable of catching his analytic missteps with other genres he is less familiar with.

<sup>30</sup> Brook, "Determining Authenticity," 556.

“hard” sciences within the academy.<sup>31</sup> I would posit that this “scientific” orientation was largely responsible for the great confidence that self-styled “objective” stylistic scholars such as Brantley, Brook, and Fruehwald had in their methods, to the point that they were seemingly ultimately unable to leave room in their analyses for the ambiguous.

Moreover, the objection could be raised that absolute objectivity in musical analysis is of questionable value. Art, of whatever form, is not a science. Ultimately, analyses that are subjective, even if this lessens their reliability, may be more valuable to musicology in that they at least engage directly with the musical substance of the works under examination. The “hidden signifiers” approach used by La Rue and his followers is concerned with what Charles Ives would have termed “manner” than issues of real musical importance. Documentary studies, of course, do not even go that far.

Earlier, the point was raised that these studies have died off since the late 70s, leaving the question of why, with many works still in Webster’s “doubtful” category, have Haydn scholars not continued to pursue questions of attribution. I would like to suggest that a confluence of two factors caused this decline. First, it may have seemed like attribution techniques had hit a wall—catalogs, manuscripts, monastery libraries, contemporary correspondence, and other documentary evidence had been picked over extensively; excepting new discoveries, attribution could go no further on external evidence. Meanwhile, for all the high hopes and good intentions of scholars like Brook, La Rue, and Fruehwald, stylistic analysis had failed to truly achieve a practically reliable technique for authoritatively resolving authenticity disputes and may have seemed that any further sophistication of the technique would lead to impractically complicated procedures.

---

<sup>31</sup> Nicholas Cook, *Music: A Very Short Introduction*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998): 93.

Second, in 1985, the musicological world received a kick in the pants in the form of Joseph Kerman's book *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology*. Kerman argued that both historical musicology and music theory and analysis had become extremely "positivistic" disciplines, focused either on preparing critical editions of composers' works in the case of historians,<sup>32</sup> or on developing esoteric and ahistorical explications of musical works in the case of theorists and analysts.<sup>33</sup> Neither did enough in using their amassed knowledge to come to a useful "critical" appraisal of the music, which Kerman considered an ideal for the academic study of music, somewhat parallel to the academic study of literature as Kerman understood it.<sup>34</sup>

To be sure, Kerman took pains to stress that he realized the present activities of both musicologists and analysts to be valuable in their way, merely contending that they did not go far enough. Moreover, he personally was no foe of authenticity studies—he once decried how "spurious works lurk scandalously in the Josquin canon."<sup>35</sup> Nevertheless, the major focus of attention by Haydn scholars on authenticity studies, in ways that focused on either external evidence or hidden signifiers, smacks of positivism—it was not in any way an attempt to really engage critically with the music. Add to that, with the exception of the Op. 3 quartets (Haydn's authorship of which had been firmly and repeatedly negated, even if their true authorship had not been resolved), none of the works of disputed authenticity were those which could at all be considered central to the Haydn repertoire. Neither the Raigern keyboard sonatas, nor the string trios, nor the wind divertimento whose "St. Anthony Chorale" Brahms lifted for his *Variation on a Theme of Joseph Haydn*, Op. 56 were as beloved by audiences or frequently programmed by

---

<sup>32</sup> Joseph Kerman, *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1985, 42-44.

<sup>33</sup> Kerman, *Contemplating Music*, 72-75.

<sup>34</sup> Kerman, *Contemplating Music*, 16-19.

<sup>35</sup> Joseph Kerman, "A Profile for American Musicology," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 18, 1 (Spring 1965), 66.

performers as hundreds of works of genuine authorship. Even had musicologists been critically engaging these works, what difference would it have made? Of course, there is some precedent for musicological work facilitating the revival of some forgotten composer or repertoire.<sup>36</sup> But in line with the positivistic spirit of the discipline in that day, those musicologists studying authenticity had not done much to engage with the music directly. As such, I think, the rising generation of scholars, in light of Kerman's corrective attacks, viewed authenticity studies as unimportant and largely abandoned them in favor of other areas that more directly engaged with areas of the Haydn repertoire which more musicians cared about. Perhaps this abandonment is overkill, as even Kerman did not deny the usefulness of such studies, but it would account for the decline of the attributive branch of Haydn scholarship.

