BEETHOVEN AND LISZT: THE CREATION OF A PERSONAL MYTH

Allan Keiler

Brandeis University

The figure and personality of Beethoven plays a central role in the creative life of all of the great nineteenth century Romantic composers. In the case of Liszt the influence of Beethoven was particularly strong and his dedication to that composer was reflected during most of his life and in a variety of ways. Many of the themes, compositional, aesthetic and personal, that make up the complex relationship of Beethoven to Liszt await serious attention in the modern literature, although the problem remains still an enormous and complicated one. The long record of public performance by Liszt of Beethoven's music, and the touching zeal of his philanthropic dedication to Beethoven's memory have begun to receive some careful documentation, and the influence of Beethoven's music on Liszt's compositional and stylistic development, an irregular but recurrent theme from the time of Lina Ramann's biography, seems to be once again a theme of some recent interest.[1] Indeed, the kind of mythic importance that the figure of Beethoven held in the biographical traditions surrounding Liszt in the nineteenth century, however much actual support these earlier views can ever be given, is hardly less strong and pervasive in the work of more recent decades. It is not surprising that we are attracted now to the external aspects of a creative relationship, to stylistic influence and aspects of performance traditions than to the more personal and even unconscious dimensions of the relationship of one creative personality on another, of the kind so often suggested by the literature of the last century. Still, that there is an internal world of personal and artistic myth, of unconscius identification and invention, to the make-up of the creative artist asserts itself in one way or another in the course of every biographical enterprise, and is hardly ever to be avoided. And it is

primarily this aspect of the relationship between Beethoven and Liszt, however perplexing and even daunting it may be, that I will be concerned with here.

Both Liszt and, apparently, Wagner created a personal myth around the figure of Beethoven, a private yet often consciously accepted relationship that was related in complicated and even indirect and tenuous ways to historical fact. Wagner, for example, in discussing the influence that Beethoven had on his own compositional development, ascribed the decisive impact on that influence to a performance of Fidelio in 1829 with Schroder-Devrient, who had sung the role in the presence of Beethoven himself at the first performance of the work. But Wagner created the event by both chronological and factual substitution and displacement, in order presumably to personalize, if only indirectly, his contact with Beethoven.[2] How isolated and superficial this instance is in Wagner's life I cannot say. Berlioz, on the other hand, was apparently more accurate and direct in his reporting, and the influence on him of Beethoven's music, when it finally did occur, had a powerful and lasting effect.[3] In the case of Liszt, the private myth that he constructed around the figure of Beethoven, and in which he enacted and worked out his personal and artistic genealogy with the historic Beethoven, is a regular theme from the very first biographies of Liszt that were written in the 1840's, and the special qualities of this relationship have been taken back in almost all biographical narratives to Liszt's earliest years.

The biographical antiquity of the relationship between Beethoven and Liszt, emphasizing as it does an artistic connection begun already in the earliest years of Liszt, dictates a succession of narrative stages that it would be risky to abandon, at least at the outset, and, indeed, suggests that the complicated inner creative life of Liszt and the place held by Beethoven within it can only be understood in the context of growth and development, by

following original impulse and guiding motive through the successive chronological and psychological stages of Liszt's life. The traditional narrative sequence constructed by Liszt's biographers about the relationship between Liszt and Beethoven usually entails three distinct stages: Liszt's earliest years in Hungary, when the first manifestations of his musical talent included an uncanny sympathy and response to Beethoven's music; the period in Vienna, from 1822-23, dominated in this narrative by the alleged scene of the Weihekuss, which set the seal on Liszt's career, predestining him in his dedication to Beethoven's memory and to his music; and the first decade or so in Paris, until the late 1830's, where the fulfillment of Liszt's mission on behalf of Beethoven began. I will follow these same stages, but attempt to replace the narrative and mythic dimensions of the sequence with one whose historical and psychological truth, or as much of it as we can approach, is very often at odds with the narrative picture of most Liszt biographers.[4]

The beginning of our study takes us back to the very earliest years of Liszt, when the special significance of Beethoven is connected in most biographies to the first discovery of his musical abilities. But in a more general way, we are confronted for this earliest stage with the traditional problems inherent in the study of the childhood of the artist.[5] I will make my way, in fact, from some of these more general biographical considerations back to the early period of Liszt's life. The most obvious one in the study of the childhood of the artist, of course, is the small amount of primary evidence that usually exists, its disparate and disconnected character, and its concentration generally in the form of reminiscences and recollections from later periods. And this paucity of evidence goes hand in hand with the restricted and almost single-minded use to which biographers traditionally tend to make of the childhood of the artist. Ever since the Renaissance, when

biographers began to incorporate the period of the artist's youth, it has been assumed that this earliest period holds a key to the later history of the artist, to his choice of profession and to his talents. This single-minded fascination with everything reported about the childhood of the artist is usually incorporated into a view that the earliest experiences of the artist already reflect the influence of fate in the life of the artist, or are premonitions of his future accomplishments. As Ernst Kris has written, "... virtually everything that is reported about the childhood and youth of anyone who has a claim to a biography bears some relation to the sphere in which he subsequently distinguished himself-in the case of the artist, to his choice of profession and to the first demonstration of his abilities."[6] Thus the youth of the artist is very often purged of conflict and hesitation, of varied impulses and uncertainty so that it can be fitted up to his later personality and accomplishments in a kind of teleological straightjacket in which everything is guided and determined from the outset.

Both of these restrictions, of evidence and of purpose, are reflected in the almost universal use by biographers of a limited and recurrent vocabulary of biographical formulae or motifs, which very often have little or no relation to the actual facts of the artist's early years. Such biographical motifs or anecdotes embody universal conceptions of society's image of the artist, and include such themes as the discovery and first manifestation of the artist's talent, the geneology of artistic connections between artists of different rank and accomplishment, and the role of chance in the manifestation of the artist's choice of carreer. As Kris has argued, these formulae are generally attempts at unraveling the eternal mystery of the artist's creativity by fashioning pseudo-rationalistic explanations drawn from fantasies and other actual life experiences that later become attached to

patterns of biography.

The image and legend of Beethoven occurs as a frequent and important theme in the biographical literature about Liszt and is embodied, as I should say now, in biographical formulae or anecdotes that reflect in striking ways the typical and universal formulae associated with the biography of the artist's youth. I can illustrate now these remarks with several of the most stereotyped examples. The first two actually center around Beethoven, and I will give those versions as they occur in Lina Ramann's biography. Here is one: "When at that time, Franz was asked what he wished to become, he always pointed to the picture of a master which, among other pictures as musicians, hung on a wall of the sitting-room, and 'such an one,' he exclaimed, with sparkling eyes. It was Beethoven's picture to which he pointed."[7] And another: "But now it was that from day to day the piano occupied him more and more, and especially when his father played Beethoven, he listened with an expression about eye and mouth as though his whole soul hung on those harmonies."[8] And here is still another, which does not mention Beethoven, reported by Liszt's first biographer Joseph d'Ortigue, and presumably originating from Liszt's father, Adam Liszt: "When he was six, he heard me play Ries's Concerto in C-sharp minor at the piano. Franz, bending over the piano, listened, completely absorbed. In the evening, coming in from the garden , where he had taken a walk, he sang the theme of the concerto. We made him sing it again. He did not know what he was singing. That was the first indication of his genius."[9]

The first anecdote incorporates actually two themes. In one theme Beethoven is portrayed as an idealized hero who embodies the choice of profession that fate has chosen for the young boy. In the other, which is not unrelated, the story emphasizes the single-minded and inevitable choice of

profession for which the boy is predestined. The first theme gains significance when one realizes that it is linked to the later legend of the Weihekuss. In the anecdote I have described here, Beethoven is only the artist as idealized hero, but in the legend of the Weihekuss, he becomes the actual figure responsible for recognizing the boy's talent. Seen in this connection, the Weihekuss legend itself is a kind of myth of the discovery of talent in the young artist, heightened emotionally in the symbol of a paternal blessing and recognition, seen as inevitable from the outset in the anecdote of the picture. In the case of the second theme, there are variants which emphasize its meaning. In one, Liszt is asked by his parents if he would like to become a priest. He rejects this alternative and the story leads to his pointing to the picture of Beethoven.[10] By now it is obvious that the second anecdote, about the power of Beethoven's music, is only the necessary counterpart to the first. Liszt's reaction to the magic power of music (and Beethoven's music) dramatizes again the inevitability of his choice of profession. And if there is a hint that there is something uncanny about so young a boy recognizing the spiritual power of Beethoven's music when it was rare for anybody at the time to do so, then the anecdote only gains in significance.

The last anecdote, in which Beethoven is not mentionned, is perhaps the most interesting. On one level it seems innocent enough: Liszt, with no effort, was able to remember and duplicate some aspect of his father's playing before any of his actual study of music began. But consider the details. For one thing, a boy of six is not tall enough to bend over a piano; nor does he go walking in the garden. The actual performance of the boy in repeating the theme and the details and setting of the anecdote really do not coincide very well. In fact, the details and setting fit the story of a much older person,

and resemble the romantic imagery of the artist lost in rapture, and moved by the power of nature (why should the young Liszt have to perform his feat only after a walk in the garden), expresses his feelings in music. There is a common variant of this anecdote about the first discovery of Liszt's talent that is particularly revealing when seen in the light of this interpretation. It is often described as following a period in which Liszt suffered from frequent fevers; in other versions the fevers occur intermittently during the same period as that of the anecdote, or not long after. Sometimes this struggle with fever is connected directly to the instruction Liszt received from his father. This connection of fever and the manifestation of Liszt's talents is nowwhere given such symbolic significance as it is in Schilling: "And so the entire life of the child appeared, from the first moment of [Liszt's] lessons, a struggle of the soul with the body, a fever in which his body often threated to be overcome."[11] This image of fever is a potent one and must be connected to the frequent anecdotal association of fire as a sign of creative potency in the artist that occurs in the biographies of artists in almost all periods and cultures. The older versions of the myth are associated with the punishment of the artist by the gods for his attempt to rival them.[12] In this case it is the harnassing of the potency of fire that makes possible artistic expression. It is a motif that belongs properly, of course, to the period of the mature artist, so we have here the interesting but obvious modification of fire into fever, which is something that a small boy often has to contend with; the intent is surely the same. Liszt's first expressions of musical talent, then, arise only by means of an internal struggle and harnassing of power. Here a myth of the mature artist is shown, but only in part, to the artist's youth.

