**President’s Message**

**Paul Corneilson**

I will keep my message brief, since the fall Newsletter is jam-packed with information. As we celebrate our 20th anniversary this fall, I am especially pleased that our founding president, Isabelle Emerson, has shared her thoughts on the Society’s beginnings. On Friday, November 4, in Vancouver, we have planned a special business meeting and study session (see announcements for details), followed by a champagne-and-dessert reception. I hope that many of you will be able to join us and raise a glass to our first two decades, as we start planning for the next ones.

In addition to the two feature articles by Kathryn Libin and Dorothea Link, and reviews by Edmund Goehring and Christopher Lynch, you can read about the new Heartz Endowment, plans for a conference next October at the University of Western Ontario, and a spotlight on our student representative Emily Wuchner (who has agreed to become the reviews editor for the Newsletter). Rather than publishing an annual bibliography of recent Mozart studies in the Newsletter, we will be updating this regularly on our website, thanks to the efforts of our website editor, Adeline Mueller.

“**Twenty Years After**” by Isabelle Emerson

Life before the Mozart Society was a bit like life before the internet. That was a world packed with information about Mozart news, music, performances, festivals—but how to get at it? Sit in the library for hours, looking through newspaper and journal indexes, guides to current literature? The Mitteilungen published by the Salzburg Mozarteum were helpful—if you could read German, and if you were fortunate enough to live in the eastern half of the United States or near one of the two institutions west of the Mississippi that subscribed. Of course, by the time you found the sought-after information, it was out of date.

The then-and-now contrast struck me vividly when I visited the Mozart Society website a few days ago. Links to useful sites yielded information in a single click: a calendar of events around the world, a bibliography of works in English, lists of Mozart organizations, projects. One of the most exciting is the link to the Digital Mozart Edition, a joint project of the International Mozarteum Foundation and the Packard Humanities Institute (all available in the original language and in English). No more trips to the library—do it online! No more piles of books and notes surrounding me and my desk. Just my laptop and me!

But in 1996 it was very different. Moreover, though many...
Announcements

MSA’s 20th-Anniversary Study Session at AMS
Join us on Friday evening, November 4 at AMS for a special roundtable discussion during the 20th-anniversary business meeting of the Mozart Society of America. The roundtable is called “The Future of Mozart Studies: Researching, Teaching, and Performing Mozart,” and will take place from 8:30 to 9:30 as part of the business meeting from 8:00 to 10:00 p.m. Six musicologists will converse about new directions in their work in which the domains of research, teaching, and performing are productively informing one another. Moderated by Adeline Mueller (Mount Holyoke College), the panel includes Emily Dolan (Harvard University), Joseph Fort (King’s College London), Mary Hunter (Bowdoin College), Estelle Joubert (Dalhousie University), Nicholas Mathew (University of California, Berkeley), Roger Moseley (Cornell University), and Martin Nedbal (University of Kansas). From modern minuet performance practice to Mozart operas on screen, from nineteenth-century Prague to twenty-first-century video games, we will consider the opportunities and challenges for integrated Mozart research in the digital age. The roundtable will conclude with a Q&A with the audience. After the roundtable, stick around for a celebratory champagne-and-dessert reception.

The Daniel Heartz Endowment
In July of 2015 Daniel Heartz, Professor Emeritus of Music at the University of California, Berkeley, made a gift of $10,000 to the Mozart Society of America—of which he is a founding member, in furtherance of our current publication projects, but also with the hope that it would serve as seed money for an ongoing fund in support of Mozart scholarship. Accordingly, as our Society celebrates its twentieth anniversary, we are launching a major fundraising campaign with the aim of forming an endowment, named in Prof. Heartz’s honor, which will be used primarily to support publications by the Society and research by younger scholars on Mozart and music of the late eighteenth century. Our goal at this point is to match Professor Heartz’s gift—a goal that, if achieved, would mean an initial endowment of $20,000. Thus far his colleagues, friends, former students, and members of the MSA Board of Directors have responded generously, and we hope that other member of the Society, too, will follow our example, thereby encouraging scholarship on Mozart and his contemporaries, and paying tribute to Dan and thanking him for his generosity to the MSA.

Bruce Alan Brown
John A. Rice
Co-chairs, Heartz Endowment

Conference Announcement: Mozart and Modernity
The Mozart Society of America’s seventh biennial conference will take place from October 20 to 22, 2017, at the University of Western Ontario. The theme of the conference, “Mozart and Modernity,” aims to bring together scholars from a range of disciplines to address questions about the place of Mozart’s music in the modern world. A more specific focus might be how an appreciation of his music, which relies so much on convention and beauty, can be sustained in a modern critical climate where beauty and convention have lost some of their authority. Other topics may include, but need not be limited to, Mozart and theories of creativity, recent stagings of his operas, analytical methods, historiography, and so on.

In addition to the standard slate of free papers, this conference will offer several special events. On the eve of the conference itself (Thursday, October 19), Robert B. Pippin, of the University of Chicago, will speak on Hitchcock and modernism. We have tentatively arranged for a representative of the Don Juan Archiv in Vienna to discuss the work of that private foundation. There will also be a concert offered by UWO’s resident piano quartet, Made in Canada, which will offer a program pairing the G-minor Piano Quartet with Jean Lesage’s 2006 piano trio, “Le projet Mozart.”

For further information, please contact Edmund Goehring at egoehrin@uwo.ca.
composers—Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Liszt, Scriabin, Bernard Herrmann—enjoyed dedicated societies that facilitated distribution of information, there was nothing for Mozart. Was this possible? I searched diligently but found nothing. I went to the AMS regional meeting in Claremont, California, and inquired timidly about the existence of a Mozart society in America; encouraged by the negative responses, I proposed creating one. The response was not entirely discouraging but accompanied by gentle smiles and not very hearty wishes of “good luck.”

The account of its founding on the MSA website gives the impression that thirty-four scholars came together fortuitously, and, voilà, there it was. The reality was that I spent the summer of 1996 contacting every living American scholar who had ever published anything about Mozart. I sent out letters and I talked for hours on the telephone—with Virginia Hancock, who worked with the Brahms Society (founded 1983) and who gave me reams of useful information; with Alessandra Comini, who encouraged me in my lowest moments and gave excellent practical advice about How To Do It; with people I had written who called to find out more about the venture. Neal Zaslaw, after “groaning” at the thought of a newsletter that would add to “the flood of Mozart publications,” became one of the most articulate and enthusiastic supporters. His initial reaction forced me to clarify and specify what I saw as the real need for such an organization.

It was a long hot summer, but by November I had a cohort of allies and a room at the national AMS meeting in Baltimore. At noon on November 8, 1996, Ed Goehring, Jane Perry-Camp, Jane Stevens, Neal Zaslaw, and I entered this room, which was filled with musicologists. There were only thirty, but it seemed like a crowd. Neal called the meeting to order and nominated me to be acting chair. Jane Stevens spoke to the objectives and goals of the new society. After approval by those present, I read the following:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that an organization, the Mozart Society of America for the advancement of research about the life and works of Mozart and the late eighteenth-century context, and the dissemination of information about study and performance of relevant music, should now be formed.

