Snowy Bookends to the Mozart Year

Cliff Eisen

For me, the Mozart year was framed by snow. Perhaps this seems trivial. But Salzburg is always attractive in winter—so is Vienna—and it was winter when Mozart was born and when he died (even if the traditional accounts of stormy weather on the day Mozart was buried have since proven false). So winter was a significant part of Mozart’s environment and everyday life: it is easy to imagine him in Salzburg, reluctantly trudging through the snow, across the Domplatz, to attend to his court duties; or to picture him in Vienna, transporting his piano across town for various public and private engagements.

The Mozart year kicked off early with a conference in Salzburg in December 2005 (“The Young Mozart 1756–1780: Philology—Analysis—Reception”). Lasting three days, it included short papers by scholars from across Europe, the UK, and the United States. The topics varied widely—this was true of all the Mozart conferences I attended last year—ranging from traditional source and analytical studies to performance practice, reception, cultural contextualization, and the psychology of genius and education. Like most such conferences in Salzburg, the proceedings of this one will be published in the next Mozart-Jahrbuch. (For a review of the conference, see Eighteenth-Century Music 3/2 [September 2006], 370–3).

Salzburg was followed by London, where there were two conferences in short succession: one sponsored by the British Academy, the other by the British Library. The British Academy event took place on 28 January and included talks by Neal Zaslaw (Cornell University), “Mozart in history, history in Mozart”; Tim Day (then at The British Library, now at King’s College London), “What do the recordings tell us”; John Sloboda (Keele University), “Mozart in psychology”; and Robynn Stilwell (Georgetown University), “The Requiem in the movies.” The British Library conference, “Mozart Then and Now,” was held on 29–30 January and was geared as much to the general public as to academics: it attracted a crowd of perhaps 200, who heard talks by scholars from Israel, Scandinavia, the United States, and the UK. Their topics included Mozart’s borrowings, musical life in Prague, his singers, and different productions of his operas. The event concluded with a showing of Phil Grabsky’s new documentary, In Search of Mozart.

I also attended a one-day conference in Dublin in early February (“Such People Come into the World Only Once in 100 Years: Mozart in the Twenty-First Century”), which included several fine talks, among them a cultural analysis of Mozart by Harry White and a discussion by Simon Keefe of Mozart’s scoring in the “Paris” symphony. Three conferences in London and Dublin within the space of a week—and this was only the start of a deluge that continued throughout the year—constituted more conferences than a single person could ever consider attending (or even hear about).

No doubt the following list is incomplete, but it is at least representative of the Mozart year conference calendar: “Rethinking Mozart” (a conference sponsored by the Dutch-Flemish Society for Music Theory) in Brussels in February; “Mozart aujourd’hui” in Louvain-la-Neuve in March, and a conference at Scripps College the same month; an international Mozart conference in Vienna in April (with a magnificent attendant exhibition, Mozart—Experiment—Aufklärung, organized by Herbert Lachmayer of the Da Ponte Institut and presented at the Albertina); Interpreting Mozart” in Milan and the philologically-oriented “Mozart 2006” at Cremona in May; a conference on Die Zauberflöte at Santa Fe, New Mexico in June and July; the interdisciplinary conference “Mozart and Science” at Baden bei Wien in October; “La Réception de l’oeuvre de Mozart en France et en Angleterre jusque vers 1830” at Poitiers in November; and another conference on Die Zauberflöte (Sources et interprétations) at Brussels, as well as “Les voyages de Mozart en France: ses rencontres avec la Franc-Maçonnerie” in Paris, in December.

Two other conferences deserve special mention. One is the meeting mounted by the Mozart Society of America at The Jacobs School of Music, Indiana University from 10–12 February. The roster of speakers was studded with Mozart luminaries: the talks included John Rice’s “‘Lodi al gran Dio’: The Final Chorus of Metastasio’s La Betulia liberate as Set by Gassmann and Mozart”; Otto Biba’s “The Beginnings of Mozart’s Presence in the Viennese Church-Music Repertory: Sources, Performance Practice, and Questions of Authenticity”; Neal Zaslaw’s “Mozart’s Thamos Motets”; David Buch’s “The Choruses of Die Zauberflöte in Context: Choral Music at the Theater auf der Wieden”; Ulrich Leisinger’s “On the Earliest Copies of Mozart’s Requiem”; and David Black’s “The Exequien for Mozart at St. Michael’s.” The conference also included a performance of Robert Levin’s completion of the Mass in C minor. The other conference is “Mozart: A Challenge for Literature and Thought” hosted by the Department of German at Queen Mary, University of London.
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Conference Announcements

A one-day Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama Conference, “Ancient Drama in Modern Opera, 1600-1800,” will be held on 12 July 2007, at the Classics Centre, University of Oxford. For further details please see www.apgrd.ox.ac.uk.


The international symposium “Understanding Bach’s B Minor Mass” will be held from 2–4 November 2007, at the School of Music & Sonic Arts, Queen’s University Belfast. For further information contact Dr Yo Tomita, Email: y.tomita@qub.ac.uk and see www.music.qub.ac.uk/tomita/bachbib/conferences/Belfast-Nov2007/.

Calls for Papers/Seminars

The Fourteenth Annual Conference of the Italian Musicological Society will take place in Pescara and Chieti, 26–28 October 2007. Scholars are invited to submit abstracts on any topic within the field of musicological studies. In the abstract (which should not exceed 30 lines) indicate the title of the proposed paper, and provide an outline of your research project and its outcome. Please send abstracts, to be received no later than 15 June 2007, to segreteria@sidm.it, or by mail to the Società Italiana di Musicologia, c.p. 7256, Ag. Roma Nomentano, 00162 Roma (mark the envelope “XIV Convegno Annuale”). Provide your full name, address, phone number, fax number, and e-mail address. For further information about the conference, visit the web site: www.sidm.it.

An Interdisciplinary Conference, “John Rich and the Eighteenth-Century London Stage: Commerce, Magic and Management,” will be held at the Royal College of Surgeons of England, Lincoln’s Inn Fields, London, UK, 25–27 January 2008. For further details about the conference please see: www.johnrich2008.com. Abstracts of up to 500 words should be sent to: info@johnrich2008.com. These must be received by 30 September 2007. Electronic submissions are preferred; however, they may also be mailed to Dr. Berta Joncus, St. Catherine’s College, Manor Road, Oxford OX1 3UJ, UK. Information about awards and travel subsidies for delegates, particularly for students, will be posted on the web site.