It would be foolish to insist on the literal meaning of such an

It is only their symbolic meaning that preserves the universal appeal of such formulae, by encoding in a kind of psychological shorthand themes common to the mental and fantasy life of the individual, and unless such formulae lead to attempts to understand the private and secret world of the individual artist, the story of the earliest years of one creative personality will be much like any other. Still, one cannot help being impressed by the pervasiveness of the tradition that bestows so significant a place for Beethoven in the childhood of Liszt. And if we consider the strength of this tradition to be thus far its strongest and most real evidence, then we should pursue all of those biographical problems that form a link to it. There are two issues that are suggested by anecdotal tradition. The first, of course, concerns the role that the figure and music of Beethoven might have played in the musical life of Liszt as well as his father, who, until the boy came to study with Czerny in Vienna, was his sole teacher; and this question leads to the broader one of the musical and psychological relationship between Liszt and his father. From the perspective of Beethoven and his music we have to balance the competing problems of accessibility and understanding, and of the two participants, the different status of age, talent and both musical and psycholgical need. The full picture can no longer be known, but there is a more realistic and plausible view to be had than the traditional one.

Adam Liszt's musical competence has been exaggerated from the very first biographies of the composer, probably to explain his son's abilities at least in part as a result of heredity and disposition. D'Ortigue, for example, wrote that Adam Liszt, "without being a pianist of the first rank, had a rather remarkable technical ability. A consummate musician, he played practically every instrument."[13] But in 1801, in one of a continuing number of petitions that he addressed to Prince Esterházy, hoping to persuade the Prince

to transfer him from Kapuvár to Eisenstadt so that he might play some role in the musical life of that court, Adam Liszt said that he played the organ, violin and if necessary cello, that he could sing bass in the church choir and play the kettledrums in the orchestra.[14] Four years later, before he was finally transferred to Eisenstadt, and still hoped to play in the ducal orchestra, Esterházy asked Johann Fuchs, the assistant conductor of the court orchestra, about Adam Liszt's abilities. Fuchs apparently examined him and gave the following description to the Prince: "Liszt is fairly musical, but the true manner of making music, which is still somewhat unknown to him, he could easily acquire, in the Prince's orchestra, because it does appear that he has some musical talent."[15] And Fuch's judgement accords rather well, in fact, with Liszt's own, which he gave to Lina Ramann as an old man: " As a musician he distinguished himself, played several instruments (piano, violin, cello and guitar) and during the brilliant period of the Esterhazy orchestra at the end of the preceeding and beginning of this century he made friends with Haydn, Hummel and often took part as an amateur in the orchestra."[16]

So it is only after about 1800 that we know anything very concrete about Adam Liszt's musical abilities or accomplishments, and the evidence that I have mentionned so far suggests a modest and limited musical talent, and probably to some degree unsystematically developed, and no more so, perhaps, than with respect to the piano, the instrument that served so important a bond, musically and psychologically, between father and son. I would say that the direction or character of his musical activity changed significantly in Raiding after his marriage, in 1810, from the years (1805-1809) that he spent in Eisenstadt. He was allowed by the Prince to transfer to Eisenstadt only when a place was found for him in the admistrative service, and not because he was needed as a regular member of the resident orchestra. He played, in fact,

as second cellist, only on those unusual occasions when he would be needed as a supernumerary. You will remember that he did not mention the piano at all in his petition of 1801 to the Prince; since he clearly wished to impress him, I think he would have mentioned the piano as well if he had had any facility at all at the time, even if it was not as a keyboard player that his services might be of some use to the Prince. Adam Liszt himself claimed that it was only after hearing Hummel play, at Eisenstadt, that he began to work seriously at the piano.[17] After he was transferred again, this time to Raiding, in 1809, he was concerned about his musical isolation from Eisenstadt, and it was presumably here, away from the more lively and collegial musical atmosphere of the court, that the piano began to hold a major part of his musical interests.[18] On the occasion of his marriage, in 1810, he bought his first piano, which by 1819, because of the moist weather of his rural environment, had to be replaced. And again, some three years later, before the family left for Vienna, Adam Liszt was forced to buy a new instrument, this time by having to sell some valuable family possessions.[19] But however significant the new instrument had become for him he could not have been more than self-taught, and his ability at the instrument irregular and unsystematic. This was, after all, how Czerny remembered his son's playing when he first came to Vienna as a boy.

It would be prudent to limit any discussion of Adam Liszt's musical abilities to his technical accomplishments alone, or to a record of the opportunities he had for the actual public performance of music. There is another side, one which reveals itself, for example, in his steady petitions to Prince Esterházy, of almost relentless enthusiasm and passionate dedication that is found invariably in the dedicated hoppyist or amateur, especially when such preoccupations are satisfying and perhaps even necessary in ways that

have to compensate for the disappointments of one's actual profession. In this light, the four or five years that Adam Liszt spent in Eisenstadt must have held for him an importance musically that went considerably beyond the limited role that he played in the musical life of the court. Indeed, one incident surely stood out for him that would help to explain the preeminent role that the figure of Beethoven is said to have held both for Adam Liszt and his son, because it brought Adam Liszt in touch with Beethoven himself. In 1807 Beethoven came to Eisenstadt to conduct the first performance of his C Major Mass, and Adam Liszt was hired as a supernumerary to play the second cello part in the orchestra. The contact could not have been casual. Beethoven arrived three days before the day of the performance to take charge of the rehearsals. Prince Nicholas himself attended all of the rehearsals, and the rather frenzied and last minute changes and preparations that were required could only have lent a drama and immediacy to the experience that must have remained with Adam Liszt for many years.[20]

What influence of a profound and long lasting nature incidents of this kind might have had on Adam Liszt and eventually his son has to be seen alongside the more straightforward question of the place that Beethoven's music held for Adam Liszt, and this is the question we have to face now. It is a difficult one because it is impossible to avoid conjecture, however plausible. We know little that is concrete about Adam Liszt's involvement with Beethoven's music before he took up residence, in 1809, in Raiding. His contribution to the performance of the C Major Mass is so far an isolated occurrence of its kind. It seems that Liszt was fairly isolated during his years in Raiding, although it may be the case that he had connections, perhaps musical connections in Vienna. Hárich claimed that Adam Liszt's son, by 1821, was already well-known in Vienna, but he gives no evidence.[21] In one of

Liszt's petitions to Prince Nicholas that year, he applied for permission to spend 8 to 10 days in Vienna so that his son could perform in a public concert, which was to take place sometime in April, but there is no record of such a concert.[22] So one has to assume, after all, that what Adam Liszt knew of Beethoven's music during this period he knew from his own doing. Now there were many arrangements, in many forms, of almost all of Beethoven's orchestral music that were available from the very beginning of the second decade of the nineteenth century. If Adam Liszt's contact with other musicians was regular, and arrangements of these kinds found their way into his home, he could have known and played some of the symphonies and chamber music of Beethoven, as well as some of the piano sonatas. But one must still remember, however, that there was hardly any general musical culture, even in the German speaking countries, that embraced regularly and with understanding Beethoven's music at the time that could have played a profound role in Adam Liszt's musical experience, and considering the technical and intellectual demands of much of Beethoven's music, and the limitations of Adam Liszt's facility and experience, especially at the keyboard, I think that the amount of Beethoven's music and the impact that it had for him may have been modest. We are asking a lot of an amateur and isolated musician, no matter how enthusiastic, to have experienced technically and substantively in any significant way music that was still found during these years so intractable and that would have required in any case genuine insight and even foresight to appreciate.

As for Beethoven's music and its meaning for Franz Liszt during these years, one has to be still more tentative. There was the music in the home, and whatever music played a role in his studies, but his reactions, even to the same music, cannot be measured in the same way as for his father. Certainly his reactions would have been more tied up with his growing

technical skills than with musical content. Presumably some of the sets of variations and sonatas played a part in his studies. And father and son alike could even have toiled away at the technical peaks of Beethoven's music in the way that the talented young and the older enthusiast do, fearlessly unaware of the perils.[23] In one petition addressed to the Prince, Adam Liszt claimed that his son could already play many of the works of Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Clementi, Hummel, Cramer and others, but there are no details, and in any case he had to persuade the Prince of his son's unique talents.[24] Certainly for Adam Liszt, then, and also for his son, it was not so much Beethoven's music that played all that significant a role in their musical experience, but rather the force of Beethoven's fame and personality, experienced first hand by the father and without doubt conveyed to his son probably from the very beginning of his studies. It is the latter, after all, that is suggested so dramatically by the anecdotes that have come down to us in the biographical literature.

So far we have stuck to straightforward matters, the importance that the reputation and music of Beethoven might have played in the musical development of Adam Liszt and his son. From this vantage point alone, we will not find room in the musical and psychological life of Liszt for Beethoven to figure as prominently and obcessively as we find suggested again and again. If the figure of Beethoven figured prominently in the emotional and fantasy life of liszt, as a candidate for the creation of a family romance, as a mediating agent for conflictual feelings and ambivalence otherwise repressed, or as the private object of identification and idealization, then only a clearer picture of the emotional development of Liszt within the context of his developing musical talents, and especially within the context of his family will suggest such possibilities. And few would doubt that it was the relationship with his father, who had to act as both parent and teacher, and who in any case

negotiated his lost hopes and aborted ideals as a musician in his relationship to his son that is the central issue to pursue.