The resolution was approved; bylaws were distributed and approved. A provisional board was presented: Thomas Baumman, Emerson, Goehring, Gordana Lazarevich, Daniel Leeson, Perry-Camp, Elaine Sisman, Stevens, and Zaslaw. I was asked to be president, Goehring volunteered to be secretary, Leeson treasurer, and Stevens vice-president, to serve until the new Society was ready to hold regular elections. During the lively discussion that followed, Jan LaRue proposed a session at the 1997 AMS meeting; Christoph Wolff spoke about relations with Salzburg Mozartists; Jane Perry-Camp urged us to seek affiliate status with the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies. A biannual newsletter was proposed for which Ed Goehring agreed to serve as editor. The meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m., having given birth to the Mozart Society of America!

The first year was tumultuous, exciting, and filled with achievements. The original group of thirty-four members had grown by August 1997 to over one hundred. Christoph Wolff arranged a gift from David Packard of facsimiles of a Mozart aria fragment to be sent to the first two hundred members. Jane Perry-Camp led the new Society to affiliate status with ASECS, the Society was granted 501(c)(3) status, a website was established, Jane Stevens organized lively sessions at AMS and ASECS national meetings, and Ed Goehring created the Newsletter of the Mozart Society of America in a format that endured for twenty years. The January 2000 issue presented the first-known reproduction of an autograph of the recitative “Tutto è disposto” from Le nozze di Figaro, courtesy of the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries. Permission to publish the autograph was obtained by Daniel Leeson, who prepared the inventory of Mozart manuscripts in the San Francisco Bay area.

Five years later, the first MSA biennial conference took place on my home turf, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Led by Mary Sue Morrow, the meeting included a visit to the Liberace Museum, an afternoon of instruction in eighteenth-century dance, a lecture-recital by fortepianist David Breitman, and concluded with a banquet and ball in good eighteenth-century style. Subsequent conferences have taken place at Cornell University, Indiana University, the Santa Fe Opera, Prague, and most recently Tufts University. Since 2013, initiated by Peter Hoyt, the Society has presented a panel session during New York City’s Mostly Mozart Festivals. With the 2011 publication, generously supported by Daniel Heartz, of The Autobiography of Ludwig Fischer: Mozart’s First Osman, by Paul Cornelison, the Society first realized the early intention of producing monographs of special interest to Mozartists. Again with Daniel’s support, this vision has now been further carried out with the publication of Lisa de Alwi’s Anti-Da Ponte (which first appeared in the MSA Newsletter, vol. 12, nos. 1–2, vol. 13, no. 1).

As I look back over the early years, certain moments of grace stand out:
Jan LaRue’s exuberant delight at the founding meeting
Bathia Churgin saying to me simply “Thank you for doing this”
Dan Heartz giving me a kiss on the cheek and saying “Thank you” during a meeting at Notre Dame
Christoph Wolff’s unfailing helpfulness amid his busy life
The willingness of so many people to give time and energy and wisdom to nurture the Society.

We sent copies to Oliver Neighbour of the first Newsletter with its elegant dedication to Alan Tyson composed by Neal Zaslaw. Neighbour wrote me that he took it to Tyson, already so ill, hoping that he could perhaps make him realize that “somebody, somewhere, has said nice things about him.” He added, “Alan's friends everywhere will be both pleased at and touched by your Society's generous words.”

The very rapidity of its growth in those first years speaks eloquently to the need for the Mozart Society, and no doubt added momentum to the quickly following establishment of the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music and the Haydn Society of North America.

The Society has grown with the times. After twenty years, it is refreshing to see a new design for the Newsletter. I applauded the move from the Newsletter to the website of the calendar of events and the bibliography of writings in English, enabling both to be updated as needed. The Newsletter has published from time to time descriptions of Mozart manuscripts in North American locations; there was talk of collecting these into a monograph. Perhaps this “Census” of Mozart in North America would be an appropriate successor to Anti-Da Ponte.

Today—Twenty Years After—the internet has opened undreamed-of means for research. We can go online and visit library collections all around the world; we can examine online any volume of the Neue Mozart-Ausgabe; we can discover in a flash all the most recent publications. The Mozart Society has come of age in a world of ever-growing ease and speed of communication. It is good to know that the Society has contributed to the expansion of frontiers in the world of Mozart while at the same time profiting from and growing with this new world.

The first issue of the Newsletter presented a Guest Column by Daniel Heartz (reprinted on p. 16 of this issue). He concluded, quoting Idomeneo, “O me felice!” and rejoiced to “have lived to see an age in which the music of Mozart is no less loved and honored than that of Beethoven. The founding of a Mozart Society of America testifies to the seriousness of purpose with which we now take our favorite composer.”

I say, with Dan and Idomeneo, “O me felice!”—here’s to the next twenty years!

Isabelle Emerson is professor emerita at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Her research has centered on Mozart and eighteenth-century music, but she has written and lectured about a number of other topics. From 1997 to 2002, she directed seminars for the Santa Fe Opera. Emerson earned her B.A. at Barnard College, Master’s in Sacred Music at Union Theological Seminary, and Ph.D. in musicology at Columbia University. Organ study with Searle Wright at Columbia was followed by a Fulbright grant to study with Helmut Walcha in Germany. She served as president of the MSA from 1996 to 2007 and as editor of this Newsletter from 2007 to 2010.

Introducing Emily Wuchner

The MSA is pleased to introduce Emily Wuchner, a new student representative on the board. She will also serve as Reviews Editor for the Newsletter beginning with the Spring 2017 issue. Emily is a PhD candidate in musicology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. In July, she successfully defended her dissertation, “The Tonkünstler-Societät and the Oratorio in Vienna, 1771–1798,” and she anticipates graduating in December. The first half of her dissertation considers the organization of the Tonkünstler-Societät (a musician’s pension society) and its role in Viennese concert life, while the second half surveys some of the oratorios and cantatas commissioned by the Society. She received a Eugene K. Wolf travel fellowship through the AMS to support her dissertation research. She has presented her work at the conferences of the AMS Midwest chapter and the Mozart Society of America. She earned her bachelor’s degree in journalism and music from Murray State University (Kentucky) and spent a summer interning in Vienna at the Mozarthaus and the Haus der Musik, before beginning work on her masters in musicology degree at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. For five years, she held a teaching assistantship at the University of Illinois and she has served as editor of the UI School of Music alumni magazine, Sonorities. She frequently performs on bassoon and contrabassoon with orchestras and bands throughout central Illinois.
Mozart’s “Batti, batti, o bel Masetto” Performed in London in 1789

Dorothea Link

Mozart's mature operas were slow to reach the London stage—La clemenza di Tito in 1806, Così fan tutte and Die Zauberflöte in 1811, Le nozze di Figaro in 1812, Don Giovanni in 1817, and Die Entführung aus dem Serail in 1827. During the 1780s and 90s, however, Londoners sometimes heard individual numbers from Mozart's operas in the form of insertion numbers in other composers' operas. The first of these, as reported by Alfred Loewenberg in 1943, was the duet “Cruel! perché finora” from Le nozze di Figaro, performed by Nancy Storace and Francesco Benucci in Gazzaniga's La vendemmia on May 9, 1789. In what follows I would like to draw attention to another Mozart number performed in the same opera, the aria “Batti, batti, o bel Masetto” from Don Giovanni.