## **Reception**

I entered into this research project with the belief that authenticity studies would have had a considerable, direct, and observable effect on the reception of both Haydn's music and the composers of the music incorrectly attributed to Haydn. After all, if our perception of Haydn's output changed, would that not entail a reevaluation of Haydn's worth, as he could no longer bear the responsibility (for good or ill) for works he did not write, works, which prior to being authentically attributed, whose perceived merits or deficits would have affected Haydn's reputation? And would not the composers of these works also undergo a reevaluation, for if some of their works were once considered worthy of Haydn's name, surely they must have been composers of some merit?

---

<sup>36</sup> The same example mentioned above, namely Vivaldi, Gesualdo, and Handel's operas are excellent examples.

In practice, I have found that this has not necessarily been the case. With regard to the reevaluation of Haydn's contemporaries, authenticity research seems to have sparked little enthusiasm for composers such as Leopold Hofmann, Georg Wagenseil, Ignaz Pleyel, and others. It is true that Brook could write, at the end of an article brimming with indignation over the popular and scholarly neglect of the string trio, that "the intensive seminar work on the string trios...has convinced everyone involved of the historical significance of the genre and the high musical value of the repertory."<sup>37</sup> However, though Haydn is not mentioned by name, Brook's task, and his seminar's, was to compile an edition of Haydn's string trios. Thus, Haydn's trios would have been the works most closely studied by the seminar, other composers only as they were marginally related by having had their work pass at some point under Haydn's name. It is therefore reasonable to assume that it is primarily *Haydn's* music that the seminar students found to be of "high musical value." This does not truly represent a meaningful encomium to any of Haydn's contemporaries.

Romanus Hoffstetter certainly did not fare well in the wake of the debate on Op. 3. In a classic 1929 study, Donald Francis Tovey spoke highly of the Op. 3 Quartets, noting a "great progress made between op. 2 and op. 3; a progress which makes it impossible to put the first eighteen quartets into one group."<sup>38</sup> Only a decade later, scholarly certainty on their attribution was first questioned by Jens Peter Larsen on the basis of the set's thin documentation,<sup>39</sup> and László Somfai intensified the attack in the 1960s based on stylistic grounds.<sup>40</sup> Finally, with Tyson and Landon's discovery of the erased name of "Hoffstetter" on the plates for the printing

<sup>37</sup> Brook, "Haydn's String Trios," 75.

<sup>38</sup> Donald Francis Tovey. "Haydn's Chamber Music," In *The Main Stream of Music*, (New York, Oxford University Press, 1949), 20.

<sup>39</sup> Jens Peter Larsen, *Die Haydn Überlieferung*, (Copenhagen, Einer Munksgard, 1939): 151. Cited in Fruehwald, 151.

<sup>40</sup> László Somfai, "A klasszikus kvartetthangzás megszületése Haydn vonósnégyeseiben," *Zenitudományi tanulmányok* 8 (1960) 295-420 and "Zur Echtheitsfrage des Haydn'schen 'Opus 3'," *The Haydn Yearbook* 3 (1965) 153-65. Cited in Fruehwald, 151.

of the Baileux edition,<sup>41</sup> scholars began to accept that the set was not by Haydn. In 1975, at the International Haydn Conference, scholars were already deriding the quality of the quartets: “mechanical,” “simple,” “crudity,” “poverty,” “blunders,” and “lack of imagination” were some of the terms used.<sup>42</sup> It seems that, even though these quartets were once greatly admired by music lovers, many musicologists seem incapable of admitting their composer might have had some merit.<sup>43</sup>

There is in fact only one case I found where an attribution study clearly and overtly had a direct effect on the researcher’s opinion of one of Haydn’s contemporaries. The musicologist in question was H.C. Robbins Landon, certainly the most important English-language Haydn scholar of the twentieth century. Landon studied several works attributed to Haydn and discovered on documentary grounds that they were in fact by Carlos von Ordoñez. Landon was very struck by the contrapuntal sophistication, structural innovation, and (in one case) use of antiphony in Ordoñez’s music, and was moved to say that “Ordoñez was one of the most original and talented composers of his day,” and that “no student of the eighteenth century can afford to overlook this talented and curious composer.”<sup>44</sup> With this exception, Haydn authentication scholarship seems to be very dry indeed on the possible merits of any of Haydn’s contemporaries.

With regard to Haydn’s reception the situation is not quite as disappointing, but still offers little in demonstrable effect. There is, however, at least one piece of circumstantial

---

<sup>41</sup> Tyson and Landon, 506-507.

<sup>42</sup> “Problems of Authenticity, Op. 3,” In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al., 95-106.

