From the President

It is with great pleasure that I address you, the membership of the Mozart Society of America, for the first time in my new role as your president. I appreciate the trust you have placed in me and look forward to working together with you on many initiatives over the next two years. I have been involved with the Mozart Society since its inception in 1996: I have read papers at MSA sessions at the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies (ASECS) and at our biennial conferences (most recently in Minneapolis); I have served the Society as a Board member, as chair of our nominations committee, and in various other capacities. I have watched the Society grow and develop with great interest over the years and had many opportunities to think about our objectives and goals as well as to experience the benefits of membership. Since taking office in July, I have been working to familiarize myself with the current state of the Society and to begin the important work of planning for the future. I am grateful to everyone who has helped with my transition, but most especially to our Vice-President, Paul Corneilson, who has been an invaluable resource during this transition period.

I would like to express my thanks to Peter Hoyt, our outgoing president, not only for his exemplary service to the Society, but also for making possible the MSA panel “Mozart Revealed,” which took place as part of the Mostly Mozart Festival at Lincoln Center on Saturday 17 August 2013. Bruce Alan Brown deserves our special thanks for organizing this panel, which included four speakers: Samuel J. Breene, Edmund J. Goehrung, Peter A. Hoyt, and Martin Nedbal. I was delighted to receive an informal and very favorable account of the event and its audience from Bruce Alan Brown. You can read more about this panel elsewhere in this issue of the Newsletter. I would also like to say a word of thanks to Stephen Fisher for providing us with yet another marvelous issue of the MSA Newsletter. It has always seemed to me that our Newsletter is one of the greatest benefits of membership: here we consistently provide articles, translations, and other news items related to Mozart can find nowhere else.
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I am delighted to report that Neal Zaslaw has agreed to speak to us at this year’s study session at AMS in Pittsburgh, which will take place on Friday 8 November at 12:15 pm. There will be an announcement closer to the time, of course, but please invite your colleagues, students, and friends. I look forward to seeing you there to say hello to old friends and to introduce myself to those of you I haven’t met yet.

We will have two panels in April 2014 at ASECS: “Mozart and Modernity,” chaired by Edmund J. Goehring and “Mozart and his Situation,” chaired by Peter Hoyt and myself. (Please see details elsewhere in this issue of the Newsletter.) The MSA Board is beginning to work on our biennial conference for 2015: we hope to make this one an international conference. While this conference is still very much in the planning stages, we would welcome suggestions and volunteers to serve on the program committee.

I would also like to say a special word about our membership. Our greatest asset as a society is the number, variety, and experience of our members. We count on you to contribute papers to our sessions at conferences, send us your work for the Newsletter, and more generally to sustain the field that unites us all: the study of Mozart in all its forms. We are a small society, but a distinguished one. We count among our members many of the most important figures in Mozart studies, several of whom have given tirelessly to the Society over the years. The MSA is also fortunate to have a dedicated group of individuals currently serving on the Board of Directors and in key roles: as officers, chairs of committees, and as editor of the Newsletter. I look forward to our first Board meeting, which will take place this November at AMS.

As the Board prepares for this first meeting, I invite you to write to me with any thoughts, suggestions, or comments you might have for the MSA (jwaldoff@holycross.edu). If you would consider volunteering for any committees or tasks, if you have ideas for the 2015 conference, if you have any ongoing project other members might like to read about in the Newsletter, please let me know. At the Board meeting in November we will also be talking about the website, the possibility of collaborating with some of our sister societies (the Society for Eighteenth Century Music, the Haydn Society of America, and the Bach Society, for example), and a number of other ongoing initiatives. I would be very interested to hear your ideas and involve as many of you as possible in future planning. The more we can look to members to take active roles, the stronger our society will be.

Finally, on a practical note, you will find on the last page of this Newsletter a membership renewal form. If you have already sent in your membership renewal for 2013, thank you very much for your ongoing support. If you have not yet sent in your dues, please return this sheet with the appropriate amount. If it is within your means and inclination to make an additional contribution to the Society, this extra support would be much appreciated. We are a small society with limited means, but an important mission! Your dues and gifts make it possible to publish the Newsletter, plan conferences, maintain the website, and pursue new initiatives and relationships.

My very best wishes to you all,
Jessica Waldoff
In 1784, Leopold Mozart’s daughter Nannerl moved from Salzburg to her husband’s home in St. Gilgen, 32 kilometers away. In 1785, she returned to Salzburg to give birth to her first child, Leopoldl. She soon returned to St. Gilgen, leaving her son in Salzburg to be raised by her father and his servants. From that time until his own death in 1787, Leopold sent weekly reports to her on the development of Leopold.