The duet “Cruel! perché finora” was inserted into the London libretto of La vendemmia in act 2, scene 5. As Loewenberg points out, the dramatic situation at that point is similar to that in Le nozze di Figaro that “there was no need to change the words at all.” The decision to import the duet into the opera was a good one. The Morning Post, May 11, 1789, referred to it as “Mozart's delicious duet” and in a second review on May 18 reported, “The charming duet of Mozart was encored.” The duet was evidently popular enough for Stephen Storace to have it printed in full score by Birchall & Andrews, which, as Loewenberg observes, was the only number in the opera to be published.

The next instance of a borrowing from Mozart reported by Loewenberg occurred in Francesco Bianchi's La villanella rapita, produced on February 27, 1790. Largely a pasticcio by then, the opera incorporated, among other imported music, four Mozart numbers: the trio “Mandina amabile,” K. 480, and the quartet “Dite almeno, in che mancai,” K. 479, both of which Mozart had composed for insertion into Bianchi’s opera for its 1785 Vienna production; the aria “Deh vieni, non tardar” from Le nozze di Figaro; and “Batti, batti, o bel Masetto.” Of the four numbers, in all of which Nancy Storace as Mandina sang, only “Deh vieni, non tardar” was rewritten for her. The part of Mandina in the trio and quartet had been composed for Celeste Coltellini and “Batti, batti” had been composed for Caterina Bondini, while in Vienna it was sung by Luisa Laschi Mombelli. Loewenberg observes that the words of “Deh vieni, non tardar” were altered somewhat to fit the new dramatic situation, but he makes no mention of changes in “Batti, batti, o bel Pippetto.” Indeed, the dramatic situation is almost identical to that in Don Giovanni. Pippo has found Mandina in the count’s residence dressed in fine clothes, and she seeks to mollify him. Consequently the text is largely untouched, save for the substitution of the characters' names and a gratuitous restatement of the varied line “Pace, pace o vita mia.” I have shown the changes in italics in my transcription from the libretto. The restatement of “Pace, pace o vita mia” distorts the poetic form and probably resulted from a mechanical copying of the words in the score (compare to the Da Ponte text on page 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batti batti o bel Pippetto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La tua povera Mandina;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starò qui come agnellina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le tue botte ad aspettar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasciò tracciammi il crine,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasciò cavarmi gli occhi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E le care tue manine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieta poi saprò bacciar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah lo vedo non hai core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace, pace caro sposo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace, pace vita mia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In contenti, ed allegria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notte, e di vogliam passar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reviews of the opera all single out Mozart's music in some way. The Public Advertiser, for March 1, 1790, informs its readers that the music in the pasticcio was composed not only by Bianchi and “Hogart” (Mozart), as initially announced, but also by “Martini” (Vicente Martín y Soler) and “Painello” (Paisiello). The Times for March 1, 1790, reports, “The music of Bianchi and Mozart, with the assistance of Signora Storace, could not command but two encores, her song in the first act, and the duet with Borselli in the second—these, with the finale of the first, and quintette in the second, were the only White Boars of the evening worth notice.” The review in The Morning Herald for March 1, 1790, evidently written by a Mozart fan, provides further details:

All the music of the opera deserving celebrity is by Mozart . . . . To the merit of this favourite singer [Storace], all the success the Opera experienced is also to be attributed. The air, by Mozart, ‘Bella rosa porporina’ and the trio by the same master, in which Storace and Mussini took a pre-eminent lead, with another air, may be adduced in proof. In the second act, Mozart's music equally challenged approbation, particularly the quintette [sic], ‘Dite almeno in che maniera [sic]’ . . . Another noticeable performance was ‘Occhietto forbetto’; but this we have heard, in Allegrianti’s time, executed much better. The composer of this popular duet is the present Martini.
We can flesh out what the reviews said with a bit more information. Eisen already questioned the attribution of “Bella rosa porporina” to Mozart and, indeed, a search in RISM reveals that the aria forms part of the original Bianchi opera. So the first of the two pieces that were encored was not by Mozart after all. As we already know, neither was the second, the duet “Occhietto furbetto” from Martín y Soler’s L’arbore di Diana (1787), sung by Storace and Fausto Borselli as Pippo in act 2, scene 5. While the reviewer in The Morning Herald correctly named the composer, he was mistaken about having heard it previously sung by Allegranti, for, as Price, Milhous, and Hume point out, Allegranti had left London four years before the duet was even composed. The Times and The Morning Herald are both in agreement about the pre-eminence of the “quintetto,” by which they mean the quartet, “Dite almeno in che manci.” The reviewer in the latter newspaper also makes favorable mention of the trio, “Mandina amabile,” in act 1, scene 3, performed largely by Storace and Nicolò Mussini as the Conte. The reviewer further praises an unnamed “air” composed by Mozart and sung by Storace. He seems to say it occurred in the first act, although both Mozart arias occur in the second act, “Deh vieni” in act 2, scene 2, and “Batti, batti” in act 2, scene 3, so we do not know which aria he meant.

None of the reviewers mentions having previously heard “Batti, batti,” although if they had attended the 1789 production of La vendemmia they would have done so. In act 2, scene 11, Agatina (Storace) has just reassured the gluttonous Conte Zefiro (Benucci) that he is not going to die, because the lemonade he has just drunk was not poisoned after all. She then diverts attention to herself, complaining about the Marchese’s poor opinion of her and then launching into a woe-is-me type of aria. The adjusted text is presented below, followed by the original Da Ponte text.

For some reason the order of putting out the eyes and pulling out the hair is reversed in the revised text. The important change, however, lies in the third quatrain, which has been rewritten to show the culmination of Agatina’s despair. This contrasts with Da Ponte’s text, where Zerlina joyfully sees that Masetto has forgiven her. Mozart’s musical setting of the text distinguishes between the two affects expressed therein, Zerlina’s coy submissiveness followed by their reconciliation, by portraying the first as a gavotte in 2/4 and the second as a pastorale in 6/8. Ever sensitive to the text, Mozart begins the pastorale only with “Pace pace,” the second line of the final quatrain, setting the first line “Ah lo vedo non hai core” as a transitional passage at the end of the 2/4 section to lead into the 6/8 section. Mozart now has to repeat the quatrain’s second line to give himself enough text to compose four musical phrases. The question then arises: how was the aria performed in London? Was the entire aria sung with the new words replacing Da Ponte’s in the 6/8 section, despite

---

Aria text in La vendemmia

Batte, batte in petto il core  
Della povera Agatina,  
Sventurata, poverina,  
Non so più quel che ho da far.  
Lascierò cavarmi gli occhi  
Lascierò stracciarmi ’l crine?  
E le care sue manine  
Lieta poi dovrò baciar?  
Pace pace ah più non spero,  
Troppò è ’l Ciel funesto e nero,  
Il piacer ed il contento  
In tormento ha da cangiar.

(The heart in poor Agatina’s breast beats [wildly], / unfortunate one, poor thing; / I no longer know what I ought to do. / Do I let my eyes be put out? / Do I let my hair be torn out? / And then should I gladly / kiss his dear hands? / Peace, of peace no more do I hope, / Heaven is too dismal and black, / pleasure and contentment / have changed to torment.)