<sup>43</sup> I suppose this does represent a change in reception after a fashion; after all, the debate on Op. 3 is the only reason more than a small handful of living people have even heard of Hoffstetter. However, from a practical perspective (i.e. the effect on how many people choose to listen to or perform his music) the difference between a nonexistent reputation and a terrible reputation would seem to be a small one.

<sup>44</sup> H. C. Robbins Landon, “Problems of Authenticity in Eighteenth-Century Music,” In *Instrumental Music: A Conference at Isham Memorial Library, May 4, 1957*, ed. David G. Hughes, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1959, 34-35.

evidence suggesting that, perhaps, the fact that most of the Haydn's works whose authenticity was doubted were from his early period has had some effect on scholars' perceptions of the evolution of Haydn's musical style and the relative merits of his various periods.

The prevailing view (exemplified by Charles Rosen's 1971 work, *The Classical Style*) was that Haydn's early works are immature and if not necessarily of poor quality, then of much poorer quality than his post-1780 compositions. This view was challenged in 1991, when James Webster wrote an immensely influential book on Haydn, *Haydn's Farewell Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style*. Webster demonstrates that even early in his career Haydn was creating highly sophisticated compositions, through such characteristics as motivic coherence, harmonic ingenuity, and long-range planning.<sup>45</sup>

Webster is perhaps the leading living Haydn scholar. Although he made no major contributions to the authentication of disputed works, he was intimately familiar with such researches, even going so far as to call attribution "the most important issue in Haydn scholarship,"<sup>46</sup> and his comments on authentication and categorization of "authentic," "doubtful," and "spurious" works have been influential on several subsequent authenticity researches.<sup>47</sup> Surely Webster's familiarity with authenticity scholarship influenced his views on Haydn's music, as articulated in his monograph.

Consider that stylistic examination of Haydn's early work was largely undertaken as part of the authenticity debate. Before dubious works can be considered stylistically, authentic works must be studied in detail to come to any useful knowledge of Haydn's early style. Given that it is difficult to appreciate, much less love, that which is not understood, is it so radical to suppose

---

<sup>45</sup> James Webster, *Haydn's Farewell Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

<sup>46</sup> James Webster, "External Criteria," and "Relations between the Documentary and Stylistic Evidence," In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al., (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981): 75-78, 99-102.

<sup>47</sup> Brook, "Determining Authenticity," 554; Fruehwald, 7-8; Spitzer, 320.

that the stylistic authentication effort, by familiarizing Haydn scholars (in this case, Webster) to a much greater degree with his early works led to their greater appreciation for those works? Especially with Spitzer's demonstration of the effect of attribution on assessment of merit, it seems all the more likely that scholars would, of the music composed in the 1760s and 1770s, find the greatest merit in the work of Haydn.

The problem is that, suggestive though this is, it remains circumstantial. Direct causation cannot be proven: there were certainly other factors that drove stylistic examination of Haydn's early works, such as dating. Is there any evidence that an authenticity directly and explicitly caused scholars to reevaluate Haydn's music? Only one example comes to mind: Brook's paean to Haydn's string trios, which can be taken as evidence that he and his students had become enthralled with the genre, but has that had any wider implications? Brook's two articles on the string trios certainly have not had nearly the circulation and influence that Webster's book has had.

Ultimately, authenticity studies do not seem to engage with the music in any critical or evaluative way that would be useful for examining Haydn's reception. Almost all of the articles on attribution that I read were fully guilty of the positivism Kerman found so objectionable. With the few exception cited in the preceding pages, scholars were solely concerned with determining authorship with the maximum possible degree of objectivity and reliability, seemingly without thought for the actual musical substance that was before them.

## Bibliography

Badura-Skoda, Eva. "The Influence of the Viennese Popular Comedy on Haydn and Mozart." *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*. 100 (1973-74): 185-99.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Joseph Haydn: Proceedings of the International Joseph Haydn Congress, Wien, Hofburg, 5.-12. September 1982*. Munich: G. Henle, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. "An Unknown Singspiel by Joseph Haydn?" In *International Musicological Society: Report of the Eleventh Congress, Copenhagen 1972*, edited by Henrik Glahn, Søren Sørensen, and Peter Ryom, Copenhagen: Wilhelm Hansen, 1974. Vol 1, 236-39.

Barrett-Ayres, Reginald. *Joseph Haydn and the String Quartet*. London: Barry and Jenkins, 1974.

Benton, Rita. "A Resumé of the Haydn-Pleyel 'Trio Controversy' with Some Added Contributions." *Haydn-Studien* 4, no. 2 (1976-80): 114-117.

Blazin, Dwight. *Michael Haydn and "The Haydn Tradition." A Study of Attribution, Chronology, and Source Transmission*. Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 2004.