On 3 November 1785 he writes: “On St.-Wolfgang’s Day [31 October] at 8 in the morning, after he ate his cereal, he suddenly had such a convulsion that I went running at the horrible cry of the maids. I saw the child choked, with his face all swollen, his mouth and eyes closed, blue like a hanging victim, showing no sign of life whatsoever. I opened his mouth with this breathing emergency. How could Leopold respond when faced with this breathing emergency?

He described two procedures: one of them, mouth-to-mouth pulmonary insufflation, is surprising because even today it is a basic artificial ventilation maneuver for breathing emergencies. Leopold deliberately opened his grandson’s mouth and breathed into it. This description seems to come from a modern-day text on resuscitation, although Leopold does not explain whether he pinched the child’s nose to prevent air from escaping. The other procedure, intestinal insufflation (about to be practiced by the maid Thresel), is also surprising today, but in this case for its physiological absurdity.

How could Leopold and his entourage have known about these procedures? How could Leopold have been ready to put them in practice so quickly when the situation called for it? This letter offers a glimpse into eighteenth-century notions of how to reverse sudden apparent death. The two aforementioned maneuvers were in accordance with medical practice of the time and were consistent with resuscitation procedures used for apneic newborns and sudden accidental-death victims in the eighteenth century. Some knowledge of the history of resuscitation is important to understanding this passage in the letter.

The oldest references to artificial mouth-to-mouth resuscitation occur in Egyptian mythology and in the Bible. Despite these references, the medical and lay people of antiquity did not seem to consistently use any form of artificial respiration for seemingly dead people in respiratory arrest. No readily accessible documentation of such practices occurs until Paulus Bagellardus’ 1472 book of pediatrics, Libellus de aegritudinibus et remedis infantium, where he advises Italian midwives: “If she finds [the newborn] warm, not black, she should blow into its mouth, if it has no respiration, [...] or into its anus.” This would imply that this practice was established at that time, if not earlier, in at least some Italian city-states.

There is another interesting reference by the Italian physiologist Giovanni Borelli who, in 1679, was called to attend to a woman who collapsed after delivery. Upon arriving he saw “a maid [who] during my absence stretches herself over the puerpera, blows her breath into her mouth which quickly calls her back to life.” Further, the maid indicated that she was applying methods used by midwives
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on “apparently dead babies,” and also mentioned their use at Altenburg in Thuringia. Later references to the usage of such methods include (but are not limited to):

1740, Paris. Avis de la Ville concerning assistance to the drowned: “Insufflation of hot air in the mouth and intestines and fumigation of tobacco smoke into the intestines;” printed and distributed again in 1759, 1769 and 1772.

1744, Edinburgh. Dr. William Tossach made the first communication in the journal of the Edinburgh Medical Society of a mouth-to-mouth rescue effort on “A Man Dead in Appearance, Recovered by Distending the Lungs with Air.”

1745, London. After reading Dr. Tossach’s communication, Dr. John Fothergill became a promoter of the mouth-to-mouth rescue all over Europe.

1746, London. Dr. Rowland Jackson publishes A physical dissertation on Drowning...With an Appendix, containing some Methods for the Recovery of those who hang themselves, and of Children supposed to be born dead. “The [...] method to restoring still-born children to life is to blow into their mouth, as is obvious from various well-attested observations.”

1754, London. Surgeon and obstetrician Benjamin Pugh, in his Treatise of Midwifery, recommends for an apneic newborn: “press your mouth to the child’s at the same time pinching the nose with your thumb and finger to prevent the air escaping, inflate the lungs, by which method I have saved many.”

1766, Zürich. “Official Edict” of the City of Zürich, concerning the drowned: “...one must not neglect to stimulate the lungs, stomach and intestines by smoke of tobacco into the anus... If the mouth is open, someone pinches off the nose, puts his mouth tightly over the mouth of the drowned, then blows hard.”

1767, Amsterdam. The first Humane Society of Europe was founded to inform the general public and to encourage them to rescue those discovered drowned in the city canals (400 people per year). Other cities rapidly created analogous humane societies, first in Rotterdam, then Vienna, Milan, Padua, Hamburg (1768), Paris (1771), and Dresden (1773).

1774, Paris. On behalf of L’Académie des Sciences, Dr. Antoine Portal reports on the reanimation of asphyxiated persons and apparently dead newborns by mouth-to-mouth ventilation and mentions Dr. Tossach, “who brought to life a man by mouth-to-mouth.”

In contrast, in 1776, Scottish surgeon William Hunter referred to mouth-to-mouth as “the method used by the vulgar to restore stillborn children.” His remark may have been pointed at midwives, who at the time were not considered members of the medical profession, but who may have independently been applying mouth-to-mouth for neonatal apnea.