---

Aria text in Don Giovanni

Batti batti, o bel Masetto,  
La tua povera Zerlina:  
Starò qui come Agnellina  
Le tue botte ad aspettar.  
Lascierò straziarmi il crine,  
Lascierò cavarmi gli occhi,  
E le care tue manine  
Lieta poi saprò baciare  
Ah lo vedo, non hai core:  
Pace pace o vita mia,  
In contenti, ed allegria  
Notte e di vogliam passar.

(Beat me, dear Masetto, / beat your poor Zerlina: / I will stand here like a little lamb / waiting for your blows. / I will let you tear out my hair, / I will let you put out my eyes, / and your dear hands / gladly then I will kiss. / Ah, I see you do not have the heart: / Peace, peace, oh my life, / in contentment and joy / we will pass night and day.)
the incongruity of affects between the words and the music? Perhaps not. Conceivably Storace could have sung only the 2/4 section of the aria, with the new words of the third quatrainsubstituting for those of the first quatrains at the da caporesstatement of the opening in measures 37–52, and the aria would have ended there. However the aria was performed, it was probably unsatisfactory, which might explain why Storace reused it the following season in La villanella rapita, with both the words and music retained from the original in a matching dramatic situation.

Dorothea Link teaches at the University of Georgia. Her principal research project, on Mozart’s singers, has resulted in numerous publications, including The National Court Theatre in Mozart’s Vienna: Sources and Documents, 1783–1792; Arias for Nancy Storace; Arias for Francesco Benucci; Arias for Vincenzo Calvesi; and Arias for Stefano Mandini. She has also written on Mozart’s appointment to the Viennese court, and her essay “The Fandango Scene in Mozart’s Le nozze di Figaro,” which appeared in Journal of the Royal Musical Association, won the Marjorie Weston Emerson Award in 2010.

NOTES
3. See page 72 of the libretto, which is all that survives of the production’s performance material. “LA VENDEMMIA. / A / NEW COMIC OPERA, / IN TWO ACTS. / As performed at the / KING’S THEATRE, in the / HAY-MARKET. THE MUSIC ENTIRELY NEW, / BY SIGNOR GAZZANIGHA, / UNDER THE DIRECTION OF / Mr. MAZZINGHI. / LONDON: PRINTED BY L. WAYLAND, DOGWELL-COURT, WHITE / FRIARS, FLEET STREET. –1789.” Eighteenth-Century Collections Online, Gale Databases, accessed through the University of Georgia Library, July 22, 2016.
9. MDL, 320.
10. Eisen, 151.
11. Ibid.
12. Répertoire International des Sources Musicales, RISM series A/II, www.rism.info, shows that the Sächsische Landesbibliothek—Staats- and Universitätssbibliothek (D-DI) owns a score of the opera (RISM ID 270001377), which was copied from the Venice performance score. The cavatina “Bella rosa porpora” occurs in act 1, item 11. It is in A major, in 6/8 meter, and marked andantino grazioso.
13. Price, Milhous, and Hume, 431 n. 2. On page 429 the authors report another possible “sighting” of “Batti, batti,” in I due castellani burlati, produced on February 2, 1790. Their argument, however, is unconvincing. They quote the opening four lines, beginning with “Pace, pace, bel mostaccio,” of a longer text that they say was set as a trio. While these four lines bear a superficial resemblance to the opening four lines of “Batti, batti” by virtue of sharing the same poetic meter, in their affect they correspond only to the final three lines of the Da Ponte poem (“Pace, pace”), which of course Mozart set to different music from the “Batti, batti” part of the aria.
14. La vendemmia, 87. The English version of the dual-texted libretto has a completely different aria text here, suggesting that “Batti, batti” was a late and apparently not well thought-out substitute aria. “My heart is in a strange agitation—I don’t know what I can do—if I stay / here, I am sure the lady will do me / some mischief. As to my passion for / the Marquis, I have no hopes of suc- / cess; and therefore every considera- / tion induces me to / depart.” La vendemmia, 86, 89.
The Musical Notenbuch of Countess Wilhelmine von Uhlfeld
Kathryn L. Libin

Mozart and Countess Thun
At the height of a busy spring season in 1784, when Mozart sent his father a list of subscribers to his private concerts in Vienna that March and April, among the nearly 175 names one finds “Comtesse Thun née d’Ulfeld.” The list of names is impressive, representing a fair proportion of the upper nobility resident in Vienna at the time. Mozart knew quite a few of them personally, having performed in their palaces, in some cases—such as those of Esterházy and Galitzin—on numerous occasions. As early as 1762, while in Vienna with their father, Mozart and his sister had performed at the Uhlfeld house. It is unknown whether Countess Thun, who had then been married for a year, was present on that occasion. But in 1784 Mozart’s relationship with Countess Thun might be characterized as something rather more personal than purely that of a professional contact, though there is no doubt she was helpful in promoting his career. When he first mentions her three years earlier, shortly after his arrival in Vienna, he uses warm language, calling her “the most charming, dearest lady that I’ve seen in all my life; and I mean a lot to her as well.” The facts of Mozart’s relationship with Countess Thun are well established, so we need not rehearse them at length; but throughout his early months in Vienna her name recurs frequently in his letters, as he dines regularly at her house, performs for her, attends concerts with her, plays through new music for her, receives her advice, etc. Clearly her friendship and support meant a great deal to him during a period when he had a fateful decision to make about the course of his career, and were no doubt influential in convincing him that he had a future in Vienna.

In June 1781 Mozart lent the countess a copy of his score for Idomeneo, along with a libretto. She lent him a piano, which he used in his famous duel with Clementi at court in December 1781, and perhaps in other public appearances before he acquired his own concert instrument. Though Mozart’s many social visits to the countess may have dwindled after his marriage, with her name appearing much less frequently in his correspondence—indeed, the 1784 list of subscribers is the last instance of her name in the Mozart letters—there can be no doubt that she remained a strong supporter of Mozart and his music until his death. Mozart’s success as a composer and performer depended very much on the good will and active patronage of that group of musical connoisseurs, many of them amateur musicians of some accomplishment. In the case of Countess Thun, Mozart’s use of both her married and maiden names sets her within a familial context, and reminds us that her own cultivation of music developed out of a significant musical heritage extending back for some generations.

Maria Wilhelmine von Uhlfeld and Her Family
Maria Wilhelmine von Uhlfeld was born in 1744 in the palace of her father, Anton Corfiz von Uhlfeld (1699–1770), on the Minoritenplatz in Vienna. Count Uhlfeld had served in the diplomatic corps early in his career, and later held the lofty court position of Obersthofmeister, which entailed many responsibilities connected with supervision of the imperial residences, including the court theatre and ceremonial functions. According to Charles Burney, Count Uhlfeld employed musicians, including the young violinist Franz Benda and the famous cellist Francesco Alborea, who was also the count’s teacher; apparently the three played trios together. In 1743 Count von Uhlfeld married Princess Maria Elisabeth von Lobkowitz (1726–86), daughter of the fourth Prince Lobkowitz, Philipp Hyacinth (1680–1734), and his second wife Anna Maria Wilhelmine von Althan (1703–54); on this side of the family a wide range of intensive interests in music can be documented. Both of Wilhelmine von Uhlfeld’s maternal grandparents were noted lutenists, well known for their cultivation of sophisticated courtly music; Silvius Leopold Weiss was among the musicians with whom they studied, and an extensive lute repertoire, including their own compositions, survives to this day in the family library. After the death of Philipp Hyacinth in 1734, his widow married a distant relative, Joseph Gundacker von Althan (1665–1747), and moved with her children into his palace across from the Augustine church. The Lobkowitz Palace, as it is known today, had been renovated by Count Althan in the years before his marriage; he also commissioned glorious ceiling frescoes, depicting the liberal arts and sciences, for the hall that would one day provide the backdrop for the première of Beethoven’s Eroica Symphony. It is thought that the young Gluck, whose father had been employed by the Lobkowitz family in Bohemia, may have begun his career by playing in the Althan Palace in Vienna in 1735–36.

