President’s Message

Paul Corneilson

The Mozart Society of America is very active these days, and I hope you all enjoy the special booklet with an essay plus illustrations of the Prague Estates Theater, written by Martin Nedbal. We are also enclosing a print of the theater plans, which is suitable for framing. I want to thank the Publications Committee, especially Bruce Alan Brown and John A. Rice, and the designer Dean Bornstein, for assisting with this handsome booklet. It would be nice to have publications on other theaters from Mozart’s time, and on behalf of the Publications Committee, I invite proposals from members who would like to write similar essays. This publication is paid for by the Daniel Heartz Endowment, and I want to thank everyone who has contributed so generously to this fund.

By the time you receive this, MSA will have had its fifth annual panel session at the Mostly Mozart Festival at Lincoln Center in New York, on July 30. Bruce Brown chaired the session and three of our members gave papers on topics relating to “Mozart the Wunderkind”: Alyson McLamore, Adeline Mueller, and Edmund Goehring. Please note the call for proposals for the MSA session at the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies and for the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music’s conference next year. I also want to draw your attention to MSA’s upcoming biennial conference with the theme “Mozart and Modernity,” which will be held at the University of Western Ontario in London, Canada, the weekend of October 20–22. (Read about the conference and program on pages 3 and 4.) This should be a fine time of the year to visit Ontario and celebrate Mozart’s impact on music history in the modern era. The conference will conclude on Sunday morning with a brief business meeting, in lieu of having it during the American Musicological Society (AMS) meeting in November.

If you haven’t already done so, please renew your membership today (a form is enclosed), and if you are able, please be generous in contributing to the Heartz Endowment. Please consider ordering a copy of Mozart in Prague: Essays on Performance, Patronage, Sources, and Reception (MSA, 2016) for yourself, and please encourage your institutional library to purchase a copy as well. (Members of MSA pay only $25, a 50% discount off the list price of $50.)

I am still looking for a student representative to the MSA Board for a one-year term, and there are several slots on standing committees that need to be filled in the coming year. Please contact me (pcorneilson61@verizon.net) if you are interested in serving the Society or if you have any suggestions for the Board to consider.
Call for Papers: MSA at ASECS

MSA is organizing a session at the forty-ninth annual meeting of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, which will be held from March 22 to 25, 2018, in Orlando, Florida. The session description is below. If you are interested in participating, please send a proposal to session chair Laurel Zeiss (Laurel_Zeiss@baylor.edu) by September 15, 2017. Only one submission per author will be considered. Please provide a cover sheet and proposal in separate documents. The cover sheet should contain your name, email address, phone number, and proposal title. The proposal should contain only the title, abstract, and audio-visual requirements. The committee’s decision will be announced in mid-November.

“Mozart the Wunderkind in Context”

The extraordinary compositional and performing skills demonstrated by W. A. Mozart while still a child have loomed large in his biography and in the reception of his music. This session will place “Mozart the Wunderkind” into a broader context. Topics might include concepts of “genius” and “prodigy” during Mozart’s time (especially in relation to music and childhood), the early travels and exhibitions of skill by the Mozart children, Leopold Mozart’s educational and promotional strategies with regard to his children, other child prodigies (musical and otherwise) during the eighteenth century, and artistic display by and exploitation of child performers in pre-modern times. Musicians and other personalities encountered by the Mozart children during their early travels could also be addressed.

SECM invites proposals for papers and presentations on all aspects of eighteenth-century music. Presentations may be traditional papers of twenty-five minutes (thirty-five-minute slot), work-in-progress presentations of ten minutes (twenty-minute slot), panels (forty-five minutes) or lecture recitals (up to forty-five minutes). Preference will be given to those who did not present at the 2016 meeting in Austin. All presenters must be current members of SECM.

Submit your proposal (250 words) as an email attachment to the chair of the program committee, Drew Edward Davies (secm2018@gmail.com) by October 30, 2017. Only one submission per author will be considered. Please provide a cover sheet and proposal in separate documents. The cover sheet should contain your name, email address, phone number, and proposal title. The proposal should contain only the title, abstract, and audio-visual requirements. The committee’s decision will be announced in mid-November.