In Europe, the theoretical basis of first aid aimed at saving people dying from accidents was specifically developed in the eighteenth century. Mouth-to-mouth rescue breathing was then introduced, among other maneuvers, for adult resuscitation as well. A specific literature on health education was developed in form of “notices” “popular pamphlets,” “instructions,” “decrees (royal, governmental and civic),” “edicts,” or textbooks issued by physicians or philanthropic reanimation societies. These were addressed to the public to teach techniques for the resuscitation of sudden deaths from drowning, lightning strike, hypothermia, suffocation, intentional hanging, poisoning, fits of convulsions and also asphyxia in apneic newborns and unborn infants surviving the death of the mother.

Despite these efforts, popular belief in Mozart’s time still did not typically emphasize the importance of reestablishment of breathing in such emergencies. Much precious time was wasted on maneuvers erroneously thought necessary for the asphyxiated: intestinal insufflation of air or tobacco smoke, shouting, shaking, inversion (placing the victim upside down), emetics, smelling salts, aromatic stimulants, blood-letting, “barreling” (rolling the victim on a barrel), etc. All these attempts lacked a sound physiological understanding of the underlying mechanisms of revival.

Still, regardless of the lack of scientific merit of these techniques, they started a collective belief that resuscitation was possible and the suddenly dead could
be revived.

A basic assumption, according to the physiopathological theories of the time, was that such deaths were only “apparent,” i.e., defined merely by a state of suspension of the vital functions by a violent external effect. They did not imply the end of life itself in individuals without previous pathological status or injuries to the organs. In other words, the belief in Mozart’s time was that, in such deaths, an intermediate state existed between life and death, in which the vital impulses could be “suspended” and the body could be recovered through “irritation.” It was believed that a quality of “irritability” continued in the body a considerable amount of time after respiration and circulation had ceased, and the irritation of the muscular fibers of the intestine and lungs was seen as key to re-activate suspended life. As it was believed that such irritability was retained longer in the muscular fibers of the intestines, there arose a belief in the potential value of intestinal distention (with air or tobacco smoke) to re-activate the “apparently dead”. As well, reactivating the lungs by the insufflation of air stimulates the motion of the heart and the circulation of blood.18

In reading Leopold’s letter we may ask, had Leopold acquired this knowledge as a result of having witnessed childbirths in his family? Was he imitating what he had seen midwives do when faced with an apneic newborn? Or had he read popular medical material on the subject? While pulmonary mouth-to-mouth insufflation may be an instinctive and spontaneous behavior which imitates natural respiration in its absence, intestinal insufflation is not a reflexive or intuitive behavior. His conduct was clearly not an improvisation and implies previous knowledge, corroborated by the swiftness of the action taken. Leopold did not let himself be caught off-guard by this emergency. All the evidence suggest that it was not the first time he had seen an apneic child being resuscitated. The presence of mind he displayed is laudable.

As previously discussed, this knowledge may also have come from new ideas about resuscitation that were spreading throughout Europe. Leopold may have read information about these practices or discussed them with physicians or even seen instances of resuscitation in the course of his numerous travels. Leopold was very interested in medical treatments of his time, as attested by the information on this subject he included in many of his letters. The announcement of his estate sale lists three top-quality optical instruments: “Firstly a composite microscope with all appurtenances, made by Dollond of London, still in prime condition and deficient in no particular. Secondly an excellent solar microscope with all appurtenances, likewise made by Dollond. Thirdly an achromatic tubus of three feet in length with double objective glass made by the same Dollond and in first-rate condition.”19 It should further be noted that this dramatic episode occurred when his grandson Leopoldl von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg (1785-1840) was three months and two days old, not exactly a newborn!

This incident gives us a richer sense of the worldview in which the Mozart family lived.

---


2 Apnea is a pathological cessation of breathing. It is a common occurrence in sick newborns.


5 A woman in childbirth or shortly thereafter.

6 Trubuhovich, part 2, 154.


8 Medical Essays and Observations, revised and published by a Society in Edinburgh, 5(1744), part 2, 605–8, cited after Trubuhovich, part 2, 158.