There is first of all a portrait of Liszt as a boy who comes gradually under the tutelage of his father that I think can be established. Here I want to emphasize the importance, in spite of the usual problems attached to these sources, of several early biographical studies, especially those of Rellstab and Schilling, and the recollections of Adolph Frankenburg, a childhood friend of Liszt.[25] All of these have left portraits of Liszt as a child that, in one way or another, remain unusually suggestive, even insightful psychologically; and there are details that are confirmed from other sources. In Frankenburg, we have the portrait of Liszt who felt more lonely and isolated as the full nature of his talents developed.[26] And it is from Schilling that we are first made aware to what degree both parents experienced uneasiness and conflict about what course to take as the boy's talents became evident.[27] Adam Liszt settled on an extreme course of rigid and severe training, harsh to the point of punishment and uncomprehending of the boy's musical curiosity. Indeed, both of these traits can be seen in Liszt's recollection of his father's response to his early interest in the Hammerklavier Sonata. This is how he told the story to Göllerich, many years later: "...my childhood presumption went so far that I delved passionately into Beethoven's 'Grand Sonata for Hammerklavier', which my father loved so much. I remember that this foolishness brought a couple of vigorous slaps, which nevertheless hardly reformed me, for secretly, during the frequent excursions of my father, I continued the dismemberment of my favorite sonata."[28] The recollection is a touching one, because Liszt after some four decades conveys in this recollection not an attitude about his childhood daring in which he has gained some tolerant understanding and even

appreciation, but one in which he still partly at least identifies with his father's shortsighted judgement. There were witnesses to Adam Liszt's treatment of his son. A Genevan woman, for example, who about 1820 was a governess in Pest in the home of a noble family where Adam Liszt and his son often visited, relates that the father treated the boy harshly and often went so far as to beat him in order to see to it that he did his exercises.[29] Many of these instances have been covered over by a layer of amused tolerance, but the underlying affect is hard to miss. In fact, these incidents suggest rather on the part of Adam Liszt what Freud once called affectionate abuse, an angry, restricive and intolerant response covered over with playfulness and affection.[30] The later apologizers of Adam Liszt's behavior were not so far from the truth.

Liszt's recollections of his father in his later years are often revealing and have to be analyzed with the greatest care. I will stick to only one source here, the small slips of paper on which Lina Ramann, toward the very end of Liszt's life, wrote questions for him to answer that she could make use of in her biography of the composer. Here is one exchange: "Did you have at that time (1822, in Vienna) others who instructed you in music? "No. My father gave at that time instruction in history, Latin etc. to several young gentlemen, and had no time to spend with me."[31] Now Ramann didn't ask about Liszt's father, and the context of questions makes it clear that she was not thinking of him. And Liszt, even at the time (he was already eleven or twelve) must have understood the superhuman sacrifices that his father had made on his behalf. As an old man, with many years to understand the sacrifices of his parents as a boy, to so dispassionately resent the time that his father spent with others in order to earn some money (he was not in the pay of Prince Nicholas at the time) is at the very least meanspirited. But

more important, it is what a small boy says, not an adult, when he cannot express the deeper feelings of regret, which are then displaced on to something which in itself is not important at all. There are several questions about the death of Liszt's father, and here the ambivalence of feelings is striking as well. The first question goes: "Does a cross or stone cover the grave of your father?," Liszt is asked, and he answers: "Unfortunately not. For what reason I will tell you in person."[32] In the next question, Ramann asks: "In what cemetery does he lie", and Liszt answers: "I don't know the name of the cemetery in Boulogne-sur-Mer...." [33] Liszt was sixteen years old when his father died, and he lived for at least a decade not more than a hundred miles away from his father's grave, which he never visited. And Liszt's answers are all the more revealing when one remembers that he worked tirelessly for years to raise himself all of the funds necessary for the erection of a monument to Beethoven in Bonn, a statue which still stands today. In those recollections of Liszt about his father that I have described, one notices above all, not the mature and self-confident deidealization of his father that is achieved with the development of a strong and secure sense of self, but a sense of loss and disappointment that suggests rather an inability and failure to idealize the memory of his father, preserved perhaps from early childhood.

I would give the following profile to the earliest period that we are considering here. We have to see in it the possibility of a period of conflict and ambivalent feeling on the part of Liszt toward his father, whose love and approval was certainly often only partially conveyed, entangled as it was with the anxious sternness in the training of his son. Adam Liszt himself was never able to realize his own musical aspirations, and seems to have been afflicted, perhaps rather severly with a sense of failure and disrupted self-esteem.

Even in his administrative service to Nicolas, he was transferred rather often and this excessive impermanence could not have bolstered in the sphere of his professional work what he suffered as a disappointed musician. We know, in fact, that he showed real puzzlement and indecision about the reality and promise of his son's talents; at least some of this indecision was affected by his own lack of success and accomplishment as a musician. One can argue, therefore, that he would not have found it easy to accept any role as idealized father image that his son must have attempted to assign to him. Indeed, the swings from self-glorification and exhibitionistic display to insecurity and hesitation that marked several decades at least in Liszt's life only support the assumption of a disturbed and unanchored early father identification. So we should not be surprised to find indications of the creation of an early family romance constructed around the figure of Beethoven, or perhaps split among several candidates, or at least elements of a parental replacement that eventually came to be incorporated primarily into a personal myth of great tenacity.[34] In this earliest period it was the figure or idea of Beethoven more than his music that contributed to the psychological determinants of that myth.

2.

Adam Liszt arrived with his family in Vienna in May 1822; the brief period of less than two years in the Austrian capital is dominated in the biographical literature by the legend of the Weihekuss, the alleged meeting between Beethoven and the young Liszt at the end of Liszt's concert in April 1823. Indeed, scholars have repeatedly promoted the story of the Weihekuss to a significant developmental milestone that would ensure the kind of narrative purpose and inevitability that biographers normally require. This period is,

in fact, usually described in the literature as almost idyllic, as Liszt astonished his teachers, the Viennese public and finally Beethoven himself. Walker, for example, has recently summed up this period as the triumphant close of one period and the auspicious beginning of another: "After Liszt's appearance in the Redoutensaal Adam could look back on their short stay in Vienna with considerable satisfaction. Every one of his objectives had been achieved. His son was now the centre of attention in the capital. He had played before the most critical audiences and had brought honour to his family, his teachers and his country. He had published his first composition. Above all, he had grown in artistic stature and stood on the threshold of a shining career."[35] I think that views such as these, and certainly in reference to the questions occupying us in this essay, are the product of Romantic fancy, simplistic psychologically and devoid of the complicated and layered texture of both inner and outer life history. We shall see that it is the more earthbound record of hope and disappointment, of struggle and decision during this period that will occupy us. This is, in fact, the context of the facts of the alleged Weihekuss.

The bureaucratic conditions under which Adam Liszt and his family were finally able to leave Hungary for Vienna, in May 1822, and which ultimately helped to determine his decision not to return to the employ of Esterházy, lie at the center of the economic hardship and uncertainty of the family. Nor was there certainty, not only for the Prince but for Adam Liszt as well, about the training and future of the young musician. The idea of leaving Hungary for Vienna began to take hold for Adam Liszt, according to the record at least, about 1819. What he wanted from the Prince was a leave of absence with an understanding that his position would be held for him should he want to return, and, to make the venture economically feasible, a yearly stipend or

position in the Prince's service in Vienna.[36] Esterhazy, who was concerned about the boy's frailty and ill-health, had reservations about the successful outcome of such a plan of study. In 1820 the Prince actually approved one of Adam Liszt's many petitions, although giving him less than he asked for: a one-year leave, a stipend of 200 forint, and the promise that his position would be held for him should he need to return.[37] Adam Liszt declined the offer, but in March 1822 the same offer was made and this time Liszt accepted.[38] By the time the family arrived in Vienna, in May 1822, Adam Liszt's financial situation was precarious. His own fortune and that of his wife had already been exhausted by the demands of his son's education. Although he was given 200 forint by the prince in May, in July he wrote an embittered letter confessing that his whole fortune at the moment consisted of 162 forint.[39] He repeatedly asked for free housing from the Prince in the city but was told that none existed; so he was forced to live in the suburbs of Vienna until October.

The economic strain and worry that Adam Liszt had to face during these months must have been enormous, and the domestic worries and challenges that arose from them could have been no less serious. The decision to leave Hungary for Vienna must have been a wrenching one. For the young Liszt the burden must have been the most difficult of all; it placed an enormous sense of responsibility on him and he surely felt the strain of a household that gradually yet consistently gave up many of the ordinary and satisfying pleasures for the singleminded pursuit of developing his talents. Once in Vienna it was for the most part the success, musical as well as financial, of Liszt's concerts that brought money to the family. The fact that Czerny, now the boy's teacher, held back until December from allowing his pupil to appear

in a public concert surely added to the economic strain. That concert took place on 1 December. Liszt played for the last time in Vienna at a public concert on Sunday afternoon, 13 April in the small Redoutensaal, the concert around which the legend of the Weihekuss was to take root.