The 8th International Symposium on Spanish Keyboard Music “Diego Fernández” will be held in Almería, Andalusia, from 11–13 October, as part of “FIMTE 2007: the 8th International Festival of Spanish Keyboard Music.” Proposals for papers are particularly encouraged in the following areas: (1) Portuguese-Spanish musical relations during the 18th century, with an emphasis on keyboard music and keyboard instruments; (2) Domenico Scarlatti: the Sonatas, Performance Practices, and Keyboard Instruments; (3) New research in Spanish keyboard music of the 16th–18th centuries. Abstracts of 200–250 words are invited. These should be signed at the bottom with the author’s name, institutional affiliation or city of residence and full return address, including e-mail address and fax number where possible. Official languages: English and Spanish. Deadline for Abstracts: 30 May, 2007. Visit the symposium web site at: www.fimte.org/fimteeng.htm.
Founding of the Haydn Society of North America

Michael Ruhling

On 4 November 2006, numerous Haydn scholars met to inaugurate the Haydn Society of North America, which supplants the four-year-old Haydn Society of California. This change was prompted by the large number of papers and projects submitted to the Haydn Society of California for its conferences in 2003 and 2005 from all parts of the U.S. and Canada. Board members of the new Society include music historians, theorists, and performers: Michelle Fillion (University of Victoria), Ethan Haimo (University of Notre Dame), Michael Lamkin (Scripps College), Elaine Sisman (Columbia University), and James Webster (Cornell University). Officers are Michael Ruhling, president (Rochester Institute of Technology), Benjamin Korstvedt, vice-president (Clark University), and Rebecca Marchand, secretary-treasurer (University of California-Santa Barbara). The Haydn Society of North America is open to all those interested in researching and performing the works of Joseph Haydn. For more information on the Haydn Society of North America, or if you would like to become a member, please contact Michael Ruhling (michael.ruhling@rit.edu) or Rebecca Marchand (rebecca.marchand@gmail.com) or visit www.rit.edu/haydnsociety.

Obituary: Dr. Georg Feder

James Webster

Prof. Dr. Georg Feder, the Wissenschaftlicher Leiter of the Joseph Haydn-Institut in Cologne from 1960 to 1992, died on December 11, 2006.

Professor Feder was born in 1927 in Bochum. He obtained his doctorate in 1955 at the University of Kiel, with a dissertation on arrangements of works by J. S. Bach. He was a giant of Haydn research, arguably the leading Haydn scholar of his generation. His reputation rests above all on his leadership of the Haydn-Institut for the critical phase of its existence, during which its complete edition (Joseph Haydn: Werke; Henle) developed from a new enterprise with an uncertain future into what is widely acknowledged as one of the finest of all the major postwar scholarly editions. In addition, he published an imposing number of studies devoted to Haydn and his music, including monographs on the string quartets and the Creation, as well as on related topics such as philology and hermeneutics, many of which are fundamental contributions to musicology. The field of Haydn studies is much diminished by his passing.
Conference and Concert Report

Salieri Week in Vienna: “als Kontrapunkt im Mozartjahr”

Jane Schatkin Hettrick


The “Salieri year” (2000), marked by a conference in the composer’s home town, Legnago, went by unnoticed in his adopted city, Vienna. But this central figure in Viennese musical life made it into the Mozart year, thanks to the institution that bears his name, Institut Antonio Salieri (a division of the Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien), and to a small but devoted group of Salieri enthusiasts. The name of the Institut honors Salieri’s work as teacher, author of the textbook Scuola di Canto, and director of the new Vienna Singschule (Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, 1817). The symposium, “Antonio Salieri—Zeitgenosse W. A. Mozarts, Hofkapellmeister und Musikpädagoge,” was part of a larger event entitled “Antonio Salieri im Mozartjahr.”

The symposium took place in the beautiful Alter Konzertsaal of the Salesianerinnenkloster, founded by Empress Wilhelmina Amalia (widow of Emperor Joseph I), which now houses the Institut Antonio Salieri. Things got underway on the first evening with a “Festliche Eröffnung” including a champagne reception and Italian buffet. By tradition, Salieri events always feature wine with the Salieri label (white and red) and the composer’s favorite candy, a delectable concoction called “capezzoli di Venere” (nipples of Venus)—all imported for the occasion from the Legnago area. The festivities included greetings from a number of university officials and also the director of Vienna’s “Mozarthaus” celebrations, Peter Marboe. In between these remarks, students of the Institut performed selections from Salieri’s La Grotta di Trofionio and Armida, and a trio by his pupil and later Hofkapellmeister Benedikt Randhartinger. The keynote address was given by Rudolph Angermüller, the dean of Salieri research, who spoke on “Salieri, ein europäischer Musiker.” After setting the stage of world history of the time, Prof. Angermüller (Mozarteum, Salzburg) reminded us of Salieri’s enormous achievements, the success of his operas, and his importance as Hofkapellmeister and pedagogue. He also referred to the recent renaissance of interest in Salieri and concluded that Salieri tended to push singers beyond their usual limits. Otto Biba characterized Salieri as a traditional Kapellmeister, Dr. Biba shed light on little-known aspects of the composer’s creative process, comparing it to those of Brahms and Mahler. Using the expression “Schaffensökonomie,” he discussed Salieri’s reuse of his own material and the related annotations on the composer’s manuscripts. A disputed question concerns whether the substitution of (religious or liturgical) Latin texts for secular words of operatic arias originated with Salieri himself or derived from foreign hands.

After a lunch break (which several of us enjoyed at the “gemütlich” Salm-Bräu “Lokal” next-door), the afternoon session began with Gerhard Kramer’s treatment of the subject “Antonio Salieri und die Mailänder Scala: L’Europa rivalizzata als Eröffnungswerstellung 1778.” Prof. Kramer (Vienna) explored the history of this innovative opera, which Salieri wrote for the opening of La Scala (and which was revived for the reopening of that house in 2004) and delved into its unusual features (e.g., extensive use of chorus, absence of secco recitative, interaction of chorus and soloists, and two-act format). The programmatic overture, which paints a “tempesta di mare,” a favorite subject in eighteenth-century opera, served as a musical example. We next heard from John Rice (Rochester, Minnesota), who spoke on “Salieri’s Armonia per un Tempio della Notte and the Tempel der Nacht at Schönau: Setting the Record Straight.” In his paper, Dr. Rice gave us a preview of the content of his book (now published) on the subject. Rice’s research has sorted out a number of misconceptions of the “Tempel der Nacht” at Schönau, including the theory that it was a Masonic temple, associated with Die Zauberflöte. Rather, it was Salieri’s La Grotta di Trofionio that inspired the grotto at Schönau, and the a cappella quartet “Silenzio facciasi” from his Palmira was the music that sounded in the Tempel der Nacht.

Opera topics continued with Roberto Scoccimarro’s “Il mondo alla rovescia und L’isola capricciosa: Ein Vergleich.” The comparison provided insight into the pathway from an opera begun, but left unfinished in 1779 (L’isola) to its revised version in 1792 (Il mondo), contrasting the latter with the setting by Giacomo Rust (1780). Noting Salieri’s extensive use of ensemble and chorus as well as his skilled exploitation of theatrical effects, Scoccimarro (Rome) credited Salieri with a decisive change in the concept of dramma giocoso. Michele Carella (Universität für Musik und Darstellende Kunst Wien) took on the matter of “Salieris Einlagearien und die Praxis der Opernbearbeitung.” Prof. Carella reported that he had identified almost twenty autograph “Einlagearien” (insert arias) within operas by Piccinni, Anfossi, Paisiello, and Galuppi, among wind instruments. (My edition of these works was to be performed later in the week.)