9 Trubuhovich, part 2, 158–59.

10 Printed for Jacob Robinson, at the Golden Lion in Ludgate-Street, London 1746, 78–79.

11 Trubuhovich, part 2, 159.


17 Trubuhovich, part 2, 161.

18 Marinozzi, et al.

This is the long awaited third volume of the trilogy that Daniel Heartz had begun with Haydn, Mozart and the Viennese School, 1740–1780 (1995) and continued with Music in European Capitals: The Galant Style (2003). The original plan (in the 1970s) had been for a volume on Music in the Classic Era for the Norton series in which the classic accounts of Music in the Renaissance by Gustave Reese and Music in the Baroque Era by Manfred Bukofzer had appeared. That plan fell through—luckily for us. We now have three large-scale (not to say monumental) volumes before us, the first two of which have already become classics. The work ethic and the capacity for work of the author (born in 1928) are to be admired. This third volume, too, is beautifully printed and opulently illustrated; unfortunately the number of typographical errors is not trivial (the two most flagrant are an erroneous musical example on p. 753 and the fact that Haydn’s London publisher William Forster is consistently called William Foster—even in the index.

The first volume (reviewed by me in the Neue Zürcher Zeitung for 20–21 January 1996, p. 51) concentrates on Vienna during the reign of Maria Theresia, the structures of Viennese musical life, the most important Viennese composers, and the history of composition as reflected in her personal style. The second volume (with reviews by, among others, Susan Wollenberg, in JAMS (59) (2006): 196–202; by Julian Rushton, in Early Music, 32 (2004): 138–39; and by me in Die Musikforschung (59) (2006): 393–94) is, in this day and age, a nearly unique historiographical accomplishment, in which the moribund principle of “one man, one book” celebrates its triumphal resurrection.

The third volume again alters the methodological focus, and with this in mind one can read the trilogy as a study of musical historiography, written with a user-friendly, Anglo-Saxon sort of understatement. The subject is what one traditionally undersands as the Viennese Classical style, in a narrower sense, and at the center of this account are the works of the three masters; their contemporaries appear only on the margins. The chronological scope is a plausible one, within the limits of the concept: 1780 as a “turning point…after which they [Haydn and Mozart] gradually emerged as leaders of the Viennese school” (Preface, p. xv), and Beethoven’s Second Symphony of 1802 as “watershed,…the last of his big works in which he looked to Haydn and Mozart for inspiration” (p. 788). The mode of presentation is, as in both other volumes, one of effortless narration, without pedantry, with ostentatious learning, and penetrating methodological reflection, saturated with perception and experience, sustained by stupendous knowledge of the works, and, not least, by a never flagging enthusiasm for the subject. What Susan Wollenberg said of the second volume is also valid here: “Indeed, it can all too easily make other, perfectly respectable histories seem somehow flat by comparison.”

The presentation follows the chronology of the composers’ lives, which is further divided up, for the most part, according to the chronologies of works and genres: first Mozart’s all too short Viennese period; then Haydn’s creations in Eszterháza, London, and Vienna; finally Beethoven’s career up to his Second Symphony. To this are added two appendicies on Michael Kelly’s unreliable Viennese memoirs and on Sarti’s 1784 visit to a performance at Eszterháza of Haydn’s Armida, as recounted by Framery in 1810; Framery’s moving anecdote about Sarti’s meeting with Haydn—“so touching…it deserves to be considered true, whether it is or not” (p. 802)—sets the capstone.

Naturally, a plan in which the masterworks of the composers stand at the center takes some getting used to. Behind it stand, apparently, the traditional, emphatic idea of the Classical style, and the conviction that this idea allows itself to be perceived through analysis of the individuality of the works and their relation to one another, understood as a virtual conversation among the composers. In fact this approach largely works, thanks to the author’s extraordinary analytical and interpretive competence, which, not least on account of its incisiveness, makes one think of the greatest representative of the Anglo-Saxon analytical tradition, namely Donald Francis Tovey. It is indeed a highly remarkable accomplishment that this book of nearly 800 pages is such a great and unremitting pleasure to read, despite the unavoidable accumulation of so many necessarily similar discussions of works.

There is naturally more to the book than just single analyses. Typically, a work’s genesis or that of its genre is first described, often also the political background and the institutional context, and in the process there are many historiographical tours de force—as with the section on “Contexts for the Paris Symphonies” (pp. 356–61), or the chapters on the great Mozart operas from Die Entführung onward. Indeed, these chapters are among the highlights of the book; read together with the corresponding chapters of Heartz’s book Mozart’s Operas (1990), they make most treatments of the subject seem somehow flat. That the author has an affinity for music theater (and since the time of his studies of Idomeneo, above all for Mozart’s music dramas) is already clear in the first main section, on Die Entführung. The plot summary here and
in later operatic chapters may occasionally seem rather extensive, but it allows one to visualize the staging very vividly; the analytical details are kept to the essentials, and the cross-references—here, above all to Idomeneo—are always enlightening, sometimes amazing, constituting detail studies for a reconstruction of Mozart’s musical language. On the other hand, the pronounced concentration in the analyses on tonal strategies initially takes some getting used to, and in fact its deeper meaning only shows itself in the discussion of Die Zauberflöte; this work “summarizes much of Mozart’s long-evolving use of tonality to denote specific emotional states” (p. 285).