Soon after that concert Liszt and his father returned briefly to Hungary, and during the time between the end of September and the middle of December Liszt traveled to a number of German cities to perform. Although Adam Liszt and his family did not leave Vienna for good until the end of December, their thoughts, and musical activities came more and more to be turned elsewhere. So it is unfortunate that from these simple facts alone the concert of 13 April could so easily be turned into a fateful and decisive milestone, ending presumably by intention Liszt's first period of connection with Vienna. There is evidence, and certainly reason, to view that concert differently. For one thing, something of the significance of the concert (and of the Weihekuss as well) derives from the view that it was a farewell concert and hence marked the end of a period of developmental significance as well as a symbolic beginning, an augury of Liszt's career and talents. It is, in other words, thought of as the closing of the circle that began with the earliest foreshadowing, expressed in the anecdotes with which I began this essay, of Liszt's predestined connection with Beethoven and his music. But it was not billed as a farewell concert and therefore presumably not intended in this way. Can we believe that Adam Liszt, as astute an entrepreneur as he was in the business of his son's career, would fail to take the obvious opporturnity to advertise publicly that on that occasion his son would play for the last time in public before leaving Vienna? And indeed, he seems to have had no such idea at the time. On 29 March, two weeks before the concert, it was decided by Prince Esterhazy to ask Adam Liszt for a statement about his plans. His leave

would be over on 8 May and he had still not communicated with Esterhazy. Liszt was given three months to respond; his position would not be held for him any longer.[40] Liszt responded on 15 April, only two days after the concert, and it was in this letter that he expressed for the first time his intention to travel to Paris and London, and at the same time asked for a two-year extension to his leave of absence.[41] His petitions continued until 31 July. A two year leave of absence was never granted. During all of this uncertainty, and probably anxiety about the future of his family, a concert was planned for which it was hoped that Beethoven himself would attend and offer a theme on which Liszt could improvise. The idea probably came from Schindler, who was already taken with the young boy's talents, and who would have liked nothing better than to accomplish the impossible, to entice Beethoven to the boy's concert.[42] Adam Liszt must have given in to the possibility, and the advertisement, in any case, promised the presence of Beethoven, and in a rather opportunistic way: "Free fantasy on the pianoforte from the concertgiver, on a written theme most humbly requested from Someone in the audience."[43] I will later on suggest a stronger connection between these uncertain times and the concert of 13 April. We must first turn our attention directly to the concert and to the evidence for the Weihekuss.

The entire narrative that Beethoven attended Liszt's final concert in Vienna and bestowed on the boy the Weihekuss at the end, a narrative that Liszt held on to so strongly, is pretty much the invention of Schindler and Liszt's biographers; and the legend Liszt himself encouraged during the 1840's, when a whole series of biographies came to be written about Liszt.That Beethoven never attended the concert we know from his Conversation Books, the relevant evidence from which I have given in Figure I.[44] The entries occur in three separate books, and I have grouped them into short time periods before

and after the concert, which can be established fairly well from events mentionned in them, and have marked the spurious entries of Schindler as they have recently been established with an asterisk.[45] Here is what we can learn from a careful study of these entries. 1) During the week preceeding 13 April Liszt and his son attempted to see Beethoven at his house, in order to invite him to attend the concert. Nothing whatever follows this single entry, so it is unlikly that much came to pass of the visit, and this is confirmed by later entries. Indeed, many years later, Liszt confided to Göllerich that "...I never played at his house, but I was there twice. There was a piano there with strings torn out."[46] 2) It was Schindler who, a day before the concert, communicated the request to Beethoven for a theme on which Liszt could improvise at the concert. 3) There followed almost immediately after a short discussion that makes it clear that Beethoven, on the day before the concert, had no knowledge about Liszt and his successes in Vienna; he even had to be told that Czerny, with whom the composer was not on good terms at the time, was the boy's teacher. 4) During the week or so following the concert there are two separate conversations with Beethoven about Liszt's concert, in which the composer is told about the size of the audience, about the boy's playing, etc. that indicate without any question that Beethoven could not have been there.

There is more evidence to be submitted about the conclusion that I have just reached. But first I have to deal with a view raised recently by Alan Walker, that "There was indeed a Weihekuss, although it occurred in circimstances rather different from those invented by his biographers. Liszt himself left a record of his only meeting with Beethoven, giving this oral account to his pupil Ilka Horowitz-Barnay, more than fifty years after the event."[47] This account, later published by Horowitz-Barnay, is the following.[48]

I was about eleven years of age when my venerated teacher Czerny took me to Beethoven. He had told the latter about me a long time before, and had begged him to listen to me play sometime. Yet Beethoven had such a repugnance to infant prodigies that he had always violently objected to receiving me. Finally, however, he allowed himself to be persuaded by the indefatigable Czerny, and in the end cried impatiently: "In God's name, then, bring me the young Turk!" It was ten o'clock in the morning when we entered the two small rooms in the Schwarzpanier house where Beethoven lived. I somewhat shyly, Czerny amiably encouraging me. Beethoven was sitting at a long, narrow table by the window, working. He looked gloomily at us for a time, said a few brief words to Czerny, and remained silent when my kind teacher beckoned me to the piano. I first played a short piece by Ries. When I had finished, Beethoven asked me whether I could play a Bach fugue. I chose the C-minor Fugue from the Well-Tempered Clavier. "And could you also transpose the fugue at once into another key?" Beethoven asked me. Fortunately I was able to do so. After my closing chord I glanced up. The great master's darkly glowing gaze lay piercingly upon me. Yet suddenly a gentle smile passed over his gloomy features, and Beethoven came quite close to me, stooped down, put his hand on my head, and stroked my hair several times. "A devil of a fellow," he whispered, "a regular young Turk!" Suddenly I felt quite brave. "May I play something of yours now?" I boldly asked. Beethoven smiled and nodded. I played the first movement of the C-major Concerto. When I had concluded Beethoven caught hold of me with both hands, kissed me on the forehead, and said gently: "Go! You are one of the fortunate ones! For you will give joy and happiness to many other people! There is nothing better or finer." Liszt told the preceding in a tone of deepest emotion, with tears in his eyes, and a warm note of happiness sounded in the simple tale. For a brief space he was silent, and then he said: "This event in my life has remained by greatest pride - the palladium of my whole career as an artist. I tell it but very seldom and - only to good friends"

"According to this account, Walker goes on, the Walhekuss took place in Beethoven's home, not in the concert hall. And Beethoven's Conversation Books corroborate that this is where a meeting actually did take place."[49] Now, in fact, just the opposite is true: the Conversation Books make it relatively certain that this account is not a retelling based on original fact at all. The sole entry in Book 28 is clearly a first attempt at a meeting at Beethoven's house. And it is unlikely that, once Beethoven did not attend the concert, Liszt or his father made any further attempt to see him. No concert

followed that of 13 April, and only two days later Adam Liszt decided that he would turn his attention away from Vienna. The original purpose of a meeting, to entice Beethoven to provide a theme for an improvisation simultaneously with his appearance, was now lost, and if Beethoven had taken no interest before the concert, would Schindler have made still another attempt at bringing the parties together? This seems unlikely, and without understandable motivation. So the whole affair is circumscribed by a period of only about two weeks, during which no meeting took place in Beethoven's house or at the concert any more than it could have taken place before or after that period.

About the concert there is furthermore circumstantial evidence, and it reinforces what I have already claimed. There was a a review of the concert in the Wiener allgemeine Musikzeitung by Kanne, who does not mention the presence of Beethoven at all.[50] Kanne could hardly have failed to notice the presence of the composer or of such an act as the Weihekuss if it had happened at all, in a hall that seated at most four or five hundred people; nor would he have failed to mention it if he had. Adam Liszt had opportunities as well to mention so dramatic an event, especially in the long and passionate letter that he wrote to Prince Nicholas in July 1823, in which he goes to such lengths to argue that all of the hardships that his family had to undergo for his son's musical education had been amply rewarded.[51] Would he not have mentionned Beethoven or the Weihekuss if it had occurred? What more eloquent and moving testimony to the boy's accomplishments could Adam Liszt have pointed to? But he mentionned no such thing.

The concert itself was not a great success. Adam Liszt and Schindler failed to bring about the sensation that they wanted: to entice Beethoven to the concert and to get from him a theme for improvisation. The hall was not full, and Liszt went astray in his improvisation, on a theme too long and

cumbersome, which, of course, was not from Beethoven but from someone in the audience. Liszt's improvisation may even have caused some snickering; Kanne, in fact, at the end of his review, by adding Risum teneatis, attempted to caution indulgence. So perhaps there is a connection between the actual events of the concert and the decision that Adam Liszt expressed only two days later, after holding off for more than two weeks, to leave Vienna and to travel to Paris and London, no doubt for greener pastures financially as well as musically. After less than two years in the Austrian capital the decision seems abrupt; it appeared that way to Czerny, who felt that it was immature and bad for the boy's musical studies. Indeed for Adam Liszt to ignore the counsel of Czerny, for whom Liszt and his son held such respect and who represented such authority for both, would seem a thoughtless and precipitous act. These connections must remain tentative for the moment, but it would be ironic indeed if this last concert in Vienna, not because of its triumphant success, but rather its unexpected and demoralizing disappointment, actually led to a turning point in Adam Liszt's plans for his son.

Liszt believed in the actuality of the Weihekuss for all of his life. In view of the denial and idealization that such a belief required, questions about its origin and development, and of course motivation are hard to avoid. The evidence will never permit us to decide between viewing the whole affair of Liszt's final concert in Vienna as a naive but enthusiastic attempt on the part of Schindler and Adam Liszt to engage Beethoven's interest in a musical prodigy whom both believed unique and certainaly astonishing, and a conniving and thoughtless offense of the deaf composer's privacy in order to achieve notoriety and economic advantage. There were presumably elements of both at work. That the aborted attempt caused disappointment and humiliation for the two engaged in the plot, Schindler and Adam Liszt, can hardly be doubted. For

Adam Liszt the success of the venture would have been something of a renewal, linking that experience had it succeded with that time in Eisenstadt when Adam Liszt played in the orchestra that Beethoven conducted. There was, to be sure, some economic gain to be had from the concert, but Adam Liszt was used to hardship and disappointment [redacted] and cagey and experienced enough to find opportunity. After all, only two days after the concert he announced his new and rather bold plan to Esterhazy. We have in these reactions from the journals only the public and indirect side of private and complicated family relationships, but they add as contemporary testimony to the likelihood of what I have said about the relation of Liszt and his father during these years.