The symposium title stresses Salieri the Hofkapellmeister and music educator, but, as is appropriate given his output of forty theatrical works, several of the papers dealt with Salieri as opera composer. In her paper “Composing for the Singers: Salieri’s La Grotta di Trofionio and Prima la Musica, poi le Parole,” Dorothea Link (University of Georgia) gave us a fascinating look into the world of opera singers of Salieri’s time. Some composers wrote for specific singers, while others composed more “generic” music. Salieri, for example, worked around the vocal needs of Nancy Storace, even to the extent of protecting her voice in ensembles. On the other hand, Salieri’s innovation is to be found in the way he pushed singers beyond their usual limits. Otto Biba shed light on how Salieri used the “as Kontrapunkt im Mozartjahr.”

The next day opened with Elisabeth Fritz-Hilscher (Vienna) speaking about “Antonio Salieri und der Wiener Hof.” Dr. Hilscher reviewed Salieri’s life story, in particular how it related to his fifty-eight-year relationship with the court and the four monarchs that he served, and how it occasionally intersected with Mozart’s ambitions vis-à-vis the court. The history of Salieri’s work with the court continued with “Musik per tutta la Funzione: Antonio Salieri’s doppelt-chörige Kirchenwerke für ein kaiserliches Dankfest,” ‘read by myself’ (Rider University). I focused on Salieri’s Mass in C (with Gradual, Offertory, and Te Deum), which he composed in 1799 and revised for an 1804 performance, adding numerous
others. He cautioned that much work needs to be done in this little-investigated area of Salieri studies. The final paper brought us back to Salieri as the namesake for the Institut. Hartmut Krones, director of the Institut für Stilforschung of the Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien and organizer of this conference, clarified Salieri’s influence on vocal pedagogy in his “Antonio Salieri, das Konservatorium der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde und die Gesangspädagogik.”


The featured concert of the conference was the first modern performance of Salieri’s plenary Mass in C. The composer’s largest cycle of liturgical music, this work comprises a mass, introit (Beata gens), gradual (Venite gentes), offertory (Cantate Domino), two verses from the hymn Pange lingua, and a Te Deum—all for double chorus. Originally composed in 1799 for an anticipated but unrealized peace celebration, these works received their first performance in 1804 in Vienna’s largest church, St. Stephan’s Cathedral. The occasion was a Dankfest celebrating the assumption of the österreichische Kaiserwürde by Holy Roman Emperor Franz II, whereby he became Emperor Franz I of Austria. For this important service, Salieri revised his original scores by adding parts for many more wind instruments. Altogether, the 1804 performance may have involved up to eight oboes, ten bassoons, eight trumpets, and three pairs of timpani as well as three instruments that did not appear in his original versions: four clarinets, four horns, and contrabassoon. The modern performance was based on my critical edition of the entire work, which will be published in the Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich.

As can be imagined, producing a performance of such large-scale works was a challenge, and planning proceeded over several years. Unlike Salieri, we did not have the resources of the imperial coffers. The original venue (St. Stephan’s Cathedral) and comparable musical groups (Hofkapelle singers and instrumentalists) would have been too costly. But we arrived at a very satisfactory solution. The Congregazione Italiana, at home in the beautiful Gothic Minoritenkirche, provided the space and sponsorship for the concert. How appropriate to hear these works in the Italian national church, where, according to his own words Salieri began his life in Vienna: “The day after I arrived, my mentor [Florian Leopold Gassmann] took me to the Italian church, in order to pray there. On the way home, he said to me ‘I thought you should begin your musical education with God.’” Fifty-nine years later, on June 22, 1825, a performance of his own Requiem (written in 1804) sounded as funeral music for the Kapellmeister in the same church. The current Prefetto of the congregation, Sergio Valentini, a long-time director of the Vienna Hofmusikkapelle (home of the Wiener Sängerknaben). (The latter position makes him a successor of Salieri!) Harrer has introduced two other Salieri masses (B-flat Major and D Minor, my editions) to audiences in Vienna and Legnago. For this performance he conducted the choir of the Institut Antonio Salieri and the Webern Symphonie Orchester. Under Maestro Harrer’s direction, these student ensembles sang and played with excellence and sensitivity to the music—a testament to the high quality of the faculty and student body in this institution. A pre-performance lecture by cultural expert Walther Brauneis (Wiener Denkmalschutz) placed the works in historical context. It was a thrilling evening: magnificent performance, packed house, many notable guests—all come to honor Salieri, who until recently may have been considered a footnote in music history. Moreover, the Mass will be heard again, since the Österreichischer Rundfunk recorded the concert for future broadcasting.

The week of homage to Salieri ended with a “Festtag bei Salieri” at the Institut. This day-long open house featured student performances of music by Salieri and his contemporaries. We heard outstanding renditions of Der Schauspieldirektor and Peter Winter’s incomplete Das Unterbrochene Opferfest among other works. The fact that Salieri wrote poetry inspired the concept of “Salieri-heute,” a competition of student composers who wrote settings of his Italian verses.

Members News


Margaret Butler has accepted a position as assistant professor of musicology at the University of Florida, which she will take up in fall 2007.

Ilias Chrissochoidis has received a Huntington Library visiting fellowship for 2007-08. In March 2007, he curated the exhibit “Celebrating Handel in Georgian England” at Harvard’s Houghton Library.

Anthony DelDonna was awarded a 2007 Summer Research Grant from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at George-town University to complete work on Francesco Mancini’s opera Il zelo animato.

Sterling Murray, founding president of our society, has retired from West Chester University after nearly thirty years of service. His colleagues and students would like to salute him on this occasion.

Mary Térey-Smith conducted the modern premiere of J. F. Faschi’s Passio Jesu Christi oratorio (in her edition) at the 2006 International Church Music Festival in Budapest, Hungary.
The Packard Humanities Institute’s ambitious project of publishing the complete works of C. P. E. Bach is now well under way. The Institute’s stated goal of completing the critical edition of one hundred and twenty volumes in eight series by the 300th anniversary of Bach’s birth in 2014 is admirable, given that there are more than a thousand extant works by this important and prolific eighteenth-century composer. As C. P. E. Bach is perhaps best known for his three hundred and fifty keyboard works, David Schulenberg’s edition of eighteen sonatas and six sonatinas is an appropriate volume to examine here, both on its own and as a means to assess the overall quality of the Complete Works edition.

The works in this volume were all published during Bach’s lifetime. The six “Probestücke,” or “demonstration pieces” (Wq 63/1-6), were published around 1753 as examples to accompany the first edition of Bach’s Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen. The pieces were intended as a companion to this treatise. Schulenberg’s edition faithfully preserves all of these markings from the original publication, including extensive fingerings. The generous spacing and layout of the edition means that the music is readable despite a large amount of information on each page; however, Bach’s use of multiple thirty-second and sixty-fourth notes in some movements (such as the Adagio assai of Sonata V) occasionally creates an unavoidably dense layout. All references to these works in the Versuch are helpfully included in the introductory remarks. The critical report thoroughly describes the corrected print that was used as the principal source (no extant manuscript dates to the time of publication), as well as evaluating the later editions and manuscripts that were consulted.

The “Leichte” Sonatas (Wq 53/1-6) were published in 1766, forming Bach’s last keyboard collection that was printed while he was in Berlin. The designation of these works as “easy” sonatas may have been a marketing ploy by Bach or the publisher Breitkopf: they are still difficult as compared to those issued by other composers of the day. Nonetheless, they sold well for many years. Soprano and treble clef versions of these sonatas, printed by Breitkopf, serve as the sources for the edition. There also exist two partial autograph manuscripts containing variations and embellishments for several Bach works, including four of the movements from the “Leichte” Sonatas. Schulenberg could well have relegated these alternate versions to small examples placed at the end in the commentary section. Instead, and wisely, each movement is printed twice in the edition, with the embellishments inserted into the second print of each. This allows for the easy comparison of the two versions, and gives insight into how Bach, and probably most composers of the time, reinterpreted works.