One sees that the author is expecting readers to be attentive, to have long attention spans, and to possess a requisite amount of knowledge of the subject.

This becomes even clearer with regard to instrumental music. Here, too, accounts of individual works and of groups of works are in the foreground, always as a musically very sensitive and vivid description that one reads with great profit. Here too harmonic details play a noticeably prominent role, and many comparisons of details within the works of a composer’s œuvre and between the composers strengthen the tendency to separate the three “Classicists” from their compositional-historical context. This functions as a set-up for an experiment, but has its limits, when connections between genres are not sufficiently clear (as for example with the genre of the keyboard trio), or when the protagonists’ fundamental differences of compositional attitude (as for example in the opposition of Mozart’s six great quartets to their models by Haydn) recede too much behind similarities of detail. Generally speaking, with instrumental and vocal works alike, most of what is considered to be more or less common knowledge is silently assumed; this too is understandable, but it does not make reading easier when, for instance, the discussion of Mozart’s Requiem omits mention of its connections to Handel, or the account of Beethoven’s First Symphony says nothing about the earthshattering tonal strategy of its opening bars (or about the series of premonitions of this in Haydn).

But, when all is said and done, when one lays down this book, one has the impression of having participated almost directly in a conversation of the three composers, enshrined in their works, and led by a most distinctive sort of guide. If one again opens up the book, one is again immediately struck by the immediacy with which history is transformed into living narration. It is an account from a very unique perspective, “seen through a temperament” [Emile Zola, Mes haines: causeries littéraires et artistiques, 1866], and it is not the only possible and suitable account. But one might well say that it is an important account, an important historiographic accomplishment.


Simon P. Keefe, Mozart’s Requiem: Reception, Work, Completion
Reviewed by Erick Arenas

Mozart’s unfinished setting of the Requiem Mass arguably ranks as the most storied liturgical composition in the musical canon. The varied body of literature it has engendered since it first entered the concert repertoire at the dawn of the nineteenth century, in the version completed by Franz Xaver Süßmayr, includes enduring streams of critical inquiry and mythological explication, and items in between. Questions concerning its completion and authenticity have long dominated this literature, and the alternative completions of it that have appeared in recent decades have renewed mysteries and debates surrounding its compositional history. In Mozart’s Requiem, Simon Keefe moves beyond such questions to a broader perspective that accounts for the vitality of the Requiem’s romantic reception history and interrogates its impact on critical engagement with the work and aesthetic experience of it over the past two centuries.

The first three chapters are devoted to exploring reception issues as they developed around the traditional Süßmayr version (a summary of the known facts of the commissioning, composition, and completion of the work can be found in the introduction). Keefe convincingly argues that reception reveals “a fundamental feature of the Requiem’s ontological status, namely that our collective understandings of it derive from our imaginative (and often undifferentiated) engagement with fictional, quasi-fictional and factual circumstances of composition....” He shows how the Requiem legend that ties Mozart’s work to the circumstances of, and consciousness of, his own demise (and integrates further biographical anecdotes of varying authenticity) began to take hold soon after the composer’s death and resonated vividly in the nineteenth-century imagination and beyond.

Chapter 1 examines not only the emergence and development of this Requiem legend in the realm of musical commentary, but its expansion into the realms of fiction, drama, and poetry, thus demonstrating the breadth of its cultural influence. Manifestations of the legend on scholarly reception of the Requiem from the time of its publication to the present are charted in chapter 2. Here Keefe chronicles the rich critical history surrounding the Requiem’s aesthetics and authorship that was set in motion by Friedrich Rochlitz in 1801. This includes an examination of the Requiem-Streit of 1825–42 and a thoughtful consideration of the nineteenth-
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century “peaks and troughs” in Süßmayr’s reception as musical contributor, subjects familiar from Keefe’s essay “‘Die Ochsen am Berge’: Franz Xaver Süssmayr and the Orchestration of Mozart’s Requiem, K. 626,” (and the subsequent colloquy, “Finishing Mozart’s Requiem”) whose material is also recast in chapters 4 and 5.1

Chapter 3 turns to aspects of performance history and reception. Keefe begins with discussion of the most important nineteenth-century editions of the work, their relationships to the scholarly perspectives of the era, and their manifestations of the Requiem legend. He shows how in prominent, mainly liturgical, performances during the same period the storied work and lofty occasions were often mutually reinforced. Performances and performance strategies in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries continue to reflect the influence of the Requiem legend, as well as our collective desire to attach drama to the work. Keefe explains that because stories associated with the Requiem are intrinsic to our understanding of the work, “we need Requiem performances to tell us stories.”