The effect of the concert is more complicated to assess in the case of the son. His disappointment could only have been related in a diffiicult web of feelings toward his father, from whom clear and unequivocal signs of love must have often been tied up with his son's successes as a performer and in earning money. It was a pattern long established, I believe, that Liszt saw his success as a performer and musician as the key to his father's approval and often probably even affections. During the period in Vienna, this entanglement of father and teacher was loosened when Czerny became the boy's teacher. Czerny was stern and demanding, to be sure, but his reputation and accomplishments as a musician, unlike those of his father, commanded respect and, in any event, his role toward the boy was unequivicatingly divorced from the emotional dynamics of Liszt's family constellation. Nonetheless, the complicated relationship of father and son had probably grown worse during the period in Vienna, at least in so far as the burden of earning money and the successes that required put on Adam Liszt's son. About this we are on farily clear ground. Czerny felt rather early that Adam Liszt, if only out of

necessity, was exploiting his son's abilities and jeoprodizing his studies for economic reasons.[52] The issue became public in 1824 when the critic of La Pandore drew attention to it.[53] Adam Liszt responded to the charges, but his rebuttal, in which hurt pride is the dominant motive, hardly counts as valid refutation.[54] Only a year later on the occasion of the performances of Liszt's opera Don Sanche, the issue again was raised in the Press; this time glory rather than money was seen as the motive for the parents' exploitation: "One has to feel sorry for this child, whose eminent musical organization has caused our admiration, and whose parents, too intoxicated with [the possibility of] a precocious glory, have compromised his future in advising him to rank himself, at thirteen, among the Mozarts and Glucks. One must not blame him but feel sorry for him. Useful advisers ought to have shown the family the absurdity of such an enterprise."[55] There was no public rejoinder by Adam to these charges, and, in any event, the article from which I have given the above showed considerable concern and sympathy. But the article does suggest how much Adam Liszt may have been reenacting through his son his own earlier desire to become a musician.

It is, of course, only from the complicated afterlife of the disappointment of Liszt's final concert in Vienna that we are able to reconstruct something of its original effect. In Vienna, Liszt was brought close to the actual figure of Beethoven, not only by expectation and anticipation, by his father's earlier recollections, but by the intermediate link that Czerny, a student of Beethoven, formed between Liszt and the composer. His reaction to the events of the concert must have included both a sense of failure that he felt toward his father and a feeling of rejection as well by the aged composer, who until then had lived a secure life in the fantasy world of the child. Indeed, the events of the concert could only have

brought together and confused this feeling of rejection from both parties, and made it all the more easy for Liszt to negotiate eventually the ambivalent and contradictory feelings that he had toward his own father around the idealized figure of Beethoven . His feelings about the Weihekuss as an adult will help to shed light backwards on the origins, as well as the later meaning that this ritual act came to have for him.

It is unfortunate that what we know of Liszt's adult responses to the concert in Vienna and the Weihekuss are, except in a single instance, second-hand, reported to us in the literature by those who claim to be communicating what Liszt himself told them. Some are matter of fact, sober and without embellishment . All deny the actual facts as they occurred, at least with reference to the concert. I have mentionned already Liszt's recollection to Gollerich, which comes from the last decade of Liszt's life; here I will give the whole passage: "Beethoven appeared at my second concert in Vienna, to please Czerny, and kissed me on the forehead. I never played at his house, but I tried to see him twice. There was a piano there with strings torn out."[56]

There are two themes to Liszt's reminiscences that figure in this account. One involves the replacement of his father, who surely accompanied him, along with Schindler presumably, to Beethoven's house, with Czerny, who could not have. About this the Conversation Books are explicit. Of course, the replacement here is transposed to the events of the concert, but this is not always the case. It is significant both that Liszt denies his father any role at all in his early connection to Beethoven, and that he, consistently as you will see, chooses Czerny, who was, in fact, closer to the composer and formed in fact a link of psychological significance. Only a few years after Liszt's death Lina Ramann, in response to an article by Alfred Kalischer, gave her own recollection of a conversation with Liszt about the Weihekuss. The exchange is

the following:[57]

> Our conversation turned then to another topic. Suddenly Liszt interrupted, and switched back to the preceeding with the half humorous, half angry exclamation:
> "And this chap wanted to deny me my kiss!" - , whereupon I interjected: but you did receive it.
> "Naturally I received it", he replied, and raised his head proudly as he remembered that moment. -

Again Liszt's answer is not very helpful in betraying more of the deeper levels of feeling associated with those early events, but we cannot help wondering if the element of doubt that creeps into Ramann's question was more widespread than we know while Liszt was still alive.

There are several retellings of the legend of the Weihekuss that will bring us closer to Liszt's more private feelings. The first is the one reported by one of Liszt's pupils, Mrs. Barnay, to which I have had occasion already to refer. I said there that it could not be taken as fact; its significance in revealing to us something about the myth created by Liszt around Beethoven is what interests us now. When Liszt told this story to his pupil he was an old man, and the events surrounding the Weihekuss were known in one form or another by anyone who had any kind of personal relation with him. So Liszt's motivation could not have been simply to inform her about some facts of his early days as a student in Vienna. Liszt himself gave away some of the atmosphere that he wished to create with the final confession of his story: "I tell it but very seldom and only to good friends." This atmosphere, between the aging, celebrated and adored teacher and a younger and especially female student, was one that Liszt must have cultivated innumerable times. It served to create an occasion for him to establish a kind of intimacy that would then permit him to express some of his deeper feelings and private emotions and at the same time cultivate the respectful and even adoring attitude of the listener.

The narrative detail and form that Liszt gave to this revelation are not only improbable and calculated for effect, but in some cases does not agree with some facts that we do know. For one thing the motivation is all wrong. The point of Schindler's machinations was to entice Beethoven to Liszt's concert; the one thing neither Schindler nor Adam Liszt would have wanted was to give the whole thing away before the concert by getting Beethoven to hear Liszt play. And after the concert, as I have discussed already, there would have been little likelihood of any attempt to see Beethoven another time. In general, no actual meeting would have produced so dramatic a transformation in Beethoven's attitude in so short a period, even if he could have heard anything. The detail is too intentionally precise for an account recollected after half a century, and the narrative buildup corresponds too obviously to the traditional picture of Beethoven's moodiness and irascibility.

What is striking about the story, on the other hand, is that it is a retelling in varied form of all of the themes of the traditional legend of the Weihekuss: the difficulty of getting Beethoven to Liszt's concert is here transformed to Beethoven's slow and even suspicious willingness to hear Liszt play; the unexpected and remarkable effect that the boy's genius has on the composer, the actual gesture of fatherly benediction, Beethoven's predilection about his future and the significance of the response for Liszt. These are the very motifs that give life to the Weihekuss legend and these are the motifs that underlie the new version. Only a new setting is provided for those motifs, one in Beethoven's house,that is more intimate and personal than the public concert of the original story, a setting which corrresponds to the actual one of the retelling by Liszt to Horowitz-Barnay. What is not altered, in other words, is the deeper layer of meaning, or latent meaning, as Freud names it. Indeed, the manifest or surface form of the story reveals to us

details that are particularly revealing psychologically. Here again, Liszt replaced his own father with Czerny. We can sharpen the theme of this distortion now. Czerny was for Liszt the intermediary in the artistic geneology that he constructed around Beethoven, a role that could not have been played (or he would not grant) to his own father.

The other recollection is found in a letter that Liszt wrote to the Grand Duke Carl Alexander on 1 November 1862.[58] The letter is prompted at the outset by the death of the uncle of Carl Alexander, for whom Liszt expreses sympathy, and the general feelings of pain and suffering are carried over into the subsequent discussion about Liszt's compositional activity, where his Vision à la Chapelle Sistine, in which Liszt has combined themes from Allegri's Miserere and Mozart's Ave Verum Corpus, leads him again into more personal associations, of human misery and anguish and divine love and mercy, in a general feeling that is frankly eschatological. Indeed, I do not think it accidental that when Liszt comes to mention Beethoven, it is alongside The Last Judgement of Michelangelo that the shadowy figure of Beethoven appears to him. Liszt's creative associations then gradually draw him into a more personal and fantasizing mood, during which mention of the Weihekuss is made. I will give Liszt's own words now, as he remembers the story of Mozart as a young boy writing down the Miserere of Allegri during a visit to the Sistine Chapel:[59]

> Therefore I have often sought there the spot where Mozart should have been. I even imagined that I saw him and that he looked at me with a gentle condescension. Allegri was there close by ....
>
> Then, slowly, there appeared in the background, near the Last Judgement of Michelangelo, another shadowy figure, of inexpressible grandeur. Carried away, I recognized it immediately, because while It was still exiled to this life, it had consecrated my forehead with a kiss.

During this waking dreamlike state Liszt forms an analogy between Mozart and

Allegri and himself and Beethoven and uses this parallel of artistic geneology to express the symbolic meaning of Beethoven's blessing as a kind of final artistic judgement linking him with the past. The original meaning of the Weihekuss, a paternal blessing to a son about to accept the challenge of manhood, is here turned into a recognition of accomplishment and participation in tradition. The two themes of paternal blessing and artistic lineage are combined into a spiritual symbolism by association with the motif of paternal authority and final judgement embraced by Michelangelo's The Last Judgement. Again it is striking to see the original elements of the Weihekuss legend expanded and transformed by the associations and context in which Liszt is led during the various subjects of the letter.

3.