Boer, Bertil H. van, Jr. "The Sonatina with Twelve Variations by J. Haydn (sic)." *Haydn-Studien* 5, no. 2 (1982-85): 139-41.

Bonds, Mark Evan. "Replacing Haydn: Mozart's 'Pleyel' Quartets." *Music and Letters* 88, no. 2 (May 2007): 201-225.

Branscombe, Peter. "Hanswurst Redivivus: Haydn's Connexions with the 'Volkstheatre' Tradition." In *Joseph Haydn*, ed. Badura-Skoda, 369-75.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Music in the Viennese Popular Theatre of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 98. (1971-72): 101-112.

Brantley, Daniel L. "Disputed Authorship of Musical Works: A Quantitative Approach to the Attribution of the Quartets Published as Haydn's Op. 3." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1977.

Brook, Barry. S. "Determining Authenticity through Internal Analysis: A Multifaceted Approach (with Special Reference to Haydn's String Trios)." In *Joseph Haydn*, ed. Badura-Skoda, 551-66.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Haydn's String Trios: A Misunderstood Genre." *Current Musicology* 36 (1978): 9-45.

Brown, A. Peter. "A Country Dance by Haydn." *The Musical Times* 127, no. 1715 (1986): 17-18.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Haydn and the Gows." *The Musical Times* 129, no. 1747 (1988): 459-60.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Haydn's Keyboard Idiom and the Raigern Sonatas." In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al. 111-15.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Problems of Authenticity in Two Haydn Keyboard Works (Hoboken XVI:47 and XIV:7)." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 25 no. 1 (Spring 1972): 85-97.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Solo and Ensemble Keyboard Sonatas of Joseph Haydn: A Study of Structure and Style." 3 vols. Ph.D Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1970.

Burkholder, J. Peter, Donald Jay Grout, Claude V. Palisca. *A History of Western Music*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2010.

Cook, Nicholas. *Music: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Davis, Shelley, "Regarding the Authenticity of the 'Haydn' Keyboard Concerto Hob. XVIII:F3." In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al., 121-26.

Deutsch, Otto Erich. "'Unfortunately Not by Me' (Musical Spuriousities)." *The Music Review* 19 (1958): 305-10.

Eby, John. "A New Missa Brevis Attributed to 'Heyden'." *Studies in Music from the University of Western Ontario* 3 (1978): 127-56.

Eckhoff, Øivind. "The Enigma of 'Haydn's Op. 3'." *Studia Musicologica Norvegica* 4 (1978): 9-45.

Feder, Georg. "Haydn's Piano Trios and Piano Sonatas." In *Haydnfest: Musical Festival, September 22-October 11, 1975; International Musicological Conference, October 4-11, 1975*, edited by Jens Peter Larsen and Howard Sewer. Washington, D.C.: John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, 1975, 18-23.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Manuscript Sources of Haydn's works and their Distribution." *The Haydn Yearbook* 4 (1968): 102-39.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Newly found Authentic Source for Joseph Haydn's *Missa in honorem B.V.M.*" In *Music in the Classic Period: Essays in Honor of Barry S. Brook*, edited by Allan W. Atlas, New York: Pendragon, 1965, 61-68.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Sources of the Two Disputed Raigern Sonatas." In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al. 107-111.

Fillion, Michelle, "The Accompanied Keyboard Divertimenti of Haydn and His Viennese Contemporaries (c. 1750-1780)." Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University, 1982.

Fisher, Stephen C. "A Group of Haydn Copies for the Court of Spain: Fresh Sources, Rediscovered Works, New Riddles." *Haydn-Studien* 4, no. 2 (1976-80): 65-84.

Fruehwald, Soctt. *Authenticity Problems in Joseph Haydn's Early Instrumental Works: A Stylistic Investigation*. New York: Pendragon, 1988.

Gerlach, Sonja. "Haydn's Works for Musical Clock (Flötenuhr): Problems of Authenticity, Grouping, and Chronology." In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al. 126-29.

Hellyer, Roger. "Mozart's 'Harmoniemusik' with Bibliographical Notes on Haydn and Pleyel." *The Haydn Yearbook* 9 (1975): 349-358.

Higgins, Paula. "The Apotheosis of Josquin des Prez and Other Mythologies of Musical Genius." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57

Kennaway, George. "Haydn's (?) Cello Concertos, 1860-1930: Editions, Performances, Reception." *Nineteenth Century Music Reviews* 9, no. 2 (Dec. 2012): 177-211.

Kerman, Joseph. *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Profile for American Musicology." *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 18, no. 1 (Spring 1965): 61-69.