In this magnificent setting with its many musical events Maria Elisabeth would grow up along with her two brothers, Wenzel Ferdinand (1723–39, briefly fifth Prince Lobkowitz) and Ferdinand Philipp (1724–84, sixth Prince). At this point we still know little about the musical education of Maria Elisabeth, but the musical activities of her brother, Ferdinand Philipp, are better known. He seems to have been not only a musical enthusiast but also a capable composer. It is believed that he studied violin with Gluck as a youth in Vienna, and may also have accompanied Gluck to Milan. He spent two
years, 1745–46, in London, where Burney saw him at all the opera rehearsals conducted by Geminiani at the King's Theatre in the Haymarket in April 1745; here he also heard Handel's oratorios, an enthusiasm for which his son, the seventh Prince Lobkowitz, would share. Later he became an intimate of Frederick the Great during lengthy sojourns at Berlin, where he reportedly continued his violin studies with Franz Benda and befriended C. P. E. Bach. He and Bach supposedly composed a symphony together, alternating measures; Burney, who saw some of his compositions, including a piece for two orchestras, at Countess Thun's in 1772, said that he composed “in a superior manner.”

It is worth noting that Maria Elisabeth and Ferdinand Philipp also had a Lobkowitz uncle and two cousins who were deeply involved with music. The uncle, Georg Christian (1686–1755), was Austrian governor of Lombardy and a patron of Gluck's in Milan. Their cousin August (1729–1803) hosted many concerts at his palace in Prague, and Joseph Maria Karl (1724–1802) did the same in Vienna. Indeed, the name of the latter gentleman also appears on Mozart's 1784 subscription list, along with that of Countess Thun's sister Elisabeth (1747–91), married to Count Waldstein.

It was into this family, with its extensive network of musical acquaintances and deeply rooted musical traditions, that Wilhelmine von Uhlfeld was born and reared. What, then, do we know about her musical training and accomplishments, which would be so critical to her role as a patron in the era of Mozart and Beethoven?

**Wilhelmine's Musicianship**

In 1772, when Charles Burney's musical tourism took him to Vienna, he was escorted to the home of Countess Thun by Britain's ambassador, Viscount Stormont. Then, as in Mozart's time a decade later, she was noted for her generosity and openness, and a traveler interested in music would inevitably have found the path to her door. Burney stated that she "possesses as great skill in music as any person of distinction I ever knew; she plays the harpsichord with that grace, ease, and delicacy, which nothing but female fingers can arrive at." The Countess was well enough acquainted with Gluck to be able to provide Burney with an introduction to him, and to accompany him to the composer's house for an interview. On a later visit Burney heard her play once again and wrote, "Her taste is admirable, and her execution light, neat, and feminine; however, she told me that she had played much better than at present, and humorously added, that she had had six children, and that 'every one of them had taken something from her.'"

We know that when Mozart began to frequent her salon in 1781, Countess Thun owned a fortepiano by Johann Andreas Stein (1728–92), no doubt another reason that Mozart felt comfortable in her house, since he had known Stein and his pianos for some years. Stein was the best known and most admired German piano maker at that time, and the countess would likely have ordered the piano and had it shipped from Augsburg. Clearly it was a grand piano of high quality, or Mozart would not have been interested in borrowing it for important appearances, as he did for the contest with Clementi and perhaps for public concerts in 1782 and 1783. Thus Countess Thun was keeping well abreast of trends in the keyboard world and ensuring that she, her daughters, and her guests had the best possible instrument on which to play. Obviously Mozart trusted her musical knowledge and judgment more generally, since he shared Idomeneo with her, and played through *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* for her as it was being composed.

Until now little has been known about how and with whom Wilhelmine studied music, though it is clear enough that she must have been talented, and must have received excellent training. As the bright daughter of a wealthy, musical, aristocratic household, she would have had access to the best teachers. It is perhaps for this reason that it has been casually stated here and there that she had "probably" studied with Joseph Haydn, who from our modern vantage point would have represented "the best." In the mid-1750s, when she would have been ten or so years old and ready for lessons, Haydn was a freelance musician in Vienna who did teach lady pupils. He may possibly have taught another, older Countess Thun, Maria Christine, who would become Wilhelmine's mother-in-law in 1761. But he was at that stage not yet well known, held no official position, and possessed as yet no reputation. It is likely that Obersthofmeister Uhlfeld and his wife would have been looking higher—or at least closer to the imperial court that employed Uhlfeld—for an instructor for their daughters.

**Wilhelmine's Musical Notenbuch**

Tucked away and forgotten in the music collection of the Lobkowicz Library, housed in Nelahozeves Castle, north of Prague, is a manuscript music book, elegantly bound in a green and gold floral cover. I say "forgotten," because it has emerged only recently, as the collection is now being systematically catalogued for the first time in its history. In the process, pieces of music that have not been handled since the last full-scale inventory in 1893 are coming to the surface, and many are being assessed and identified for the first time. It was a surprise to find this little book of keyboard pieces in the section of the library devoted to sacred motets; it was an even greater surprise to recognize it as having been the personal property of Countess Wilhelmine von
Uhlfeld, as inscribed for her, in French, on the front cover (see figure 1).

The book is not large, and contains forty oblong leaves, each side of which has been numbered in pencil at the upper corner. There are about sixty pieces altogether, some of which are certainly meant to form larger groupings, such as a divertimento; these occupy the first sixty pages, which are followed by some blank pages and evidence that a couple of leaves were cut out. The last nine pages in the book are occupied by instructional exercises, including scales and pitch names in various clefs (figure 2), a chart of rhythmic values, and a series of figured bass exercises. An inscription inside the back cover gives the address of an “orgelmacher, mit Nahmen Pantzer,” perhaps as someone who could tune or repair a keyboard instrument (though adding, whimsically, that his residence contained two rooms, a kitchen, a cellar, and five mousetraps).

The pieces in the book are uniformly brief and simple. They feature thin, two-part textures, almost no dynamic markings, and plain ornaments including turns and short trills. In these pieces, which are almost entirely innocent of counterpoint, the right hand carries the melody while the left
hand accompanies with octaves or single repeated notes, or very occasionally a simple triadic pattern. Many of the pieces are dances, including minuets, balli, polonaises, contre-danses, and allemandes. There are also numerous galanteries, some with names like “La petite Joseph,” “La Therese Angloise,” “La Nannetta Africana,” “La bell’Esther,” “Les Nobles Allemandes,” etc. One piece is titled “Il pastor fido.” There are allusions to the commedia dell’arte in “Pierot” and “Harlequinade.”