In the second half of the book Keefe addresses the music itself, as produced by Mozart and his collaborators across centuries. Chapter 4 focuses on the sonic strategies and effects of the work as it is left in Mozart’s autograph score, the “document in which myths and musical realities collide,” suggesting new frames for appreciating and analyzing the work in its unfinished state. The next chapter offers a reappraisal of the Süßmayr’s completion of 1791-1792, including consideration of Joseph Eybler’s contribution. Keefe’s laudable rehabilitation of Süßmayr’s accomplishment exonerates him from the fault of not following compositional intentions that largely were not and are not knowable. In this process, Keefe sheds some needed light on the Viennese church-musical context of Mozart’s time. In chapter 6 he evaluates critically modern efforts at new completions, showing how they adapt, revise and discard Süßmayr’s contribution in various ways, but asserting that they can neither eliminate the accomplishment of the original completer nor substantiate Mozart’s unknown intentions.

Keefe’s call to a wider perspective on Mozart’s Requiem is a bold and thought provoking one. The work remains “a historical musicologist’s dream, [with] self-conscious nods to earlier works and traditions brilliantly re-imagined— and with rhetorical panache—in a new context,” as he describes just its opening measures. It still offers much to be studied contextually, including matters of ritual heritage and aesthetics, and links to repertorial precursors. Whether or not one agrees with Keefe’s assertion that our preoccupation with insoluble matters of authorship have “imprisoned the Requiem in an interpretive vortex...stunting hermeneutic growth and deadening our collective critical imagination,” his study admirably exposes a critical layer of the work’s history and meaning whose facets invite and deserve further study.


Salzburg Mozarteum Foundation Quartet: Music of Wolfgang Amadé Mozart on Mozart's Violin and Viola

Jordan Hall, Boston Early Music Festival, 10 June 2013
Reviewed by Paul Cornelson

The opening concert of the 2013 Boston Early Music Festival featured Mozart’s violin and viola, played by Amandine Beyer and Milos Valent, respectively, and accompanied by Kristian Bezuidenhout, fortepiano, plus Eric Hoeprich, baroque clarinet. The instruments belong to the Salzburg Mozarteum Foundation and are normally heard only at the Mozart Gewohnhaus, which also houses one of Mozart’s fortepianos. This was the first time the violin and viola have been brought to the United States, and the program showcased the instruments in various chamber music works.

The Mozarteum Foundation has three principal functions: 1) to manage two museums, the Gebrurtshaus (birthplace) and Gewohnhaus (residence) of the Mozart family, which serve as permanent exhibit halls for Mozart relics; 2) to present concerts, especially the Mozartwoche around the time of the composer’s birthday in late January; and 3) to conduct research on Mozart’s life and music. This concert brought all three aspects of its mission to light. The violin, falsely attributed to J. Stainer, was probably built in about 1700 in Mittenwald in southern Bavaria, most likely by the Klotz family of violin makers. Its provenance is fairly straightforward: having passed from Mozart’s sister Nannerl who gave it to the father of one of her students in 1820, it was eventually acquired, unaltered, by the Mozarteum in 1955, in time for the bicentennial celebrations of Mozart’s birth. The viola, made in northern Italy around 1700, has a slightly more complicated history: it was listed in Mozart’s estate catalogue and valued at only 4 gulden, and was purchased by a lawyer and amateur musician in Vienna. In the nineteenth century it was altered and repaired, and eventually came into the possession of the Earl of Spenser in Great Britain and came to the Mozarteum in 1966. Ulrich Leisinger, research director at the Mozarteum, describes the violin and viola as “good quality but not first-rank instruments.” (Boston Globe, 8 June 2013: http://www.bostonglobe.com/arts/music/2013/06/08/searching-for-mozart-sound-his-violin/2j9n0CYTaKrjU4zDuOZwAI/story.html)

Nevertheless, this was a great opportunity in Boston to hear the instruments that Mozart played and wrote for (the fortepiano was a copy of a Walter, c. 1785–95, made by R.J. Regier in Freeport, Maine, in 1998). The concert opened and closed with two of Mozart’s Op. 1, nos. 3 and 6, in C major and D major (K. 303 and 306). These accompanied sonatas for keyboard and violin, were written in Mannheim and Paris in 1777–78. From his letters home during this period, we know that Mozart traveled with his violin and performed reluctantly
on occasion, and that on 6 October 1777 from Munich he sent Nannerl a set of duets for keyboard and violin by Joseph Schuster, which Mozart thought were “not bad.” Mozart promised to write a set of six himself in the same popular style, and he fulfilled this pledge within the year. His six sonatas were engraved by Jean-Georges Sieber in Paris, dedicated and presented to keyboard-playing Electress Elisabeth Auguste in Munich in January 1779.