Landon, H.C. Robbins. "Haydniana (I)." *The Haydn Yearbook* 4 (1968):199-206.

\_\_\_\_\_. "New Manuscript Sources of Works by Joseph Haydn, Johann Michael Haydn and Their Austrian Contemporaries." *The Haydn Yearbook* 15 (1984):199-213.

\_\_\_\_\_. "On Haydn's Quartets of *Opera 1* and 2: Notes and Comments on Sondheimer's *Historical and Psychological Study*." *The Music Review* 13, no. 3 (1952): 181-86.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Problems of Authenticity in Eighteenth Century Music." In *Instrumental Music: A Conference at Isham Memorial Library, May 4, 1957*, edited by David G. Hughes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959, 31-46.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Two Orchestral Works Wrongly Attributed to Mozart." *The Music Review* 17, no. 1 (1956): 29-34.

Larsen, Jens Peter. "Haydn and *Das kleine Quartbuch*." In *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style*. Translated by Ulrich Krämer. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988, 171-83.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Problems of Authenticity in Music from the time of Haydn to Mozart." In *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style*. Translated by Ulrich Krämer. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988, 123-35.

Larsen, Jens Peter, Howard Serwer, and James Webster, ed. *Haydn Studies*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981.

LaRue, Jan. "The Gniezno Symphony not by Haydn." In *Festschrift Jens Peter Larsen, 14. VI. 1902-1972*, edited by Nils Schiørring, Henrik Glahn, and Carsten E. Hatting, Copenhagen: Wilhelm Hansen, 1972, 255-60.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Haydn (?) Première at Yale." *The Music Review* 24, no. 4 (1963): 333-34.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A New Figure in the Haydn Masquerade." *Music and Letters* 40, no. 2 (April, 1959): 132-39.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Three Notes of Non-Authenticity." *Haydn-Studien* 2, no. 1 (1969-70): 69-70.

MacIntyre, Bruce C. "Haydn's Doubtful and Spurious Masses: An Attribution Update." *Haydn-Studien* 5, no. 1 (March 1982): 42-54.

Marrocco, W. Thomas. "The String Quartet Attributed to Benjamin Franklin." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. 116, no. 6 (Dec. 1972): 477-85.

Melanie Lowe. "After Haydn Year 2009." *The Journal of Musicology* 27, no. 1 (Winter 2010): 1-8.

Pilková Zdeněka. "Haydn and his Czech Contemporary Antonín Kammel." In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al. 171-77.

"Problems of Authenticity—'Op. 3'." In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al. 95-106.

Radice, Mark A. "Haydn and His Publishers: A Brief Survey of the Composer's Publishing Activities." *The Music Review* 44, no. 2 (1983): 87-94.

Reynolds, Christopher. *Motives for Allusion*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Rosen, Charles. *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

Roy, Klaus G. "The So-Called Violin Sonatas of Haydn." *Bulletin of the American Musicological Society* 11-13 (Sept. 1948): 38-40.

Scott, Marion M. "Haydn: Thereabouts or There." *Music and Letters* 21, no. 4 (Oct. 1940): 319-27.

Smith, Carlton Sprague. "Haydn's Chamber Music and the Flute." *The Musical Quarterly* 19, no. 3-4 (July and Oct. 1933): 341-50, 434-55.

Spitzer, John. "Musical Attribution and Critical Judgment: The Rise and Fall of the Sinfonia Concertante for Winds, K. 297b." *The Journal of Musicology* 5, no. 3 (Summer 1987): 319-56.

Tovey, Donald Francis. "Haydn's Chamber Music," In *The Main Stream of Music*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949, 1-65.

Tyson, Alan. "Haydn and Two Stolen Trios." *The Music Review* 22, no. 1 (1961): 21-27.

\_\_\_\_\_. "One of Haydn's Lost 'Contrydances'?" *The Musical Times* 102, no. 1425 (1961): 693. Reprinted in *The Haydn Yearbook* 1 (1962): 202.

\_\_\_\_\_ and Landon, H.C. Robbins. "Who Composed Haydn's Op. 3?" *The Musical Times* 105, no. 1457 (1964): 506-507.

Unverricht, Hubert. "Haydn and Franklin: The Quartet with Open Strings and Scordatura." In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al. 147-54.

Webster, James. "External Criteria for Determining the Authenticity of Haydn's Music." In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al. 75-78.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Haydn's Farewell Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Relation between the Documentary and Stylistic Evidence." In *Haydn Studies*, ed. Larsen, et al. 99-102.