The “Damen” Sonatas (Wq 54/1-6) were published three times in the eighteenth century: by Hummel in Amsterdam around 1770 and by the firm of Hartknoch in Riga (although perhaps using Breitkopf as the printer) in 1773 and 1786. While these works were marketed for women, and might thus be assumed to be easy to play, they, like the “Leichte” Sonatas, present challenges to the performer. Bach apparently did not have the opportunity to proofread any of these editions; consequently more errors occur in these printed sources than in the previous two collections, which he had corrected. A manuscript exists, which might be a copy of a source dating from before the printed exemplars; however, it cannot be placed close enough to Bach to serve as an authoritative source. The Hummel print served as the main source, and Hartknoch’s version as a comparison source to consult when errors were apparent. The commentary methodically documents the changes made in the edition, as well as providing alternate readings from the manuscript and from Hartknoch’s prints.

The final six short pieces of the edition, the “neue Clavier-Stücke” (Wq 63/7-12) appeared as an addition to the Probestücke in Schwickert’s 1787 third edition of the Versuch. Schwickert requested these new one-movement works in a simple style to balance the difficulty found in the Probestücke, which he reprinted from the earlier edition. Fingerings appear in these works as they did in the Probestücke. The sources for the critical edition of these short sonatinas posed little difficulty: the editor compared a manuscript in the hand of Johann Heinrich Michel with the Schwickert print.

Overall, this volume is a pleasure to read. There is a generous introduction, twelve large plates with pages from the prints and manuscripts, an extensive and detailed critical report, and scores that are handsomely arranged and easy to read. The quality of the layout, editorial methods, and scholarship of Schulenberg’s volume sets a high standard that we can hope the entire C. P. E. Bach edition will meet. What is perhaps most impressive about a volume of this standard is the price: US$25.00, while other available volumes in the edition range from $20.00 to $30.00. These prices should not only allow music libraries to subscribe to the complete edition, even with budgetary constraints, but individual volumes should also prove attractive to scholars and performers alike for their personal collections. More information about the entire C. P. E. Bach edition is available online at www.cpebach.org.

New Book Report
Michael Allen


Frances Anne Crewe will be little known to members of the SECM. Prominent in her own way, she was neither composer nor performer nor critic, but rather a consumer. To be sure, she was closely tied to a well-known eighteenth-century musical figure: the 22-year old Charles Burney stood beside her as she lay in the vicar’s arms waiting to be baptized in 1748 at the village church of Newton Toney, Wiltshire. Burney was standing proxy for the Duke of Beaufort as godfather to the child. Her father, Fulke Greville, had taken over Burney’s apprenticeship from Thomas Arne and welcomed him into the family not just as a musician but also as an intellectual companion. The attachment formed at such a tender age blossomed over the years. Frances Anne Greville grew into a beautiful young woman, married John Crewe, a rich landowner and Member of Parliament, and developed a role at the centre of high society in eighteenth-century London. The talented, powerful
and famous came to her homes in London’s Mayfair and at Crewe Hall in Cheshire. Sir Joshua Reynolds painted her three times, the future Prime Minister George Canning stayed regularly, and Richard Brinsley Sheridan became her lover and dedicated to her The School for Scandal. Following her support in the famous election victory of Charles James Fox at Westminster in 1784, the Prince of Wales saluted the party colors with the toast “Buffy and Blue and Mrs. Crewe!” Fanny Burney described her as “the most completely a beauty of any woman I ever saw.” She was fun too: there are many accounts of extravagant masked balls held in London—no polite dances these, but rather loud, crowded raves, excessive in fashion, glamour, food, drink, and explicit behavior, often ending as the sun began to rise. Frances Anne Crewe loved to sing, as she did at these gatherings. Plays were acted out at Crewe Hall, too, sometimes with music incorporated. Indeed, one of the great passions of Mrs. Crewe’s life was the theatre, which meant opera as well as spoken drama.

On Christmas Eve 1785, Frances Anne Crewe arrived in Paris on a visit that lasted until 10 March 1786. She recorded the sights, scenes, and people in a series of letters sent to a “Friend,” which were later collected together to form a diary. This diary is now held at The British Library and is produced in full in my book An English Lady in Paris. Readers will find here a detailed and enticing account of theatrical cultures in eighteenth-century Paris. Mrs. Crewe was very confident in her views and forthright in expressing them; after a visit to the opera she wrote: “It was a very fine spectacle. Gluck and Piccini are now the favorite composers here. Their taste in music is, I think, much improved within these ten or twelve years, and their theatres on that account much worth going to. I still think, however, one may trace a great deal of the abominable French stile of composition: but this is more, perhaps, in the manner of expression than in the composition itself. The dancing is very fine, and Gardelle, Mademoiselle Gamaise, with two or three other famous performers capital indeed.” The next day she was out again: “My mother and I went to what is called the Italian Theatre, which is that Theatre where smaller musical pieces are performed. We were very much gratified, for this an amusement perfect in its kind, and is most frequented now.” There was also a trip to one of the small theatres at the Foire St. Germain, where traveling players set up booths during the winter and performed opera-comique. I rather like the idea of the ladies of fashion squeezing into these booths with all and sundry: “We got but baddish places,” she reported, “however we scraped up an acquaintance with some odd people that sat near us; and you must know I like peeping about this town in so easy a way.”

Frances Anne Crewe was a fascinating character at the end of the eighteenth century. While her Paris diary covers far more than just music and theatre it gives a wonderful first-hand account of these by somebody with both knowledge and opinion. Music lights up her diary reports of numerous events: during tea-making for the King and Queen; when she visits her friend Lady Clarges, who was “singing with Sachini,” and sups very comfortably with her; when parties of people travel at night across ice in sleds, wrapped in furs, with torches and bands of music; and at High Mass in the King’s Chapel. On the latter occasion she observed: “The music was fine, but the drums and fiddles in my opinion spoiled the effect which good choirs ought to have – It was indeed far from ‘Dissolving the soul in ecstacies’ or bringing ‘all heaven before our eyes’. However it was harmony for all that, and good in its Gothic way.”

Publication Announcements

Floyd K. Grave and Margaret Grave have recently published The String Quartets of Joseph Haydn (Oxford University Press, 2006).


The Packard Humanities Institute facsimile edition of the autograph manuscript and original libretto of Mozart’s Idomeneo has now been published. The volume contains a musicological introduction by Bruce A. Brown, and a more general introduction by Joachim Kreutzer. This is the first in a series of full-color facsimile editions of Mozart operas, which will also include Le nozze di Figaro, Così fan tutte, Die Entführung aus dem Serail, Don Giovanni, Die Zauberflöte, and La clemenza di Tito. The editions of Figaro and Così will appear during 2007. For more information contact Old Manuscripts & Incunabula, P. O. Box 6019 FDR Station, New York NY 10150. Tel: 212-758-1946; Fax: 212-593-6186; www.omifacsimiles.com; immels@earthlink.net.