Announcements

MSA at AMS

On Thursday night, November 9, the Mozart Society of America will host a study session at the American Musicological Society in Rochester, New York. Neal Zaslaw has completed the New Köchel, a new edition of the standard catalogue of Mozart’s work list. This has been translated into German by Ulrich Leisinger, head of the research institute at the Mozarteum in Salzburg, and the volume will be published by Breitkopf & Härtel. Eventually, an English-language version will be published online, and at the study session Zaslaw and Leisinger will be discussing the new catalogue and showing samples of the online version. On Friday night, November 10, there will be a concert featuring Michael Haydn’s Requiem in C Minor followed by a reception for MSA members and our sister societies. All members are welcome to both events, and please invite friends and colleagues to join us. Also during the AMS meeting, be sure to visit the exhibit hall, where MSA will be sharing a booth with other eighteenth-century societies.

SECM’s Eighth Biennial Conference

The eighth biennial conference of the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music will be held in Tallahassee from February 22 to 25, 2018.
MSA’s Conference: Mozart and Modernity

University of Western Ontario
October 20–22, 2017

The Mozart Society of America’s seventh biennial conference, “Mozart and Modernity,” will take place from Friday to Sunday, October 20–22, 2017, at the University of Western Ontario. The conference aims to address questions about the place of Mozart’s music in the modern world, whether as expressed in performance or in scholarship. Above all, it considers how an appreciation of Mozart’s music, which relies so heavily on the authority of beauty and the availability of convention, can be sustained in a modern critical climate where beauty and convention have lost some of their cultural command.

In addition to the slate of free papers, the conference will offer several special events. On the eve of the conference (Thursday, October 19), Robert B. Pippin, of the University of Chicago, will speak on Hitchcock and modernism. The conference’s last session will be a roundtable convened on Wye Allanbrook’s The Secular Commedia: Comic Mimesis in Late Eighteenth-Century Music. Finally, we are fortunate to have two performances. One, by UWO’s resident piano quartet, Ensemble Made in Canada, will offer a program pairing Mozart’s G-minor Piano Quartet, K. 478, with Jean Lesage’s 2006 piano trio, “Le projet Mozart,” and Arvo Pärt’s “Mozart-Adagio.” The other is an evening on “Macbeth and Don Juan on the Eighteenth-Century Stage.” Students from UWO’s Theatre Studies Program will present scenes not only from Shakespeare’s Macbeth, but also from Gottlieb Stephanie’s Macbeth (1772), originally written as a substitute Don Juan play, and Anton Cremeri’s Der steinerne Gast (1788). Discussion will follow the performances.

Program

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19

4:30  Robert B. Pippin (University of Chicago), “Inner and Outer, Real and Apparent, Judy and Madeleine in Hitchcock’s Vertigo: On Suspending Morality”

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20

9:00  Welcome

9:15–10:30  Brian McMillan (Director of Music Library, University of Western Ontario), presentation on UWO’s holdings in eighteenth-century music

10:30–12:00 Session 1
Laurel Zeiss, Chair

Kevin Ngo (University of Calgary), “Studying Mozart’s Piano Music in the Twenty-First Century: Are Urtexts the Wrong Texts?”

Mary Robbins (Austin, Texas), “Mozart’s Systematic Expression: A Modern, Sustainable View of His Music”

12:00–1:30 Lunch

1:30–4:30 Session 2
Kathryn Libin, Chair


James DiNardo (University of Notre Dame), “Grappling with Form and Function in Mozart’s ‘Great’ C-Minor Mass, K. 427”

Marina Gallagher (University of British Columbia), “Forging a Modern Female Identity: Despina’s Musical Topoi and Mimetic Performances in Cosi fan tutte”

Paul Corneilson (Packard Humanities Institute), “‘Only opposites belong together’: Mozart contra Modernism”

4:30–5:30 Reception

5:30–7:45 Dinner

8:00–9:30 Concert presented by Ensemble Made in Canada, Paul Davenport Theatre

PROGRAM

W. A. Mozart, Piano Quartet in G Minor, K. 478


SATURDAY OCTOBER 21
9:00–12:00 Session 3
Christopher Lynch, Chair

Martin Nedbal (University of Kansas), “Eighteenth-Century Opera and Modern Nationalism: Angelo Neumann, Gustav Mahler, and the 1887 Don Giovanni Centennial in Prague”

Annie Yen-Ling Liu (School of Music, Soochow University, China), “Mozart, Modernization, and the Fading of the Cultural Revolution in China”

Adem Merter Birson (Ankara, Turkey), “Mozart's Turkish Tattoo: Die Entführung aus dem Serail and Turkish Music in Eighteenth-Century Vienna”

Adeline Mueller (Mount Holyoke College), “Back to Mozart, 1921”

12:00–1:30 Lunch

1:30–4:30 Roundtable on Wye Jamison Allanbrook’s The Secular Commedia: Comic Mimesis in Late Eighteenth-Century Music