I come now to the last period marked off in this essay, the years in Paris from 1824 to 1840, and the question of Liszt's performance of Beethoven's music. This is a subject too vast and complex to confront in any comprehensive way here; my interest in the subject has to be limited to its relation to the complex of ideas which make up the myth that links Beethoven and Liszt. One of the themes of the Weihekuss, and indeed, of the legends about Liszt's earliest years with which this essay began, is the assumption of Liszt's predestined dedication to the performance and dissemination of Beethoven's music from the time at least of his alleged meeting with Beethoven. The implication here is that from the very earliest years of Liszt's life there was a spiritual bond between Liszt and the figure and music of Beethoven, to which a seal was affixed at the time of the Weihekuss. We recognize these themes to be related to the biographical device of the original and predestined affinity in the artist's sympathies, a device closely

linked to that of genealogization, i.e. "the urge to anchor the individual's achievement firmly in the dynastic succession."[60] Both exclude the more rational attempt to discover the evolution of artistic sympathies and associations within the framework of a developmental creative psychology. It is this point of view that I will try to pursue here, allowing the outcome to become adjusted to what we have already learned of the more personal and private side of the myth that Liszt created around Beethoven.

Liszt's repertoire, certainly in the years before his arrival in Paris in December 1823 and until his important series of concerts in Vienna during the last years of the 1830's, was a common one for the period, consisting of concertos and the Septet by Hummel, and concertos of Ries, Weber and John Field and solo works, often variations, by Herz, Moscheles and Czerny, and during the Paris years chamber works, composed often by musicians with whom Liszt frequently performed, for example Bériot, Herz, Schunke and others.[61] It seems that his interest and performance of Beethoven's music began about the time of the first historic performances in Paris of Beethoven's symphonies, in 1828, by Habeneck and the Concerts du Conservatoire. It was, in other words, the vigorous musical life of Paris and his own developing maturity as a musician that combined to direct Liszt's energies to the performance of Beethoven's music.

As I will discuss, it is only from about 1828 that Liszt's participation in the performance of any music of Beethoven, original or in transcriptions or arrangements, apart from themes that Liszt may have used in his improvisations, can be documented. But we should not let these more public facts of Liszt's involvement with Beethoven's music obscure his more private feelings about that composer and his music, feelings to which we have some infrequent access for the years from the time of the Weihekuss to the end of

the 1820's. There is first the well-known story of Liszt substituting a sonata of some lesser-known composer for one of Beethoven, to show presumably that the philistine audiences of his time could not tell the difference. We have a letter written in the Spring of 1826 by the Marseilles lawyer, Lecourt as a recommendation to Madame Montgolfier, an acquaintance, as Liszt was about to leave for Lyons.[62] The lawyer related how Liszt, who after a concert asked for a theme for his improvisation, was given the Andante from the Seventh Symphony by Lecourt, but chose to play some variations on a theme of Rode. At the next concert, after the orchestra had performed the Andante, Liszt, as Lecourt related, rushed to the piano to improvise on the theme. Liszt's explanation to Lecourt about his vacillating behavior was presumably that it was only with Beethoven's music that he did not feel satisfied with himself, and that, in any event, "can one play such things as that {the Andante} for asses." Lecourt has left us much the same view as Liszt's biographers, that he did not yet feel worthy of the great master's music. Perhaps, yet one cannot help seeing a deeper layer of meaning to Liszt's play on the subject of Beethoven during these years. His playfully disguising Beethoven's music, and withholding it from audiences out of contempt betray an attempt to dramatize his presentation of Beethoven's music as personal and ordained, and to establish a link with Beethoven that would have a private meaning for him that could be distinguished from the mutual and social yet impersonal sharing of the composer's music by others, a personal and unique relationship that Liszt had to construct out of earlier disappointment and rejection. His mature negotiation of these conflictual feelings, of course, was realized in his willingness and ability to share in open and public involvement with Beethoven and his music.

In 1828 the first session of the Concerts du Conservatoire began. One of

the aims of these concerts was to introduce to the Parisian public the major orchestral works of Beethoven. These yearly sessions of concerts must have been musically formative for Liszt although we do not have many details of his connections with them. It was Lenz who began the story that Liszt performed the Emperor Concerto at a special concert of the Conservatoire in December 1828[63], and it was Haraszti, in our century, who discovered that that concert did not take place. This was the concert of 25 December, in which a Beethoven concerto, without indication of tonality , was mentionned, and in which Liszt was to have performed, at the Théatre de Madame, in the presence of the Duchesse de Berry.[64] That year it was Madame Brod who performed part of the C Minor Concerto of Beethoven.[65] Liszt played for the first time at the Concerts du Conservatoire in 1835, a Concerto by Weber.[66] It was Mendelssohn who gave the first complete performance of a Beethoven Concerto, the G Major Concerto, in 1832[67], and it was not until the third session of the Concerts of 1838 that the Emperor Concerto was played for the first time, by Louis Chollet.[68] Liszt's first effort in the performance of Beethoven's music occurred, in fact, during the months of the first session of concerts of the Conservatoire, on the 7 April 1828 at the Salle Chantereine, when he included an improvised fantasy on themes from Beethoven's Seventh Symphony, Auber's La Muette de Portici and Rossini's Le Siège de Corinthe. Here he was drawing no doubt on popular taste: the Allegretto of the Seventh Symphony had been popular since 1821 and was played often alone and as a substitute for the Larghetto of the D Major Symphony; Le Siège was premiered only two years before and Auber's opera had its first performance only five weeks before Liszt's concert. But the fantasy which Liszt devised for his concert has to be seen also as propoganda for the slow but steady complete performances of Beethoven's symphonies, especially int Seventh Symphony in Paris during those

years. Liszt, in fact, was to participate in the curious first performance of the A Major Symphony in Paris that would occur on 20 April, at the Salons Pape, in a version for piano eight-hands, with Bertini, the arranger and Sowinski and Louis Schunke.[69] This was the modest beginning to Liszt's serious study of the Beethoven symphonies, which came to fruition first in 1837, when the composer began his transcription of the symphonies for piano, and then at the beginning of the next decade, when he began to conduct them in public.

The participation in the concern and enthusiasm for the dissemination of Beethoven's music in Paris involved Liszt not only in individual performances but in a mutual sharing with others dedicated to the same movement, and here the influence of older and musically more mature colleagues, in some cases those who had a much longer history of involvement with the movement would only have been crucial. I shall mention here Berlioz and Christian Urhan. At the time of the inauguration of the concerts of the Conservatoire, both musicians were older and more developed in their musical sympathies than Liszt: Berlioz was twenty-five and Urhan thierty-eight, Liszt only seventeen. If we are aware of the extraordinary influence of these musicians on Liszt, I want to make the point here that their involvement with Beethoven's music was at the time greater and more consistent than was Liszt's. Berlioz followed the progress of Beethoven's music in Paris relentlessly, advocating textual fidelity and condemning widespread musical abuse. By the middle of the 1830's Berlioz had become a bitter foe on matters of Beethoven interpretation with the French theorist Fétis, with whom he clashed over editorial policies in the publication of Beethoven's symphonies.[70] Urhan's significance in Paris as an interpreter of Beethoven's works began in 1814, when he was chosen by Baillot to form a part of the string ensembles which he organized, in order to introduce to French audiences the Viennese composers of chamber music. Again

in 1826, when Habeneck, the director of the concerts of the Conservatoire, invited a large group of musicians to his home for dinner (they were told to bring their instruments), Urhan was included. These musicians, at Habeneck's request, then played through Beethoven's Eroica Symphony. They were astonished and admiring enough to form the nucleus of the orchestra of the Société des Concerts du Conservatoire. Urhan was first violinist from the very first concert on 9 March 1828.[71] The boldest public demonstration of Liszt's association with Urhan as a performer of Beethoven's music came in 1837, when he performed with the violinist and Batka in a series of chamber music concerts arranged by Urhan, the first concerts in France to introduce Beethoven's piano trios and violin sonatas to the public. It is, of course, the less public, day to day experiences of these musicians that would help us to see the growth and transformation of musical ideas as they were engaged in the study of Beethoven's music, as much as the public demonstrations of their zeal, and it is glimpses of these that we must continue to pursue.

In spite of the influences that I have attempted to outline, Liszt as a public performer of Beethoven's music seems to have felt his way slowly and rarely with consistent taste during the early 1830's. This is particularly true in his cultivation of Beethoven's piano works. I do not know of any performance of a Beethoven sonata by Liszt before April 1834, when he played the second and third movements only of the Moonlight Sonata; the first movement was played then in an orchestral arrangement by Girard.[72] According to Lenz, only the sonatas op. 26, the Moonlight and the Appassionata were known, or played in Paris during those years.[73] Liszt apparently knew the sonata op. 26 well, and advised Lenz about matters of fingering and interpretation. Berlioz recalls an evening spent with Liszt and others, in 1830 or 1831, when Liszt disfigured a performance of the first movement of the Moonlight Sonata

according to the taste demanded by the public at the time: "...instead of those long sustained notes in the bass, instead of that strict uniformity of rhythm and tempo of which I have just spoken, he put in trills, tremolos, he speeded up and slowed down the tempo, disturbing the calm of this sadness by impassioned harmonies and causing the thunder in the cloudless sky, darkened only by the departure of the sun, to rumble.... I suffered cruelly...."[74] On another occasion, in 1837, Liszt played the same piece for Berlioz, with Legouvé and others present; this time he asked that all the lights be extinguished. The effect, as Berlioz reported, was extraordinary.[75] Did he realize that it was Urhan, years earlier, who chose for himself the habit of playing Beethoven in the dark.

The turning point in Liszt's seriousness in the performance of Beethoven's music seems to have occurred from about 1837 onward. It was only the next year that Liszt began his series of concerts in Vienna, renewing the relationship with that city that had been the winess to the fateful events that came to be transmitted as the legend of the Weihekuss. So it cannot be insignificant that it was there that the first fruits of his seriousness of purpose with Beethoven's music should make their appearance. The new seriousness of purpose did not go unnoticed. Czerny left the following observations in his autobiographical notes about it: "In Paris, where he settled down with his parents, he earned, to be sure, a lot of money, but he lost many years, through which his life as his art took a false direction. When I came to Paris sixteen years later (1837), I found his playing wild and confused in all kinds of bravura. I thought that I could give him no better advice than to travel around Europe, and when he came to Vienna a year later, his genius had taken on a new impetus."[76] It was in Vienna, during the remaining years of that decade, that Liszt's performances of Beethoven's music

began to increase in seriousness and variety. For his concerts in 1838, he still stuck to the Moonlight and op. 26 Sonatas. But in his series in 1839/1840, he played a work of Beethoven on almost every program, including the sonatas op. 31 #2 and op. 57, the Kreutzer Sonata and the Choral Fantasy, and his own transcriptions of the Fifth Symphony and the last three movements of the Sixth Symphony.[77]

4.