The first two pieces in the book are attributed to a certain “Birck,” undoubtedly Vienna organist Wenzel Raimund Birck: on page 1, a “Praeludium ex C del Signor Birck” appears, and on page 2 a “Divertimento Primo del Sigl: Birck.” This will be the primary form of attribution throughout the collection, and pieces are copied almost entirely in the same hand, identified on some pages as “Birck mpia” (manu propria). One example is the “Harlequinade par Birck” on page 48 (figure 3), which is also one of the only pieces in the book that contains dynamics. Only one attribution to another composer appears in the volume, a “Menuet par Mons: Pichler” on page 49. The last piece in this collection is in a different hand; titled “Menuet composée par Mad: la Comtesse Wilhelmina D’Uhlefeldt,” it is a more slender, rather more unsteady notation than that of Birck, and may represent an attempt by the young countess to record an original minuet (figure 4). Unfortunately, only the right-hand part is distributed over the tidy systems of staves; the bass part remains vacant throughout. But enough survives to demonstrate that this composer had only a shaky grasp of meter and phrasing, with twenty-one measures before the double bar, twenty-five after it, and little of the periodicity one associates with the minuet. The sense of harmonic structure is also rather vague, with a first half that modulates from D major to E or B minor, and a second half that moves quickly to F-sharp minor and ends, apparently, in A major. The key signature fluctuates roughly the same size as the other, this book contains forty-seven leaves and is inscribed with Birck’s address inside the front cover. In this case, some of the instructional material—the tables of clefs and note values—appears at the front of the volume, and is less extensive in its coverage of topics; a series of figured bass exercises corresponding to those in Wilhelmine’s book is found at the end of the book. The music begins on the verso of folio 2. Many of the around forty pieces, most of which are dances, are signed by Birck (or Pirck) mpia, in the same hand as that in the other volume. There are far fewer pieces with colorful titles in this collection. Apart from an “Aria” attributed to “Sig: Galupi” on pages 40r-41v, there are also two pieces that have been identified by Ulrich Leisinger as stemming from Wagenseil and Monn; the rest appear to be by Birck. Most interesting are the fifteen pieces shared by Birck and the Other Notenbuch

Birck and the Other Notenbuch

The “Signor” or “Monsieur” Birck of Countess Wilhelmine’s music book, Wenzel Raimund Birck (1718–63), was an organist and composer who had trained and been employed at the imperial court in Vienna his entire career. Commencing as a young scholar in the Hofmusikkapelle, he studied theory with court composer Matteo Palotta and organ with Johann Joseph Fux. When Johann Georg Reutter was promoted from court organist to Kapellmeister at St. Stephen’s cathedral in 1738, the twenty-year old Birck succeeded him in the organ post, which he held for the rest of his life. Along with his duties as organist and composer, Birck was eventually charged with the instruction of the archdukes in keyboard playing. The future emperor of Austria, Joseph II, born in 1741, was therefore likely to have been Birck’s first royal pupil. In later years, Countess Wilhelmine von Thun would be one of the emperor’s small circle of confidantes; they shared a great enthusiasm for music and a life-long devotion to keyboard playing. It seems that they also shared the same teacher in the first years of their musical educations.

Though the appearance of Birck’s signature throughout Wilhelmine’s Notenbuch is strong evidence of his authorship, further confirmation is found in yet another manuscript music book, a very similar companion to this one, preserved in the music collection of the Austrian National Library. Likewise oblong in format, bound in a marbled paper cover and roughly the same size as the other, this book contains forty-seven leaves and is inscribed with Birck’s address inside the front cover. In this case, some of the instructional material—the tables of clefs and note values—appears at the front of the volume, and is less extensive in its coverage of topics; a series of figured bass exercises corresponding to those in Wilhelmine’s book is found at the end of the book. The music begins on the verso of folio 2. Many of the around forty pieces, most of which are dances, are signed by Birck (or Pirck) mpia, in the same hand as that in the other volume. There are far fewer pieces with colorful titles in this collection. Apart from an “Aria” attributed to “Sig: Galupi” on pages 40r-41v, there are also two pieces that have been identified by Ulrich Leisinger as stemming from Wagenseil and Monn; the rest appear to be by Birck. Most interesting are the fifteen pieces shared by Birck’s book is the earlier. For example, corrections made to the Trio in his Divertimento Secondo do not appear in Wilhelmine’s book, which contains the revised version (now called Divertimento Primo). A “Ballo presto” in G appears in more polished form in Wilhelmine’s book,
with more agrément and accent marks. In most of the pieces in Birck’s book the right-hand parts are in soprano clef, but these have all been altered to the violin, or G clef for the other book; likely Wilhelmine was far less familiar with the C clefs than her teacher, the court organist, would have been.

**Conclusion**

In short, the Vienna Notenbuch by Birck appears to represent his effort to assemble pieces and exercises that could be used in the instruction of his pupils, as previously suggested by the person who wrote “Klavierschule (?)” on the cover label of the volume. The Wilhelmine Notenbuch seems to be a more polished and complete version that has been adapted in various ways for the use of a young lady, and probably reflects her skills and tastes. It is intriguing to think that Birck may have created a number of these little books for other pupils, and to wonder whether they may have survived, misshelved or otherwise overlooked, in other libraries. The preservation of Countess Wilhelmine’s Notenbuch in the Lobkowicz collections suggests that it remained in the possession of Maria Elisabeth Uhlfeld, née Lobkowitz, after her daughter married Count Franz Joseph Anton von Thun in 1761 and left the family home.

Mozart and other composers of his time were able to flourish in Vienna because of a closely-knit network of patrons and supporters who not only loved music, but were well schooled in it. Our own knowledge and appreciation of that remarkable artistic society are much enriched when we can trace the musical trajectories of its important patrons back to their sources. In the case of Countess Thun, it is helpful to know how she earned that “grace, ease, and delicacy” at the keyboard so praised by Burney; and also to know that even if she did not study with the great Joseph Haydn, she shared a common tutelage with others who were likewise in a position to influence and inspire crucial developments in a most fertile musical culture.
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2. This visit to the Uhlfelds is mentioned only briefly in a letter by Leopold Mozart on October 16, 1762; see MBA 1: 53. However, years later Leopold would refer to it when instructing his son on how to approach patrons for money, saying the “Fürstin von Ulefeld” (most likely Maria Elisabeth von Uhlfeld, Wilhelmine’s mother) sent him twenty ducats after being reminded of the performance. Letter of September 3, 1778; MBA 2: 466.


4. This would have taken place in the years leading up to Benda’s employment at Warsaw in 1732. The cellist Alborea is referred to as “Francischello” by Burney. Charles Burney, *The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands, and United Provinces*, 2nd ed. (London: T. Becket, 1775); ed. Percy A. Scholes as *Dr. Burney’s Musical Tours in Europe, Vol. II: An Eighteenth-Century Musical Tour in Central Europe and the Netherlands* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), 175.