Adeline Mueller, Moderator

Presenters: Nathan Martin (University of Michigan), James Currie (University at Buffalo, SUNY), Edmund Goehring (University of Western Ontario)

4:30–4:45 Closing remarks


8:00 Theatre Evening: Macbeth and Don Juan on the Eighteenth-Century Stage, Paul Davenport Theatre

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 22
8:30 Breakfast and business meeting

The Heartz Endowment Continues to Grow

In 2015 Daniel Heartz, a founding member of our Society and one of the world’s leading Mozart scholars, gave MSA an unrestricted gift of $10,000. The Board decided to use this gift as the basis of a fund for the publication of scholarly work and for the support of Mozart research by younger scholars. The Board named it after Dan, in honor of his work as a scholar and a teacher, and in gratitude for his generosity to MSA.

We continue to welcome donations, and future contributions will be recorded on the MSA website. Send your contributions (preferably by check, but PayPal is also possible) to Beverly Wilcox, treasurer of MSA, 435 G Street, Apt. 207, Davis, CA 95616. Email: bevwilco@gmail.com

Contributors to the Heartz Endowment, as of August 1, 2017

Circle of Emperor Joseph II: $750 and up
Bruce Alan Brown
John A. Rice
H. Colin Slim

Circle of Countess Wilhelmine Thun: $250–749
Paul Corneilson
Joshua M. Kosman
Robert Levin
Kathryn L. Libin
Dorothea Link
Steven Machtinger
Marita Petzoldt McIymonds
Alyson McLamore
John Platoff
Murl J. Sickbert Jr.
Jessica Waldoff
Beverly Wilcox
Christoph Wolff
Ian Woodfield
Craig Wright
Neal Zaslaw
Laurel E. Zeiss

Circle of Baron Gottfried van Swieten: $10–249
Rebekah Ahrend
Jane Bernstein and James Ladewig
Bathia Churgin
Caryl Clark
Frank D’Accone
Stephen C. Fisher
Suzanne Forsberg
Paul Gibbs
Floyd Grave
Thomas S. Grey
L. Michael Griffel and Margaret Ross Griffel
Jane Schatkin Hettrick
Matthew Lemieux
Robert L. Marshall
Daniel Melamed
Anthony Newcomb
Michael Ochs
Enrique Oliver
Janet K. Page
Bertil van Boer
Bonnie Wade
Royer E. Wates
Domenico Guardasoni’s Prague Conducting Score for Così fan tutte

Martin Nedbal

In 1791, Prague was one of the first places in Europe outside of Vienna to see Mozart’s Così fan tutte. That year the opera was in fact produced by two different companies; Domenico Guardasoni’s Italian company performed the work in the original language in the National (now Estates) Theater, and Wenzel Mihule’s Patriotic Theater company produced a Singspiel version in the Theater at the Hybernians. As Claudia Maurer Zenck has shown, Mihule’s Singspiel version was quite influential for the South German reception of the work in the next decade. Ian Woodfield has also pointed out the importance of Guardasoni’s production for the spread of the Italian opera to other places in Europe and for inspiring Christoph Friedrich Bretzner’s Singspiel version of the work, titled Weibertreue, which became one of the most widespread German-language adaptations of the opera in the next century. Thanks to Mihule and Guardasoni, furthermore, Così became so popular in Prague that it remained in the local repertoire until the 1830s.

Little has been known about the exact shape the opera took in the two 1791 productions beyond what scholars could glean from the German and Italian librettos associated with the two Prague companies. Our knowledge of Guardasoni’s approach to Così acquires sharper contours, however, in view of the conducting score that the impresario used during his stay in Prague between 1791 and 1806. Until recently, Guardasoni’s score has lain in the uncatalogued part of the National Theater Archive in Prague (it is now catalogued as H189/P9, I-IV) and was therefore not taken into consideration by any previous Mozart study, including the Neue Mozart-Ausgabe and the studies of Zenck and Woodfield. The score originated in the Vienna copy shop of Wenzel Sukowaty. It was probably sent to Prague and used in Guardasoni’s production in 1791. The score also bears signs of nineteenth-century German and Czech productions by the companies of Wenzel Müller, Carl Maria von Weber, Jan Nepomuk Štěpánek, and Johann August Stöger. It originally consisted of four volumes, but as a result of its use in the later productions, only the first three of the original four Sukowaty volumes remain—the fourth volume was replaced with a manuscript that contains nineteenth-century German adaptations of the opera.