I will try to bring together now some of the more important ideas of this essay, in order to describe in an integrated way the stages of development in the creation by Liszt of a personal myth around the historical figure of Beethoven, and to try to characterize something of its meaning. At least by the 1840's Liszt had constructred a complicated personal myth, of both conscious and unconsciious dimensions, that interacted with Beethoven in a variety of ways. To the extent that the myth involved the replacement of his own father, or the displacement of paternal identification onto the figure of Beethoven, we can speak of the formatiion of a family romance. The roots of this personal myth go back to Liszt's childhood, and so far as I can tell, to his relationship with his father, although there must have been other determinants as well, for example Liszt's own inherited dispositiions and remarkable talent as well as other family tensions and conflicts of his earliest years. As a child Liszt was moody and experienced periods of loneliness and feelings of isolation; these are common enough traits of the unusually gifted child, and a crucial stage is reached first as the child comes to awareness of his own striking talent, and in the case of Liszt another when both he and his father came to realize the boy's talent actually surpassed that of the father. Adam Liszt was a strict and harsh

disciplinarian, often uncomprehending and uncertain about his son's future. In view of the conflicts and tensions of Liszt's childhood years, and the difficulty he must have felt in winning unequivocal signs of love and approval from his father, it is not hard to understand the emphasis that has been transmitted through the biographical literature of Liszt's almost passionate idealization of the figure of Beethoven, a feeling that was surely communicated directly from his own father. Perhaps already did the figure of Beethoven represent for him the benevolent and understanding artist with whom he could identify, a role which to some extent was eventually shared with Czerny. As a composer Beethoven was still more myth than substance and without any direct reality. As for Liszt's involvement with Beethoven's music during this period, I think that it was haphazard, immature and anecdotal.

Liszt's experiences in Vienna were decisive for the actualization of the myth he created. The economic hardships which the parents faced now affected Liszt directly, for he was expected to provide a large part of the actual income of the family. The consequences of this and other factors no doubt telescoped into a decisive and premature period developmental necessities that normally require the span from the period of latency through most of adolescence for achievement. For example, Liszt no doubt experienced a heightened and intense sense of bonding with his father because of the musical experiences which they were able to share; on the other hand, the more adult sense of responsibilities hoisted on the boy prematurely and negotiated primarily with his father, helped to drive a wedge of conflict and ambivalence in their relationship. I think Liszt had been in a position for years in which the more his talent grew and the more sacrifices from his parents that it required, the more difficult he found it to win unequivocal approval, a situation that would have seemed distressingly paradoxical for any child.

Czerny must have had a liberating effect on Liszt, and it was he and others who brought Liszt close to the actual figure of the composer. But the actuality of Beethoven had ultimately to be set beside the disappointments of his attempts to see the composer, and the failure of Beethoven to attend the concert and to bestow on him the ultimate approval of his blessing. This rejection came ultimately to be denied and the events surrounding the concert and the visits to Beethoven's house were idealized. Indeed, a rejection so intensely felt is comomonly the breeding ground for unconscious transformation, a process affecting recollection, memory and the storehouse of feeling. For Liszt, the fateful events in Vienna were but a single yet apparently decisive ingredient in this process, through which he was able to negotiate the ambivalent and complex feelings toward his father by replacing him with the idealized parent figure of Beethoven. His father's premature death, in 1827 (and only five months before Beethoven died), must have left him with some sense of guilt and failure (the malaise or psychological breakdown that Liszt suffered during the next year attests to this) and this loss and its consequences would add to the development of the idealized "good father".

Adam Liszt's death occurred on the eve of the close of his son's adolescence, at a time when the father's affirmation of his son's readiness for independent self-realization is most critical, an affirmation often conferred by a ritual act of blessing. It is this act, surely, that the Weihekuss came to symbolize for Liszt. The private myth that Liszt created, in order to negotiate conflict and ambivalence, could easily have lived on to provide a troubling and neurotic aspect os his personality. It was his own growing musical maturity, the influence and contact with musicians like Berlioz and Urhan, and eventually the possibility of his own personal

contribution to the memory of Beethoven and his music that made it possible for Liszt to transform what might have been psychologically disabling conflict into a therapeutic and beneficial mission in the service of musical tradition.[78]

FOOTNOTES

1. See, for example, Wolfgang Dömling, Franz Liszt und seine Zeit (Laaber, 1985), especially Chapter II, "Das instrumentale Drama."

2. See John Deathridge and Carl Dahlhaus, The New Grove Wagner (New York, etc., 1984), p. 7 for this view of Wagner and his early relationship with Beethoven's music. There the authors explain that it was the same singer in a performance of Bellini's I Capuleti e i Montecchi in Leipzig, 1834 that Wagner heard, and that that performance became the impetus for Wagner's later, transformed recollections.

3. See, for example, The Memoirs of Hector Berlioz, trans. David Cairns (London, 1969), Chapter 20.

4. I am not following exactly here the distinction pursued with usefulness and distinction by Donald P. Spence, Narrative Truth and Historical Truth: Meaning and Interpretation in Psychoanalysis (New York, etc., 1982). Spence distinguishes between narrative truth as "the criterion we use to decide when a certain experience has been captured to our satisfaction; it depends on continuity and closure and the extent to which the fit of the pieces takes on an aesthetic finality", and historical truth as a construction that is "time-bound and is dedicated to the strict observance of correspondence rules; our aim is to come as close as possible to what 'really' happened." My own use of this distinction will be clear, I hope, from the text.

5. I am indebted in the discussion that follows to the work of Ernst Kris, his Psychoanalytic Explorations in Art (New York, 1952), especially Chapter 2, and , with Otto Kurz, Legend, Myth, and Magic in the Image of the Artist (New Haven, etc., 1979).

6. Kris (1979), p. 14.

7. Lina Ramann, Franz Liszt, Artist and Man, 2. vols., trans. Miss E. Cowdery (London, 1882), vol. I, p. 25.

8. Ramann (1882), vol. I, p. 24.

9. Joseph d'Ortigue, "Franz Liszt: Etude biographique," Revue et Gazette Musicale, June 14, 1835, p. 196.

10. Gustav Schilling, Franz Liszt: Sein Leben und sein Wirken aus nächster Beschauung (Stuttgart, 1844), p. 28.

11. See Schilling, p. 30; also Ramann, pp. 29 ff. In Ludwig Rellstab, Franz Liszt: Beurtheilungen-Berichte-Lebensskizze (Berlin, 1842), pp. 59-60, "das alte Fieber" is connected to Liszt's concert at Oedenburg, in 1820, but Liszt, as he told Rellstab, could not remember the incident. No doubt there were occasions in childhood in which Liszt suffered from a fever; d'Ortigue, p. 196, even mentions it in connection with normal childhood disease, adding that these fevers ended in Liszt's sixth year, at the time when his first signs of talent were said to emerge. The implication here, of course, is that it was only after the struggle associated with the subduing of fever that Liszt's talent could emerge.

12. See Kris (1979), pp. 86 ff.

nem hiányzig nála."

16. See Lina Ramann, Lisztiana (Mainz, etc., 1983), p. 387. Between 1874 and 1881 Ramann sent questionnaires to Liszt for the preparation of her biography. The response of Liszt about his father's musical abilities was given on the very first questionnaire of Ramann, dated August 1874

17. See Harich (1934), p. 512.

18. There were musicians, including Hummel, who visited Adam Liszt and with whom he performed in his home. See Harich (1934), p. 512.

19. Acta mus. Nr. 3500; see Hárich (1934), p. 514.

20. The details of Beethoven's concert, and his stay in Eisenstadt are discussed in Hárich,"Beethoven in Eisenstadt," Burgenländische Heimatblätter 21 (1959), 168-188.

21. See Hárich, (1934), p. 315.

22. Acta mus. Nr. 3510; see Hárich (1934), p. 315.

23. Liszt's recollection of his early struggles with the Hammerklavier Sonata, if there is any accuracy to it, has to be seen in these terms. I discuss later in the text this early recollection in more detail.

24. See Hárich (1934), p. 514.

25. I stress here the importance of the early German biographies of Liszt written in the early 1840's, not only because Liszt, in one way or another, had some direct input to all of these works, sometimes correcting what would remain otherwise as mistakes, and answering questions, but because, however

difficult remains the job of sorting out, are contemporary enough to actual events to capture suggestive and even essential insights. It is, therefore, misleading to argue simply, as Alan Walker does, see Franz Liszt: the Virtuoso Years 1811-1847 (New York, 1983), p. 4, that "Liszt must have read both books [those of Rellstab and Schilling], but his reactions are unknown." Adolph Frankenburg was a childhood friend of Liszt, and has left two different sets of memoirs: Emlék iratok [Written Memoirs], 3 vols. (Pest, 1868), and Őszinte Vallomások [Sincere Confessions], 2 vols. (Pest, 1861). His recollections in the second set are few and not very useful; those in the first are more extenseive (vol. I, pp. 66-77) and of significant value.

26. See Frankenburg (1868).

27. See Schilling, pp. 29-30.

28. August Göllerich, Franz Liszt (Berlin, 1908), p. 159-160. There is another version of the same recollection, in a letter of Liszt to the Princess Sayn-Wittgenstein, in La Mara, ed. Franz Liszts Breife, 8 vols. (Leipzig, 1893-1905), vol. VII, p. 164.