5. Count Althan had purchased the residence, then known as the Dietrichstein Palace, in 1724; his step-son Ferdinand Philipp would purchase it from him, with cash and the trade of another Vienna house, in 1745. For a history of the palace, see Barbara Feller and Friedrich Mayr, “Vom Palais Dietrichstein am Schweinemarkt zum Österreichischen Theatermuseum am Lobkowitzplatz,” in *Lobkowitzplatz 2. Geschichte eines Hauses* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1991), 17–65.


8. Ibid., 76.

9. Ibid., 101. Three of her daughters became accomplished musicians; two of them, Elisabeth and Christiane, also married important music patrons, Prince Andrei Razumovsky and Prince Karl Lichnowsky, respectively.

10. See, for example, this statement: “She was a superb pianist and as a young girl had probably been a pupil of Joseph Haydn.” Volkmar Braunbehrens, *Mozart in Vienna 1781–1791*, trans. Timothy Bell (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1989), 152.


12. Numerous inventories of the library have been carried out over the years and survive in the Lobkowicz archives. The 1893 inventory of the music collection was undertaken by art historian and Lobkowicz librarian Max Dvořák. Titled *Stand-Repertorium des Hochfürstlich-Lobkowitz’schen Musik-Archives zu Raudnitz*, it lists works by genre and composer under the general headings *Musica sacra* and *Musica profana*.

13. In Dvořák’s inventory the music book is assigned the shelf number XAe26, thus was (and is) stored with sacred motets and similar pieces in the *Musica sacra* section, i.e., not with other keyboard materials.


15. As these markings do not represent graduated dynamics, we need not take this as an example of early piano writing, though others have found evidence of it in compositions by Birck in the 1730s. See Eva Badura-Skoda, “The Viennese fortepiano in the eighteenth century,” in *Music in Eighteenth-Century Austria*, ed. David Wyn Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 257.

16. A Menuet and Trio on page 24 are also in this other hand; the trio includes the only other dynamic marking in the volume, a *pianissimo* applied to the movement as a whole.

17. NMA IX/27/1.


20. A little suite, comprising a Vivace, Menuet, and Gigue (all in C but for the A-minor Trio), on pages 11v–14r, are attributed to Wagensiel; an “Introduzzione” in G on 14v is attributed to G. H. Monn. Notes on each signed and dated “U. Leisinger, 1996.”
Book Review


With Mozart Studies 2, Simon P. Keefe has edited a second volume of essays offering a panorama of Mozart scholarship. Although ten years have passed since the first Mozart Studies appeared, there is much continuity between the volumes. To borrow from Keefe's preface to Mozart Studies 2, both collections are grounded in the idea that "cultural, historical, contextual and reception-related interrogation is central to understanding a composer's music" (p. ix). These continuities of approach should not be interpreted as a sign of staleness, however. Each author offers novel insights into Mozart's life and music.

The first two chapters are biographical and rely on fresh readings of Mozart's correspondence to shed light on his character. Ulrich Konrad's exploration of the idiosyncrasies found in the composer's letters serves not only as a useful introduction to Mozart's correspondence but also as a survey of Mozart's linguistic abilities. Konrad also touches on some of the "motifs" in Mozart's letters, including his "surrender to the governance of the divine will alone" (p. 16) and his continued belief in his artistic greatness. In chapter 2, Keefe focuses on Mozart's stay in Paris in 1778. This trip is typically characterized as devastating for the young composer due to the death of his mother, the souring of his relationship with Melchior Grimm, and his failure to obtain an appointment. Keefe, however, reinterprets this episode in Mozart's life. While not discounting the composer's failings, he analyzes Mozart's music from this time and zeroes in on his correspondence concerning the palliative nature of his musical activities, painting a portrait of an artist coming into maturity in the face of tragic loss.

Chapters 3 and 5 through 7 concern the context in which Mozart worked. In chapter 3, David Black examines documentary and musical archives to outline the composer's activities with the Tonkünstler-Societät, a charitable organization that assisted the families of deceased musicians in Vienna. In chapter 5, Rupert Ridgewell details the publication of arrangements for flute quintet of two of Mozart's pieces in 1785 to further our understanding of how arrangements of Mozart's music for chamber ensemble helped the composer disseminate his work. In chapter 6, Keefe sheds new light on Mozart's composition of the "Haydn" string quartets, revealing that "attention to performers and performances ... significantly affected Mozart's path to publication and the publication itself" (p. 148). In chapter 7 Ian Woodfield traces the various ways that the character Cherubino was presented in Habsburg lands in translations of Beaumarchais's La folle journée, ou Le Mariage de Figaro and early productions of Le nozze di Figaro. Woodfield reveals that the risqué character was criticized and tinkered with until the 1789 revival of the opera in Vienna, when "none of Mozart's revisions relates to the role of Cherubino, and there is no mention of the page in a review in the Pressburger Zeitung" (p. 194).

Chapter 4 resists grouping with other essays in the collection since it is the only contribution so focused on "the music itself." Stephen Rumph identifies what he terms the "hymn topic" in Mozart's music, a short passage of alla breve homophony based on "the old church style" (p. 77). Rumph locates the topic in Così fan tutte, Idomeneo, and Die Zauberflöte, but focuses on the composer's instrumental music. Relying on linguistic theory, Rumph meaningfully contributes to musical semiotics by noting the characteristics of the hymn topic that allow its function and meaning to change in different contexts: "In Così fan tutte, the solemnity of Alfonso's motive contrasts with the elegant frivolity of the surrounding music; in the Sonata for Keyboard and Violin in E minor [K. 304], the beatific calm of the trio contrasts with the human pathos of the minuet. In the finale of the Quartet in A [K. 464], the hymn topic provides a relief from the ineluctable drive of the Allegro" (p. 95).

The final two chapters address the connections of Mozart's music to later repertoires. In chapter 8, David Wyn Jones analyzes orchestral arrangements of Mozart's music by Ignaz von Seyfried. Seyfried's Fantasy in C minor, an arrangement of the Fantasia in C minor, K. 475, and Sonata in C minor, K. 457, was published by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1812, and his Fantasy in F minor, an orchestration of the first and second movements of the Piano Quartet in G minor, K. 478, and the Fantasia in F minor, K. 608, appeared soon thereafter. These works "may be seen as a fashionable response" to the minor-mode music of the time, and they illuminate the connection of Mozart's music to the music of Beethoven (p. 218). Finally, in the last chapter of the collection Emily Dolan identifies what she terms the "pre-uncanny" in certain late eighteenth-century compositions that can be seen as "conjuring a folk style through feigned familiarity," like "Der Vogelfänger bin ich ja" and the theme of the finale of Mozart's Piano Concerto in G major, K. 453 (p. 241). Dolan argues that in the early nineteenth century such familiarity was increasingly seen as disturbing, which she suggests explains the reception of Schubert's lyricism. Thus Dolan argues that Schubert's music is best compared to Mozart's and Haydn's, not Beethoven's, as is most typical: "Schubert's ability to create the lyrical uncanny grows directly out of the
special status given to song, lyricism, and the familiar in the late eighteenth century” (248).