Turchini Edizioni announces the publication of Le arti della scena e l’esotismo in età moderna, edited by Francesco Cotticelli and Paolo Giovanni Maione (Naples: Turchini Edizioni, 2006). The volume contains essays by Paola Pugliatti, Silvia Carandini, Sergio Durante, Claudio Toscani, Ignacio Arellano, Mario Domenichelli, Steffen Voss, Bruce A. Brown, Marina Mayrhofer, Lucio Tufano, Jean François Lattarico, Cesare Fertonani, Nancy D’Antuono, Melania Bucciarelli, Deirdre O’Grady, Elena Sala Di Felice, Maria Ines Aliverti, Guido Paduano, Diana Blichmann, Felipe B. Pedraza Jiménez, Carlos Mata Induráin, Agustín de la Granja, Wendy Heller, Margaret Butler, Paolo Giovanni Maione, Pierpaolo Polonnetti, Francesco Cotticelli, Paolo Mechelli, Francesca Seller, Antonio Caroccia, Anthony R. DelDonna, and Francesco Bissoli. For price and further information please contact Centro di Musica Antica “Pietà de’ Turchini,” Via S. Caterina da Siena, 38-80132 Naples, Italy. See also www.turchini.it; e-mail: info@turchini.it.

In November 2006, Musica Toscana published No. 8. Sonate per cembalo, e flauto di N[iccolò] D[othel], edited by Nicklaus Delius. Dothel was a flutist in the court band of Pietro Leopoldo Grand Duke of Tuscany and the most prominent flute player in Italy during the 18th century. He published a large quantity of music for flute in various ensembles in Paris and London. The only copy known of the present sonatas is in the Ricasoli Collection in the Dwight Anderson Music Library. The volume of flute sonatas can be ordered from Musica Toscana Inc., c/o Robert Weaver, 1711 Gardiner Lane, Louisville, KY 30205.

Publications Received


Record Reviews

James A. Ackerman

Paul Wranitzky, Grande Symphonie caractéristique pour la paix avec le Republique Françoise, op. 31 in C minor, and Symphony in D, op. 52. Norddeutscher Rundfunk Radiophilharmonie, Howard Griffiths. CPO 777 054-2. (Super Audio Hybrid Multi-channel CD.)

Pavel Vranicky [Wranitzky], Symphony in D, op. 52; Symphony in C minor [op. 11, no. 1]; Symphony in D, op. 36; and Symphony in C [op. 2, “The Joy of the Hungarian Nation.”] Dvorák Chamber Orchestra, Bohumil Gregor. Supraphon SU 3875-2, remastered. (Two disc set.)


Enthusiasts of the music of Paul Wranitzky (1756–1808) have much to celebrate during the 250th anniversary year. With the availability of recently published musical editions, a number of the composer’s best symphonies have been released on compact disc. In 2002, Chandos included works of Wranitzky in their Contemporaries of Mozart series. More recently, in 2006, Supraphon and CPO each released compilations of symphonies by Wranitzky. Though Milan Poštolka’s catalogue identifies roughly fifty independent orchestral works, very few are currently available in modern edition. Consequently, different orchestras have only recorded a handful of works—making a comparison of them inescapable.

Unquestionably, the most celebrated work among these is the Symphony in C minor, op. 31. An early programmatic symphony, it celebrates the peace between the French Republic and the Grand Duchy of Austria, which suffered significant casualties at the hands of Napoleon. With provocative movement titles, such as “Revolution,” “Tumult of Battle,” and “The Fate and Death of Louis XVI,” it is no surprise that contemporary reception of this symphony was ambivalent: the work even met with prohibition by Imperial decree in 1797. The ban was soon lifted, and the symphony was first performed in Leipzig. Full orchestral parts quickly appeared in print, as did versions for string quintet and piano trio. These record releases provide us with two of these possible performance choices: Howard Griffiths and the NDR Philharmonie perform the symphony with its full orchestral instrumentation, while the London Mozart Players chose to record the string version. Although both recordings are valuable, it is perhaps the orchestral version by the NDR that provides the best musical effect overall, and shows the true compositional skill of Wranitzky. In the outer movements especially, the listener is treated to a spectrum of colors created by the different combinations of wind and string instruments. But it is the third movement that provides dramatic opportunities for the full orchestral complement. Most notably, a grand bass drum (“soldier’s drum”) and trumpet calls combine to represent the com-motion of a battle. Rapid runs in the violins and flutes also help to create a vivid sonic picture. Obviously such symbolic gestures are lost in the string version on the London Mozart Players’ release. The string arrangement is not without its beautiful moments though, and the “Funeral March” for King Louis XVI is somber and quite sublime.

Paul Wranitzky’s last published symphony, his Symphony in D, op. 52 (1808), is included on both the Supraphon and the CPO releases, with widely differing results. Maestro Gregor and the Dvorák Chamber Orchestra make an unfortunate choice of tempo for the Adagio movement. Clocking in at over fourteen minutes, it is taken so slowly that temporal momentum is lost and the form is obscured. Within the context of the entire symphony the movement becomes cumbersome and throws the other movements off balance. Considered independently, however, this interpretation of the Adagio is quite beautiful with the many falling chromatic lines emerging freely to create an exquisite, lyrical masterpiece. The NDR Radiophilharmonie’s performance of this movement takes half the time, lasting just under seven minutes. Though comparatively brisk, it still retains the beauty of the melodies while presenting the work’s ternary form more clearly. A possible explanation for this disparity in tempi originates in the score itself. Although the movement is designated Adagio, the time signature 2/2 indicates Allegro. Gregor chose the quarter-note as the pulse, while Griffiths and the Radiophilharmonie correctly adhere to the half-note pulse. Perhaps something in between would be preferred.

The Symphony in C minor is one of several that Wranitzky composed in that key; it appears on the Chandos and Supraphon releases. Listed on the former simply as op. 11, it is actually op. 11 no. 1, published by André de Offenbach in 1791 and later by both Sieber, and Janet & Cotelle in Paris. The Supraphon recording names this work as “Sinfonia in Do minore,” and assigns it an approximate date of 1800. The performance is probably based on the manuscript score found in Prague’s National Museum, where the work is identified simply as “Sinfonia in Do minore.” Adding to the confusion, the piece identified on this release as Symphony in C minor, op. 11, and the earlier Symphony op. 2, “Joy of the Hungarian Nation.”

The two recordings of this symphony are quite consistent with one another: there are no considerable differences in tempi or interpretation. The work itself represents the type of symphony that Wranitzky may have composed for the Burgtheater Orchestra in Vienna, for which he was Konzertmeister. After a slow introduction, there is a string-dominated main theme. In this early work, the wind voices often appear to color the string texture; however, we also hear hints of the Harmoniemusik approach of his later works. The Presto finale strikes a perfect balance between the pathos inherent in C minor and folk-like tunefulness. This ability to balance affects surely helped to secure Wranitzky’s popularity with
both the Viennese public and the nobility.