29. See Emile Haraszti, "Liszt à Paris," La Revue Musicale 17 (April and July, 1936), April, p. 258.

30. See Sigmund Freud, "From the History of an Infantile Neurosis," in Three Case Histories (New York, 1963), p. 217.

31. See Ramann (1983), p. 389.

32. See Ramann (1983), p. 390.

33. See Ramann (1983), p. 390.

34. The family romance was first described by Freud in "Family Romances," Collected Papers 5 (New York, 1959), 74-78. Phyllis Greenacre has discussed

the role of the family romance with special emphasis on the childhood of the artistic personality in "The Childhood of the Artist: Libidinal Phase Development and Giftedness," The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child 12 (1957), 47-72, and "The Family Romance of the Artist," The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child 13 (1958), 9-43. As the title of this essay will show, I have drawn in important ways on the paper of Ernst Kris, "The Personal Myth: A Problem in Psychoanalytic Technique," Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association 4 (1956), 653-681.

35. Walker, p. 85.

36. Acta mus. Nr. 3279; See Hárich (1934), p. 514, Valkó, p. 502.

37. Acta mus. Nr. 3506; See Hárich (1934), pp. 514-515, Valkó, p. 502.

38. Acta mus. Nr. 3531; See Hárich (1934), p. 515, Valkó, pp. 502-503.

39. Acta mus. Nr. 3325, 4216; See Valkó, pp. 503-504.

40. Acta mus. Nr. 3546; See Valkó, p. 504.

41. Acta mus. Nr. 3546; See Valkó, pp. 504-505.

42. It is not entirely conjecture that Schindler had a strong hand in the attempt to entice Beethoven to Liszt's concert. The entries in the Conversation Books suggest this, and Schilling, p. 47, discusses Schindler's role in the affair.

43. The announcement and program of the concert are given in Walker, pp. 79-80.

44. See Volume III of Ludwig van Beethovens Konversationshefte, Karl-Heinz Köhler and Dagmar Beck eds. (Leipzig, 1983), pp. 168-199.

45. Schindler added the spurious entries that are marked where free space permitted, by adding to existing lines or by adding material at the end of a page. Most of the added comments clarify or enrich by detail the remarks already set down, although one lenghthy addition at the end of 20r Book 29, that records an unfriendly reception by Beethoven, has a history of its own in the literature about the Weihekuss. It was set down, no doubt, although it might have very well been true, by Schindler in order to be able to point to a motive for Beethoven's decision to attend Liszt's concert, an act that almost anyone would have found unusual and unexpected. Thus the entry supports what Schindler wrote in his Beethoven in Paris (Münster, 1842), pp. 72-73, that there was, in fact, an unfriendly reception, and that Beethoven made up for it by going to the concert. It is well known that Schindler reversed his earlier view, in the third edition of his Beethoven biography (1860), denying there that Beethoven attended the concert and insisting that the whole attempt to get Beethoven to provide a theme was an irritating and bothersome affair. This shift is not easy to explain. Some have attempted to see Schindler's later view as a reflection of his growing antipathy to Liszt as an interpreter of Beethoven's music. This is Horvath's view, for example, in his Franz Liszt: Kindheit(1811-1827), (Eisenstadt, 1978), p. 87. These attempts are not convincing. Schindler's view of Liszt as a performer was already in 1842 (in Beethoven in Paris) outspokenly negative. Indeed, Liszt himself apparently explained Schindler's later view as the result of an altercation that occurred between the two in Paris in 1841, after an all Beethoven concert in which Liszt and Berlioz performed, over Liszt's interpretations of Beethoven's music there. See the letter to the editor published in the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik 87 (1891), p. 503 by Lina Ramann.

46. Göllerich, p. 160.

47. Walker, p. 83

48. This account appeared first in "Im Hause Franz Liszts," Deutsche Revue (June, 1898), 76-84 and was often reprinted, for example in the Neue freie Presse (July 7, 1898). If the question of Mrs. Barnay's accuracy is raised, I would say that she appears throughout her recollections of Liszt as a reliable and psychologically level-headed writer. Indeed, she seems particularly able to form judgements about Liszt's character and motives which seem independent of the typical hero worshipping attitude one might have expected.

49. Walker, p. 84.

50. Kanne's review appeared on 26 April, 1823: "The eleven-year-old boy Liszt gave a concert on Sunday, April 13 in the small Redoutensaal at noon. He played the great piano concerto in B minor by Hummel, Variations of Moscheles and a Fantasy. One has to allow this talented boy sufficient due; he played with fluency and elegance, although he lacked physical strength, a lack that one noticed particularly in the performance of the concerto. To improvise on someone's theme one must possess not only talent, but also the experience of many years in the special subjects of music that is not to be demanded of an eleven-year-old boy. If the little wizard was at a loss in the performance of the theme, what could have been the cause? Nothing other than the young man, who presented him with a theme of twenty-four measures from a difficult Rondo-Risum teneatis."

51. Acta mus. Nr. 3552; See Harich (1934), p. 517.

52. See Carl Czerny, Erinnerungen aus meinen Leben (Strasbourg, etc.,

1968), p. 29.

53. On March 18, 1824.

54. Adam Liszt's reply is given in Walker, pp. 110-111.

55. La Pandore, 20 Oct., 1825.

56. Göllerich, p. 160.

57. Ramann (1891), p. 503.

58. See Briefwechsel zwischen Franz Liszt und Carl Alexander, Grossherzog von Sachsen, La Mara ed. (Leipzig, 1909), 114-118.

59. La Mara (1909), p. 116.

60. Kris (1979), p. 20.

61. See Geraldine Keeling, "Liszt's Appearances in Parisian Concerts, 1824-1844. Part I: 1824-1833," The Liszt Society Journal 3 (1986), 22-34, for a detailed survey of Liszt's repertoire, at least in Paris, during these years.

62. See Mária Eckhardt, "Liszt à Marseilles," Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 24 (1982), 163-197; for the full text of the letter see pp. 168-169.

63. W. von Lenz, The Great Piano Virtuosos of our Time, Madeleine R. Baker trans. (New York, 1899), p. 6.

64. Emile Haraszti, "Le problème Liszt," Acta musicologica 9 (1937), 123-136 and (10) 1938, 32-46, p. 126. See also J.-G. Prod'Homme, "Liszt et Paris,"

La Revue musicale (1 May, 1928), 105-123, pp. 110-111. A handbill of the concert has survived, and is in the Széchényi National Library; the contents are given in Keeling, p. 28.

65. See A. Elwart, Histoire de la société des concerts du Conservatoire Impériale de Musique (Paris, 1864), p. 132.

66. Elwart, p. 171.

67. Elwart, p. 156.

68. Elwart, p. 183.

69. See J.-G. Prod'Homme, Les symphonies de Beethoven (Paris, 1906), p. 324.

70. See Berlioz, Memoirs, Chapter 44.

71. See P. Garnault, "Chrétien Urhan (1790-1845)," La Revue de musicologie 11 (1930), 98-111.

72. In Paris, it was only the year before that Liszt performed any original work of Beethoven: in the concert of 27 April, 1833, in the Salle du Wauxhall, he was included in the performance of the Quintet for Piano and Winds as well as the Archduke Trio. The latter was omitted from the program for lack of time.

73. Lenz, pp. 14-15.

74. See Prod'Homme (1938), p. 126.

75. See Prod'Homme (1938), pp. 126-127.

76. Czerny, p. 29.

77. In Dezső Legány, Franz Liszt: Unbekannte Presse und Briefe aus Wien 1822-1886 (Vienna, etc., 1984), are collected contemporary reports and reviews

of Liszt's series of concerts in Vienna 1838-1840.

78. I wish to thank Brandeis University for the Mazer Grant for Faculty Research, which allowed me to carry on work in Budapest and Weimar, and also Dr. Anton Kris for some important suggestions and discussions about this essay. The reader will find some of the questions that surround the Weihekuss discussed already in my "Liszt Research and Walker's Liszt," The Musical Quarterly 70 (1984), 374-403, but there I was concerned primarily with a discussion of Walker (1983) and the problems that I saw in it.

13. D'Ortigue, p. 196.

14. Acta mus. Nr. 4364. See Johann Hárich,"Franz Liszt-Vorfahren und Kinderjahre," Österreichische Musikzeitschrift 26 (1971), 503-514, p. 506; this is a translation of the author's "Liszt Ferenc ősei és gyermekévei" [Franz Liszt's Ancestors and Childhood], Énekszó 2 (1935). See also Hárich, "Liszt Ferenc családja és az Esterházy hercegek" [Franz Liszt's Family and the Princes Esterhazy], Napkelet 12 (1934), 508-518, p. 511, and Arisztid Valkó, "A Liszt család a levéltári iratok tükrében" [In Light of the Archival Documents about Liszt's Family], Magyar Zene 4 (1961), 388-399 and 5 (1961), 498-507, p. 389. A good deal of the contents of Hárich (1934) is included in Hárich (1971). I call the reader's attention here to the series of documents, now in the Széchényi National Library, Budapest, known as the Acta musicalia, and that contains numerous documents relating to Liszt's family. Most of the documents that make direct reference to the Liszt family have been summarized in Valkó, and a much smaller number are discussed in Hárich (1934). In referring to specific documents I shall also make reference to them in the works cited above, so that the reader, who must unfortunately know Hungarian, can have recourse to at least some printed documentation. The entire archive of Acta musicalia is now being published by the Haydn Yearbook, the project having begun in 1982, although publication unfortunately has not yet reached the material discussed here.

15. See Hárich (1971), p. 508, and Hárich (1934), p. 512 where a translation, in Hungarian, is given from the original document containing Fuch's judgement. I will give that version, from which I have translated directly the version in the text: "Liszt eléggé muzikális, de a zenélés igazi módja előtte egy kisse még ismeretlen, amit azonban a herzegi zenekarban való gyakorlat által könnyen elsajátithat, mert a zenei tehetség, amint látszik,