Mozart Studies 2 is so impeccably edited that one can only nitpick at the most inconsequential issues. While the eagle-eyed reader might notice that the musical examples in chapter 5 are slightly fuzzier than the crisp examples in the rest of the book, for example, there is nothing that detracts from the readability or clarity of the essays. Most importantly, each chapter in this volume is fresh and provocative. Mozart scholars and connoisseurs are sure to consider Mozart Studies 2 a significant addition to the literature for years to come.

—Christopher Lynch

Performance Review

Mozart’s Requiem as Modernist Ritual

On three evenings toward the end of this past January, attendees at Roy Thompson Hall, where the Toronto Symphony Orchestra plays, witnessed an unusual event in the history of Mozart’s Requiem: its presentation as a semi-staged performance.

The production was the inspiration of Joel Ivany, artistic director of Toronto’s Against the Grain Theatre. The program itself gave little indication of anything out of the ordinary for a concert, except that it prefaced the Requiem with the Clarinet Quintet and, what is certain, except that it prefaced the Requiem itself gave little indication of anything out of the ordinary for a concert hall as temple, music as sacrifice. As it played, the vocal quartet, too, would take up “forms, moods, shapes of grief” (Hamlet, act 1, scene 2), with one soloist, stricken with sorrow upon reading from one of the cards, being consoled by another.

The general purpose of Ivany’s choreography was clear: not to press a narrative onto the Requiem, but to bring life and art together in the space of the auditorium. The staging aimed to restore to the Requiem as a concert piece its status as a ritual whereby we, privately and collectively, face mortality. In many respects, Ivany achieved that ambition. At least conceptually, his recuperation of the ancient use of art as ritual bore some affinity to the archaic symbols that animate much of Mozart’s piece. What is more, the staging, such as it was, resisted the temptation that all but defines the method of Regietheater, which is, in the name of objectivity, to distend a work’s details so that, when taken in as a whole, what one sees clashes with what one hears. Ivany, instead, elected an economy of movement that preserved decorum.

But then there were those cards. They bore the names of people who had died and whom the inscriber wanted to memorialize. This marked a place where a breach started to appear in Ivany’s conception. When it comes to psychology, to a vision of the self, Ivany’s conception is more modernist/diagnostic. As my companion noted, there was something off-putting in having fictional “charac-
ters” (but who were they, or what did they represent?) grieve over names of actual people randomly drawn from a basket. Although Ivany clearly wanted the staging to encourage a vivid intimacy with Mozart’s piece, the effect was alienating. Why that was so has to do with a paradox about how art activates moral interest. Art awakens sympathy not mainly because of the quantity or veracity of its propositions (“all men are mortal”) but when it coheres as an aesthetic experience (“this is what it looks like to confront death”). Sometimes we dissent from a particular work of art because it seems untrue to us. But sometimes we dissent not because its doctrines appear false, but because the tale is not well told.

In directing the Requiem more toward the particular—toward a death, and not death itself—Ivany ran such a risk. His decision wound up dissipating some of the power that rituals involving death have traditionally held. In voicing the grief of the individual, rites for the dead also go one step farther by discharging that solitary emotion into a larger community. Ivany, reasonably enough, thought of the Requiem as a species of tragedy, but his vision stopped with that modernist trauma and did not extend to the restorative or even renewing function that tragedy has offered from its very beginnings. And this is all to assume that the Requiem’s reigning emotion is the fear of death, as opposed to the fear of judgment, the fear that one has not lived as well as one might have. Among other things, requiems in Mozart’s day were said, at least ostensibly, for the dead, not the living, in order to lessen their time in Purgatory. Or, as the text of the Dies Irae foretells, “mors stupebit et natura”: not only Nature, but even Death itself will be stupefied when the trumpet summons the dead to the Last Judgment.

Making trauma the psychic foundation of a work of art, even one like
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the Requiem, is problematic for another reason. Because it is in large part the manner of the telling that draws us to tragedy, a compelling transformation of grief into art requires a certain control and self-possession. A canonical version of that idea as expressed in art itself occurs early in Book 6 of the Aeneid. There, Aeneas comes across a temple dedicated to Apollo on whose doors Daedalus had depicted various mythological scenes, scenes that, Virgil reports, were artistically challenging to render. Daedalus had no difficulty with that task, until he turned to the subject of his own son: “You, too, Icarus, would have large share in such a work, did grief permit: twice had he essayed to fashion your fall in gold; twice sank the father’s hands” (translated by H. R. Fairclough). The grief was too immediate for Daedalus to make art of it, even though he was an artist. But not for Virgil, who transformed Daedalus’s suffering into art.

As difficult as it may be to feel in Mozart’s Requiem a consoling touch (although some have made just that case over its reception history), what allows his last work to persist in our psychic lives today is the guiding intelligence that gives voice to and thereby validates our apprehensions regarding death. Mozart has managed to capture in sound the eeriness of death, its uncanny otherness. In that artistic achievement, there’s something oddly life-affirming that no demythologizing project can account for.

—Edmund J. Goehring

**Guest Column**
(reprinted from vol. 1, no. 1)

Fifty years ago when I entered college, the professor who taught harmony denigrated Mozart as a frivolous and effeminate composer in comparison with the serious and masculine Beethoven. Perhaps this had the effect of piquing my curiosity, contrary to his intentions. Luckily for me my piano teacher was of a different opinion and within two years had me playing the solo part of the Piano Concerto in A, K. 488, with a student orchestra. Another event that greatly affected me in the late 1940s was the American premiere of Idomeneo in Boston under Boris Goldovsky. Yet the intellectual climate at graduate school in the 1950s was not very charitable to Mozart, and I was discouraged from writing the dissertation I wanted to write on Idomeneo. Having moved from Chicago to Berkeley in 1960, I was able to study Mozart’s actual handwriting for the first time when Erich Hertzmann of Columbia University came to California as a visiting professor in 1962-63, bringing with him the theory and composition lessons of Thomas Attwood, corrected by the master, a large manuscript he was editing for the Neue Mozart-Ausgabe. Professor Hertzmann died in Berkeley on March 3, 1963. It fell to me and to Alfred Mann to finish editing the work for publication, which followed in 1965. In the process I came to meet and work closely with the two directors of the NMA, Wolfgang Rehm in Kassel and the late Wolfgang Plath in Augsburg. They knew that what I really wanted to edit for them was Idomeneo, of which I made no secret, but it was assigned, and wisely, too, to Anna Amalie Abert (who died at age 90 on January 4, 1996). Imagine my joy back in 1965 when Professor Abert withdrew and the general editors asked me to accept the assignment in her stead! The several years necessary to carry it out coincided with what were probably the most troubled times endured by any American campus, further disturbed, in my case, by service as department chairman. In June 1972, as the burden of the chair ended, Idomeneo appeared. Almost everything I have done since followed from this edition. Mozart’s Operas (with Thomas Bauman [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990]) begins with Idomeneo; Haydn, Mozart, and the Viennese School 1740–1780 (New York: W. W. Norton, 1995) ends with the same. Gradually the opera and Mozart’s music in general have won converts in every sector, from the public at large to the ivory towers. “O me felice!” as Idomeneo says at the end. I have lived to see an age in which the music of Mozart is no less loved and honored than that of Beethoven. The founding of a Mozart Society of America testifies to the seriousness of purpose with which we now take our favorite composer.

—Daniel Heartz
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