The first three volumes of the score match the content of the 1791 Prague libretto of Così fan tutte, with a few exceptions, as noted below. The score therefore must have been used by Guardasoni’s company at the Estates Theater from the opera’s Prague premiere in 1791 until the company’s dissolution in 1807. It is unclear when exactly the Italian Così fan tutte premiered, but it must have been between the return of Guardasoni’s company from Warsaw to Prague on June 10, 1791, and November 23, 1791, from which date a poster for a repeat performance survives (fig. 1). The score itself must have made its way to Prague well before October 5, 1791, when the Dresden court theater’s production of Così opened, using a manuscript from the Prague copyist Anton Grams with a version closely related to and possibly based on Guardasoni’s score. Little information survives about the daily schedule of performances at the Estates Theater prior to 1815, and so only sixteen performances of the opera between 1791 and 1799 can be dated with precision, but it is quite likely that the frequency with which Guardasoni performed Così was much higher. The Italian layer of the score provides new insights not only into the processes of operatic transmission between Vienna and Prague but also into the changes executed by Guardasoni’s troupe and possibly supervised by Mozart himself during his 1791 visit to the city.

Most discussions of the 1791 Prague Così focus on the Prague libretto and note its differences from the Vienna libretto. In his study of the Prague libretto, Woodfield has shown that it incorporated the revisions made to the opera
at Vienna’s court theater during the rehearsals and performances of 1790. As a result, the Prague libretto differs from the published Vienna libretto in that it incorporates spelling and wording changes, substitutions, and cuts executed by Mozart when setting Da Ponte’s text to music in his autograph and later copied into the Vienna court theater’s conducting score, all of which was done after the publication of the libretto. The Prague libretto also reflects cuts that were executed only in the Vienna court theater’s performance materials but which do not appear in the autograph. The libretto, however, also suggests that someone on Guardasoni’s team was interested in a completely opposite course of revisions and restored into the Prague text minute details from Da Ponte’s original libretto before it was changed by Mozart in his autograph. For example, in the second-act recitative “Amico, abbiamo vinto,” in which Ferrando and Guglielmo discuss their experiences seducing Fiordiligi and Dorabella, respectively, the Prague libretto returns to Da Ponte’s original phrase “O mio fedele messaggier Mercurio,” despite the fact that Mozart changed it in his autograph to “O mio fido Mercurio.”

Guardasoni’s score further illuminates these contradictory processes of creating the Prague version of Così. The Viennese copyist from the Sukowaty workshop incorporated into Guardasoni’s score most of the textual elements that distinguish Mozart’s autograph from Da Ponte’s Vienna libretto. The Viennese copyist also incorporated various musical cuts that must have been part of the “official” Vienna version of the opera at the time, and only some of which are reflected in the Prague libretto—mainly because some of these cuts concern music, not text (see appendix 1). Most of these cuts distinguish the opera from how it is presented in the NMA. Since they were a part of a commercial manuscript used for export, these cuts might have been sanctioned by the composer. Particularly prominent among these cuts are four of what Woodfield terms “agreed” Vienna recitative cuts, which were most likely approved by the composer but not entered in the autograph.13 The fifth “agreed” cut might have been in the lost fourth volume of the score. The presence of this cut in the Prague production, however, is uncertain; although it was incorporated into the Prague libretto, it is missing from a later score that originated in Prague (now located in Copenhagen), which was most likely based on Guardasoni’s score.13 As Woodfield points out, all of these cuts in various ways diminish the “spicy” aspects of Despina, her relationship with men, particularly Don Alfonso, and her views on morality.13 Woodfield also suggests that these cuts might have been initiated to avoid making certain scenes too suggestive after it became clear that the Viennese opera company would cast Francesco Bussani and his much younger wife Dorotea in the roles of the aging philosophe and the young maid.14 But the fact that the same cuts were retained in the “official” export version of the opera suggests that the problem with the recitatives might have been related not solely to the two singers but also to the issue of curbing the opera’s suggestive elements in general.