Unlike most of his contemporaries’ accompanied sonatas, the keyboard and violin have approximately equal roles in Mozart’s Op. 1; the keyboard was clearly the leading instrument in the earliest published works of the young Mozart (K. 6–15 and K. 26–31). The first movement of K. 303 has a composite construction with an Adagio followed by an Allegro molto, with embellishments (varied reprises) in the return of the Adagio. The second movement is a conventional Tempo di Menuetto. K. 306 has three movements, instead of two as in the other five pieces in the set. It opens with an Allegro con spirito, followed by a beautiful Andantino cantabile, and closes with an Allegretto in the form of a sonata-rondo. The violin had a delicate, even tone in the hands of Amandine Beyer, whether joking or serious, of Jacquin's "Kegelstatt" (skittles alley) dates from the mid-nineteenth century and appears to have been confused for the annotation Mozart wrote on the autograph of the Twelve Duos for two horns, K. 487, dated 27 July 1786 "untern Kegelscheiben" (while playing skittles). Nevertheless, the Trio K. 498 continues to be known by its nickname, but it certainly reflects the congeniality Mozart enjoyed with his friends. Indeed, the "conversation" between the instruments undoubtedly mimics the lively discussion, whether joking or serious, of Jacquin’s social circle. The instruments are treated as equals: the clarinet alternates the lead with the treble of the keyboard, and the viola plays the role either of an alto with the clarinet’s mezzo soprano, or a tenor with the keyboard's bass. Eric Hoeprich gave a supple reading on the clarinet, but the viola sounded a little wolfish at times, perhaps reflecting some of the rebuilding it suffered in the nineteenth century.

This defect was less apparent after the interval in the Duo for violin and viola in G major, K. 423. Mozart wrote two Duos (K. 423 and 424) during his last visit to Salzburg in the autumn of 1783 as a favor to Michael Haydn to fill out a set of six works for violin and viola. These works are pieces that Mozart and his father might have played together at home, and they were also likely performed for his former employer, Archbishop Colloredo. Here Beyer and Valent played in nearly perfect accord, and at times you had to marvel that there were only two instruments playing instead of three or four. The final Rondeau: Allegretto is especially gemütlich. No wonder Mozart has remained a popular and beloved composer.

Does Mozart’s music sound better on his own instruments? No, I think you would always prefer an excellent Stradivarius over these decent but lesser instruments. In particular, we can only imagine how brilliantly the viola would have sounded in Mozart’s hands, before its extensive restoration. But is it fairly certain that these did belong to Mozart, and therefore we are close to the sounds he imagined as he wrote his music. I would have liked to hear these works played in the Tanzmeistersaal in the Gewohnhaus in Salzburg, where the acoustics would be more appropriate than Jordan Hall. But it was a treat to hear Mozart’s violin and viola in such a diverse and imaginative program.

For further reading, I can recommend the collection of essays edited by Martin Harlow, Mozart's Chamber Music with Keyboard (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
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Erick Arenas is a recent graduate of the Ph.D. program in musicology at Stanford University, where he completed a dissertation titled “Johann Michael Haydn and the Orchestral Solemn Mass in Eighteenth-Century Vienna and Salzburg.” His secondary interests include studies in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century symphonic music and the performance of Gregorian chant and Renaissance polyphony. Currently he teaches courses in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century music at the San Francisco Conservatory of Music.

Paul Corneilson is vice president of MSA and managing editor of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Works.