The context of Wranitzky's Symphony in D major op. 36 is evidence of the high standing that he achieved with the enlightened nobility. Published by André in 1800, the symphony's title page indicates that it was composed for the wedding celebration of the Palatine Joseph Anton of Hungary to the Grand Duchess Alexandra Pavlovna of Russia. The location of the wedding at the Gatchina Palace outside St. Petersburg, coupled with the nationalities of the bride, offer some explanation for the title “Russe” appended to the middle Allegretto movement and the triple meter “Polonese” that replaces the expected Minuet. The occasional nature of this symphony is not all that is of interest. Although the slow introduction immediately sets a regal and festive mood with its dotted rhythms, use of timpani and brass, and rapid ascending flourishes, later hearings reveal to the listener that the opening dotted motif figures prominently in the development section. Of course, for this gesture to be noticed the proper tempi must be chosen. Bamert and his London Classical Players base their opening tempo on the quarter-note, as indicated in the time signature, and the effect comes off rather well: the listener is able to recognize the connection at the start of the development section. On the Supraphon release, however, the introduction is taken nearly twice as slow, the motif is imperceptible here and therefore remains unnoticed later.

The 6/8 Rondo–Finale perhaps best illustrates why Wranitzky's music had such great appeal and charm in its day. While the rondo theme is light and bouncy as expected, other twists and surprises further delight the listener. Like the first movement, the finale is preceded by a slow introduction. The horns and timpani quickly dissolve the solemn sounds of the paired winds with the exciting announcement of a hunt. Finally, the rondo theme is presented by the strings. Throughout the movement the winds continue to play an important role, alternating between support and contrast. A tempestuous middle section finally gives way to a triumphant tutti conclusion. Of the two interpretations, the London Mozart Players' seems to capture the excitement most successfully.

These three ensembles represent different approaches to these symphonies, some more successful than others. Taken as a whole, however, they all help to retrieve the music of Paul Wranitzky from its long-standing obscurity. With each new release—and hopefully there will be more—we have the opportunity to gain a more complete impression of this neglected Viennese composer.

A new web site dedicated to disseminating information about Wranitzky can be found at www.wranitzky.com.

**Tony Gable**

Leopold Kozeluch, Piano Concertos no. 1 in F, no. 4 in E flat, and no. 5 in A, Tomas Dratva (piano), Slovak Sinfonietta Žilina, Oliver von Dohnanyi, Oehms OC 588.

Leopold Kozeluch, Clarinet Concertos, no.1 in E flat, and no. 2 in E flat, Sonate Concertante in E flat, Dieter Klöcker (clarinet), Prague Chamber Orchestra. Orfeo C 193 061 A.

In Peter Shaffer's *Amadeus*, Salieri remarks that Mozart’s twelve piano concertos of 1784–6 were the greatest achievements of the mind of man in the entire eighteenth century, which makes the position of Mozart’s main rival not a little invidious. What of Mozart’s other ‘rivals’ in the field? Which works in this genre, besides Mozart’s, would Viennese audiences have heard in the mid-1780s? The three piano concertos by Kozeluch under review here, which were published in 1784–5, would have been among these. They are among the earliest of his keyboard concertos, which number over twenty in Milan Poštolka's catalogue. Prior to this disc only two of his concertos had been recorded, both twice.

If one of the tests of a classical concerto is the quality of the first-movement development, then Kozeluch generally scores high; this is especially true of the Piano Concerto in E-flat. Not for Kozeluch the march-based openings of Mozart's 1784 concertos. He prefers rather foursquare themes, although the A major work begins with some syncopation. The F major concerto presumably dates from the period of K. 413–K. 415 (1782–3), although in scope it is more akin to K. 238 of 1776. The Allegro is virtually monothematic and the inventive theme is exploited with some verve. The slow movements are the most successful, especially in the concertos in F and A (the latter a pleasing 3/8 piece in A minor), and the finales show his fondness for 6/8 (five of Kozeluch's concertos use this meter) and hunting topoi (as in the E-flat work). These are accomplished, well-written works, although they lack anything truly arresting or memorable and are largely devoid of the operatic drama of Mozart's piano concertos.

The Swiss pianist Tomas Dratva, who plays a modern grand, has edited these works with Vladimir Godár and provided suitable, economical cadenzas. He is particularly effective in the slow movements, while in fast movements one finds a certain monotony of tone. Dratva is not helped by a bias in the recording, which favors the piano unduly. Nonetheless, these recordings assist in broadening our understanding of the Viennese concerto in the 1780s. Dratva and his team should be encouraged to continue this worthwhile project with Kozeluch's later concertos from the 1790s.

Of the three clarinet works recorded on the Orfeo label, only the first is an authentic concerto by Kozeluch. The second concerto is based on a well-known work by Carl Stamitz, with its rondo à la chasse. The sonate concertante is an arrangement of three movements from Kozeluch's String Quartets nos. 3 and 6, with a minuet from the E flat divertimento, Poštolka VI.9. Dieter Klöcker is a marvellous clarinettist, but his frustrating and inadequate liner notes address none of the vital questions. Who wrote the arrangement? Surely it was not Kozeluch. Klöcker dates it to 1790; yet one of the quartets did not appear until 1791. Why is the rearranged work by Stamitz included here? Is there, perhaps, a manuscript in Kozeluch's hand? Klöcker, who has a fondness for ascribing works on slender evidence (as with the three 'Haydn' clarinet concertos), now appropriates this concerto for Kozeluch, conjecturing that the work was “perhaps … originally written by Stamitz.” Klöcker is presumably unaware that the second and third movements also occur in Stamitz's first viola d'amo concerto. He labels the Stamitz work “Concerto no. 3”; yet since Kaiser's 1962 catalogue scholars have known it as no. 11. In the first movement an episode of Stamitz's exposition is replaced. The slow movement, pace Klöcker, is not a reworking of Stamitz: it is a completely different piece, with room, unlike Stamitz's original, for a long cadenza. As to the authentic Kozeluch concerto, this recording is a joy throughout. The one exception is the lengthy first-movement cadenza, which is twice as long as Emma Johnson's more appropriate flourish (Brilliant Classics 99497).
From the Graduate Student Representative:
Questions for Future Faculty

Emily Green

As this is my third and final column in my capacity as graduate student representative to the Board of the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music, let me be frank: there are not that many graduate students writing dissertations on eighteenth-century topics. In fact, those of us writing dissertations on any field in musicology probably find ourselves among only a handful of peers doing the same. Some of our friends in our departments may be absent with grants or fellowships, some may have cloistered themselves away on private dissertation retreats, and certainly few others, or no others, are working on our particular historical, geographical, or theoretical areas. This may seem to be a problem. We all need peers in our areas, if only because we need people, other than our advisors, to whom we can ask basic—or even stupid—questions. What exactly is an x (genre of music)? Did x know y’s (music, writings)? How can I find y (primary source)? Surprisingly, however, the most interesting result of asking questions like these can be learning that oftentimes the answers are not as obvious they might seem; the questions, in other words, may not be so stupid. But it is crucial that we graduate students have forums in which we feel comfortable making such inquiries, because so much of the process of writing a dissertation is discovering not the right answers but the proper questions. We will never come upon those good questions if we do not ask the bad ones first, and we will never know the difference if we do not engage ourselves in discussion and articulate our apprehensions.

So, here is my first obvious (but not stupid) question: how can we ensure that forums for these kinds of basic inquiries exist? First, one practical measure can be coordinated by the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music: those of us writing dissertations on eighteenth-century topics should give our titles to Nancy November (n.november@auckland.ac.nz), the editor of this newsletter, so that she can print a list in the following issue. We would all then have a small catalogue of possible contacts in our areas of research. Of course, many of these contacts can also be made and maintained at conferences, such as the upcoming SECM conference in 2008, the eighteenth-century sessions at AMS, and meetings of the Mozart society or the newly formed Haydn society. The various divisions of the Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies (ASECS and its chapters, and BSECS and ISECS) also offer communities of potential colleagues, particularly for those of us whose work is in any sense interdisciplinary.

Because these conferences do not happen all that frequently, however, and because most of us cannot afford to attend more than one or two per year, we must all find ways to engage in productive discussions in our own locales. Although most of us are not privileged enough to be surrounded by others working on topics in our areas, there is still much to be learned from exchanges with those writing dissertations on other areas of musicology or in other fields. I realize that I may be stating the obvious, but I also know that in most departments of music there are probably at least two people or groups of people who do not converse about their dissertations because they feel their topics are simply too dissimilar. This, I believe, is a loss. First of all, though a frustrating exercise, we must force ourselves to recognize from time to time that our peers and superiors in our departments are the only people in the world who understand what exactly it is that we do for a living. We are further isolating ourselves, then, if we cut ourselves off from members of that population due to differences in expertise. Furthermore, if we are to succeed in and enjoy our careers in higher education, we must learn how to communicate with colleagues with different areas of interest—and colleagues with whom we may often disagree.

The unique community of higher education offers an opportunity for such well-rounded intellectual enrichment—enrichment for undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty. If we are not willing to commit to a life of learning from peers, then we may find ourselves truly alienated in our already isolated academic existences. If, however, we engage with our peers in some of the professional ways that I have suggested here, then at least there is a possibility for productive discussion of basic or complex issues. So, here is my second obvious question: will we use graduate school merely as a support mechanism for writing our dissertations or as a forum for developing scholarly, social, and professional skills that will serve us in our lifelong participation in academic communities? May this column be a simple reminder to choose the latter.

Research Report:
Torelli’s Mystery Concerto

J. M. Schlititz

What we shall call the “Roger concerto” has become Torelli’s most well known work, yet its authenticity has never been fully established. A manuscript has never been found, and the concerto itself does not bear the name of Torelli or that of any other composer. The work appeared in print as the last in a collection of six concertos published by the important eighteenth-century music publisher Estienne Roger (c1665–1722). The title page of that collection reads:

CONCERTS
à 5, 6 & 7. Instruments, dont il y en a un pour la trompette ou le Haubois;
Composez par Messieurs BITTI, VIVALDI & TORELLI
Dediez à MONSIEUR LEON D’URBINO
AMSTERDAM
Chez ESTIENNE ROGER Marchand Librarie N° 188.

In his 1970 dissertation on Torelli’s trumpet music, Eugene Enrico succinctly stated the conventional view regarding the concerto’s attribution: “one may infer, from the grouping and the order of the names on the title page, that the first two concertos were composed by Bitti, the second two by Vivaldi, and the final two by Torelli.” Enrico did qualify his statement, mentioning “conspicuous” differences in the organo (basso) part, whose figured bass is more elaborate than its counterparts in Torelli’s undisputed trumpet concertos.

Little else has been published regarding the concerto’s authenticity. It is known that Franz Giegling intentionally omitted the Roger concerto from his (now standard) catalogue of Torelli’s works (1949). This decision was rejected by Edward Tarr in his series of editions of Torelli trumpet music for Musica Rara (1968),
thus prompting generations of trumpet soloists to record the concerto under Torelli’s name. Torelli expert Marc Vanscheeuwijck has omitted the concerto in his New Grove Dictionary article on Torelli (2001) and elsewhere. Other scholars have either accepted the conventional view, or, perhaps influenced by the abundance of recordings, have remained unaware of the concerto’s disputed circumstances. Don Smithers (1988) alone has speculated on the matter, if only briefly, comparing the work to another trumpet piece listed in Giegling’s Torelli catalogue (G08). Smithers suggested that the two works must represent a later, more mature stage of Torelli’s compositional style, noting that in the first movements of both works, the trumpet enters by restating (Roger) or partially restating (G08) the opening theme.

Smithers’s observation is astute, but it is not unproblematic: even a rough chronological ordering of Torelli’s trumpet music has long confounded many a scholar (handwriting analyses notwithstanding), and it is therefore not possible to determine which of Torelli’s pieces is most nearly contemporaneous with the Roger concerto (itself appearing only after Torelli’s death). If anything, Torelli’s few dated trumpet pieces (G01, dated 1690; G15, dated 1692; and G04, dated 1693) show an evolution away from, rather than toward, late Baroque concerto forms.

In my recent research into the issue, I argue that: (1) the Roger concerto bears no obvious resemblances to Torelli’s other “mature concertos”; (2) none of the work’s three movements bears immediate signs of Bitti’s or Vivaldi’s language; and (3) a thorough comparison of movement design across all twelve of Torelli’s undisputed works for single trumpet and strings (hereafter 1TS) revealed nothing conclusive either for or against the Roger concerto’s authenticity. The following is a brief summary of my findings.

The first movement of the Roger concerto certainly does differ conspicuously from the 1TS pieces. Instead of antiphonal treatment, the trumpet-string interplay is almost constant, with fragmentary re-statements in *stretto*, not least of which is the opening three-eight-note motif \( \text{\textsf{\textit{a2-f#-d}}} \), which is tossed back and forth among all four parts. There is also a walking bass, modulation to several key areas (D–A–D–b–f–D–A–G–D), and four brilliant measures (containing the opening motif) prolonging the movement’s conclusion in lieu of the expected cadential trill found in the other 1TS pieces. All of these elements are highly atypical not only of Torelli but of his generation as a whole. This Allegro is clearly in the style of the late not middle Baroque and is therefore not possible to determine which of Torelli’s trumpet pieces and his op. 6 for strings.

Recall from the title page that Roger’s dedicatee was a certain Leon from Urbino. Nothing further has been ascertained about him, except that he had once heard these pieces. Since this collection is a potpourri of his favorites, it is not surprising that it should include works by several composers. It is perhaps for the sake of simplicity that Roger listed only three composers on the title page, rather than specifically attributing each movement within the collection to its proper author. My theory that this work is a composite concerto depends on the anomalous characteristics of the first movement, which, while atypical for Torelli, are extremely typical for Albinoni. The structure is, in fact, exactly parallel to the first movement of Albinoni’s op. 7, no. 12 (also published in 1715 by Roger). The equally un-Torellian suspensions of the Roger concerto’s second movement, meanwhile, form a trademark texture of Corelli’s slow movements. Two figures in the walking bass of the second movement can even be found note-for-note in the second movements of Corelli’s op. 4, no. 5, and op. 6, no. 8. Both of these works were published by Roger, who issued roughly half of Albinoni’s instrumental works, and all of Corelli’s known works. Further examination is of course in order. Composite concertos could, I believe, play a greater role than we think in helping to settle matters of authenticity.

Further information about the Roger concerto, including a bibliography, tables, and mp3 files, can be found at the web site: http://synthonia.org/music/scholarship/Torelli/index.html.