Enrique Oliver, M.D., FRCPC [Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Canada], is an anesthesiologist who lives in Gatineau, Québec. He is a patron of the Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum (ISM) in Salzburg. Since 2007 he has been collaborating with the ISM in collecting books in the same editions that were once in Mozart’s library, hoping that Mozarteans may have a better understanding of the composer’s mind when they see copies of his books.
Mozart portraits have been garnering a lot of attention in 2013. The Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum Salzburg, which owns the most important collection of Mozart portraits, has extended through the end of October an exhibition in the Mozart-Wohnhaus entitled “Mozart-Bilder - Bilder Mozarts,” including material on loan from public and private collections elsewhere in Europe. This has led to reevaluations of several items (announced on the Mozarteum’s website on 11 January). The curators of the exhibition have accepted a miniature on the lid of a snuffbox that may date from about 1783 as a “new” authentic portrait of Mozart. Also in the exhibition is a large ink drawing from about 1770 of a musical performance that the Mozarteum acquired in June at an auction by the Librairie Henri Godts of Brussels (announced on the website on 8 July). Though no longer thought to have a particular connection with Mozart, the drawing has been widely reproduced and discussed as a document of performance practice. Meanwhile, Martin Braun has announced that he has authenticated a portrait of the eight-year-old Mozart using biometrical techniques: http://www.neuroscience-of-music.se/ormen/Fruhstorfer%20Mozart.htm. An extended evaluation of the drawing in the Mozarteum by Dexter Edge appears at http://michaelorenz.blogspot.com.au/2013/08/not-mozart-not-zoffany-so-what.htm. Doubtless there will be further discussion of all these items.

Mozart’s violin and viola made their first appearances in the U.S. at the Boston Early Music Festival in June; a review by Paul Corneilson of the concert in which they were played appears elsewhere in this Newsletter.

The MSA sponsored a panel, “Mozart Revealed,” in the Stanley H. Kaplan Penthouse of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York on 17 August in connection with the Mostly Mozart Festival. Panelists were Samuel Breene, Edmund J. Goehring, and Martin Nedbal, with Peter A. Hoyt as moderator.

The Mozartwoche 2014, sponsored by the Mozarteum, will take place in Salzburg on 23 January–2 February. Besides Mozart, the performances will feature the music of Christoph Willibald von Gluck, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, Muzio Clementi, Richard Strauss, and Arvo Pärt. Featured works include the original 1762 version of Gluck’s Orfeo ed Euridice and Mozart’s 1788 arrangement of Bach’s Die Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu. Website: http://www.mozarteum.at/konzerte/mozartwoche.html

Two conferences of interest in early 2014 will take place in U.S. cities that retain a strong sense of their eighteenth-century origins. The Society for Eighteenth-Century Music and the Haydn Society of North America will present a conference at Moravian College (with support from Kutztown University) in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, on 28 February–2 March: http://secm.org/links/events.html. MSA and SECM paper sessions at the ASECS meeting in Williamsburg, Virginia, 20–23 March, are listed elsewhere in this issue.

---

**BOOKS**


Mozart at ASECS 2014

The American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies will hold its 2014 Annual Meeting in Williamsburg, Virginia on 20–23 March. MSA is sponsoring two paper sessions and the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music is sponsoring another of interest. Below are the topics; more details will appear in the next issue of this Newsletter.

“Mozart and Modernity” (Mozart Society of America)
Edmund J. Goehring
This session explores some of the ways that the concerns of modernity have shaped present-day Mozart criticism. One place to start is T. J. Clark’s declaration that “modernism turns on the impossibility of transcendence.” That idea captures the ethos of some prominent critical studies of Mozart, whether regarding entire repertories (especially the operas), individual works (as, for example, Figaro’s famous last-act finale as a kind of failure to achieve reconciliation), or a general disenchantment that comes through the commodification of Mozart.

Papers are invited from a range of disciplines and can encompass anything from interpretations of individual works to reflections on premises and definitions. What are the gains of a modernist approach to Mozart? What are the losses? What are the consequences for an appreciation of Mozart against this broader shift in aesthetic appreciation, a shift where the focus goes from beauty, taste, and pleasure to criticism and meaning? These are some of the questions that might be pursued but form nothing like an exhaustive list.

“Mozart and his Situation” (Mozart Society of America)
Jessica Waldoff and Peter A. Hoyt
Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart is so central to current thought on music that his position in the eighteenth century is easily misrepresented, causing him to be regarded as a massive object around which other composers can only orbit. This session invites papers that help more accurately situate Mozart in his milieu, either by providing new perspectives on his life and works or by exploring other aspects of contemporaneous culture.

“Production and Reception of European Music in the Eighteenth-Century Americas” (Society for Eighteenth-Century Music) Dianne Lehmann Goldman
This panel seeks to bring a trans-Atlantic view to the composition, performance, and reception of eighteenth-century European musical genres and styles in the Americas (including English, French, and Spanish territories). This methodology includes such sub-fields as literary history, art history, performance and gender studies, as well as musicology. Indeed, when considering music produced and performed in the Americas it is important to also take into account aspects of economics and trade, geography, and the differing religions in each area. I believe such a wide-ranging topic would be of interest to many cohorts of scholars and would address the aims of the Society well. Ideally, the four-paper panel will include one presentation each about English, Spanish, and French America and a paper that features the music of eighteenth-century Williamsburg as the fourth presentation.
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