"Mozart Year" continued from page 1

from 5–7 April. Hosted by Rüdiger Görner, this conference attempted to mobilize scholars (mostly) nominally outside of music to address broadly interdisciplinary, chiefly literary questions about Mozart. The presentations included Andreas Blödorn (University of Wuppertal), “Goethe auf der Reise zu Mozart? Der Zauberflöte Zweyter Theil und Schikaneders Libretto”; Dieter Borchmeyer (University of Heidelberg and Bavarian Academy of Fine Arts, Munich), “Um einen Don Giovanni ohne das 19. Jahrhundert bittend”; Andrew Cusack (Trinity College, Dublin), “‘Der närrische Tag’: Mörike’s Mozart auf der Reise nach Prag (1855)”, and more esoteric topics including Kris Steyaert (University of Liège), “Swept along on the wild Styx: Mozart’s demonic presence in nineteenth-century Dutch poetry” and Jörg Theis (University of Saarland), “Mozart in the context of Marcel Proust and the Belle Epoque” (a review of this conference also appears in Eighteenth-Century Music 3/2 [September 2006], 373–6).

My Mozart year more or less ended in Seoul, and in Tokyo. In Seoul, a consortium of Korean universities mounted a one-day symposium, which also included Ulrich Konrad (Universität Würzburg); in Tokyo, the National Theatre sponsored a small-scale event with Rudolf Angermüller (Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum) and Otto Biba (Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde). From Tokyo the symposium participants flew to Hakodate, capital of the Oshima subprefecture of Hokkaido province, where there was a Mozart anniversary concert and discussion for the general public. It was in Hakodate that it snowed again, so that my Mozart year came full circle, weather-wise at least. Tokyo was unseasonably warm, around 15 degrees centigrade most of the time, but almost from the moment we touched down in Hakodate it was winter. And it was magical. Hakodate was one of the first Japanese ports opened to the west, on 31 March 1853 to be exact (and negotiated by Commodore Matthew Perry). The slopes of the mountain overlooking the old port are densely packed with later nineteenth-century architecture: customs houses, government offices, private residences, and churches of almost every nationality and denomination, all rubbing shoulders with traditional Japanese shrines and
creating a mélange of styles and meanings. Particularly striking are the cemeteries for foreigners, many of them with Western-style headstones nestled among the shrines and temples, and all of them blanketed with winter.

The relatively small scale of the Tokyo symposium seemed to say something about the differences between the last big Mozart year, 1991, and now. Then there were major conferences in Salzburg, Vienna, Australia, Tokyo, London, and New York. In 2006, however, only Salzburg and Vienna mounted international events; as far as I know there was nothing at all in New York (it makes you long for the days of the magnificent 1991 conference at Lincoln Center); London didn’t even try to match its previous event at the South Bank. But I do not think this is a reflection either on Mozart scholarship or on Mozart’s standing at large. On the contrary, those of us who thought the world would have had enough by the end of 1991 were clearly proved wrong. In many ways, Mozart scholarship during the last fifteen years has flourished as never before, and has broadened its remit beyond the philological outlook that dominated the work of the Neue Mozart-Ausgabe, Alan Tyson’s ground-breaking studies of the autographs, and Neal Zaslaw’s work on performance practice. And as far as the public is concerned, there seems to have been almost as many books, articles, concerts, radio broadcasts, and celebrations as previously.

Different, though, are the economics of Mozart. Both the Salzburg and Vienna conferences were supported by the EU, a relatively new player in European cultural affairs of this sort (at least since the last anniversary); for New York, or London or Tokyo there was no such funding forthcoming, and neither the institutions nor the governments there seem to want to support big, old-fashioned ventures. (In London, at least, beyond a nod in the direction of the English National Opera, the Royal Opera House and a few orchestras, the cultural mavens at city hall seem to be firmly fixed on completing the new Wembley Stadium and on preparing for the 2012 Olympics.) This does not, however, mean that Mozart as a cultural icon is in decline. Just the opposite in fact: now more than ever Mozart is seen as the European musician, perhaps the most universally sustainable (as the bureaucrats now like to say). And there is no question that the EU is putting its musical eggs in the Mozart basket, both commercially and politically. From a commercial point of view, plans are afoot to create a Mozart web portal, to web publish the family correspondence in four languages, and generally to provide access to his life and works. After some initial seeding, all of these projects are intended to support themselves.

And why not? Contrary to thinking twenty-five years ago, the idea that quality and commerce are incompatible seems now to be the preserve of cultural elitists, not real-world pragmatists (the latter including academics). At least part of the conservative rationale—or at least the rationale for preserving a cultural elite—is that classical music is, after all, a niche market that needs to be protected by those capable of sustaining it. But surely “niche” is just a word and not a very helpful one at that. Yes, there are fewer lovers of classical music than of The Beatles, and yes, classical music CD sales are in decline. But does this mean that we are dealing with an art in terminal decline? And are these the only ways for measuring classical music’s health? Consider, for example, the online NMA, which had so many more hits than expected that the server broke down. Or the BBC’s 24/7 Beethoven extravaganza last year, which broadcast all of Beethoven’s works. Four million people downloaded the complete Beethoven symphonies, 40% of them from outside of the UK. In short, traditional ways of assessing the health of classical music are slanted not only to traditional markets, but also to ways of thinking about the world community that are outmoded in this age of the internet and communication technology generally. In this context, the word “niche” means little or nothing at all. The market may be “niche” in one sense, but it is so large in practice that the description is meaningless. Cultural policies based on this characterization ought to be dropped.

As for the political dimension, Mozart has emerged in the last couple of years as a metaphorical catalyst for European unity and European cultural self-representation (though not without dissent), as an article published in the London Times for 8 January 2006 makes clear:

Mozart to recompose European constitution

“Austria took over the European Union’s rotating presidency last week and wants to use a conference in Mozart’s home town of Salzburg on January 27—the 250th anniversary of the composer’s birth—to bring new harmony to ‘Europe’s orchestra’, which notably failed to play in tune during 2005…The idea of a Europe-wide public debate on the aims of the 25-nation bloc was first mooted by EU leaders last June after the Dutch and French rejected the constitution, effectively killing off the ratification process. Britain, which had the presidency for the second half of the year, avoided the issue, concentrating instead on securing a deal on the EU budget. To relaunch the constitution, Wolfgang Schüssel, chancellor of Austria, has invited figures from the arts, scientists, diplomats and the media to contribute ideas on European identity while being serenaded by the Vienna Philharmonic. Tony Blair and other EU leaders are not expected to attend. The Austrians hope the conference will be inspired by Mozart, who ‘transcended borders with his music and was at home throughout Europe.’ The link with Austria’s wunderkind has prompted amusement and despair among some officials in Brussels. ‘The only spirit of Mozart necessary for this constitution should be Mozart’s Requiem’, joked one official.”

It is the optimism here that fits with my view of the Mozart year just passed. I read and heard a remarkably large number of interesting, thoughtful, and insightful articles, books, and lectures, which make it clear to me that Mozart scholarship is as healthy as ever, perhaps more healthy than ever. At the same time, the possibilities for reaching out to ever-larger audiences, and the realization that we do not live in an ivory tower, are also to be celebrated.