Guardasoni’s score also contains several musical cuts that are not reflected in the libretto but which must have been a part of the official Viennese version of the opera. Although Woodfield has noted some of these cuts in the Viennese conducting score, the ones in Guardasoni’s score are more numerous yet often less extensive.15 The most prominent among these are the cuts in Ferrando’s two arias and the reductions in the stretta of the first-act finale. Besides the cuts incorporated at the Viennese copy shop (and therefore constituting the original text of the manuscript), other adapters changed Guardasoni’s score in a series of additional revisions, entered in a variety of black inks. Several of these revisions pertain to the attempt by someone, probably in Prague, to restore some elements of Da Ponte’s original Viennese libretto into the Prague Così. Appendix 2 lists these revisions alongside parallel lines from the Viennese libretto, Mozart’s autograph, and the Prague libretto. All of these revisions must have been entered at the same time, because they are in what seems to be the same hand, and all of them are also in black ink. It seems likely that these revisions were introduced into Guardasoni’s score from another source, possibly from a draft of the 1791 Prague libretto, because they are not absolutely consistent with the text of the Prague libretto and they often create musical problems, not all of which are successfully resolved. For example, in “Signora Dorabella, signora Fiordiligi,” Guardasoni’s score does not incorporate the Prague libretto’s change of Despina’s “Ditemi che cosa è stato” to “Dite che cosa è stato.” In another
case, Guardasoni’s score does include a textual revision from Mozart’s text back to Da Ponte’s, but without adjusting the music. In “Signora Dorabella, signora Fiordiligi,” this is the case with the phrase that specifies the location of the opera. In Da Ponte’s original, Fiordiligi explains that the male lovers left for war from Naples, whereas in Mozart’s autograph she first refers to Trieste and later, after a revision, to Naples. Guardasoni’s score has the lovers leave from Venice, which is corrected to Naples in correspondence with the Prague libretto. However, the vocal line in Guardasoni’s score retains accentuation that fits “Venezia” rather than “Napoli.” It is possible that the failure to adjust accentuation was an oversight, because other textual changes in Guardasoni’s score are accompanied by musical adjustments. Most prominently, in “Amico, abbiamo vinto” the reviser added a few notes to accommodate the change from the autograph’s “O mio fido Mercurio” to “O mio fedele messaggier Mercurio.” In “Che bella giornata,” the reviser adjusted the pitches of the vocal line to reflect the switch of the phrase “Non otterà niente-simo” from Dorabella (assigned that line in the autograph) to Guglielmo (to whom the phrase is assigned in Da Ponte’s libretto). Possibly due to another oversight, the revisers forgot to change the bass line accordingly at that moment. Thus the black-ink changes were clearly incorporated only afterward and were not completely thought through. It is unclear when and where they originated and whether they were used in the production of the opera in Prague.

Woodfield suggests that the person responsible for the contradictory set of revisions in the Prague libretto was Guardasoni himself, who might have been trying to make the Prague Così as close as possible to what was performed in Vienna, as with modern editors of collected works. But the confusing execution of these revisions in Guardasoni’s score and the fact that they contradict the “official” version of the opera sent from Vienna also suggest a slightly different interpretation. It is as if Guardasoni and some of his Prague colleagues, possibly in consultation with the composer himself, were in fact trying to use minute textual details to distinguish their Così from the Viennese version. Such an approach would be consistent with the sense of cultural rivalry with Vienna reflected in the writings of Prague intellectuals throughout the late eighteenth century.

As Guardasoni’s score shows, however, the Prague Così underwent further changes, as noted in appendix 1, either in the period leading up to the Prague production or sometime during its performance run, between 1791 and 1807. Most interesting is the penciled-in alternative ending of “Andate là,” which points to B♭ major instead of D major, and suggests that at some point the Prague production cut Despina’s “Una donna a quindici anni” and replaced it with “In uo-

mini, in soldati.” Guardasoni’s score also contains numerous additional pencil recitative cuts. Three of them expand the preexisting “agreed” cuts from Vienna in scenes concerning Despina and her views on women, life, and love, which once again suggests that Da Ponte’s original depiction of this character was quite problematic in the eighteenth century, and not just because it did not reflect well on a particular couple of Viennese performers. The fact that many of these additional cuts in Guardasoni’s score diminish the suggestive elements associated with Despina also points to the self-proclaimed sensitivity of Prague cultural circles to moral standards seen as deficient in Viennese operas. Similar sensitivity also marks what remains of the 1786 Prague version of Le nozze di Figaro.

As Alan Tyson has suggested in his study of the 1786 Prague libretto and a Donaueschingen score copied from Prague sources in the 1780s, the Prague Italian company, then under the direction of Pasquale Bondini, attempted to excise moments in which Cherubino expresses erotic interest in the Countess and where Don Basilio speaks in a way that would have been considered inappropriate for a priest.

Not all manuscript scores of Così used in European theaters in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were derived directly from Mozart’s autograph or the Viennese court theater’s production materials. Guardasoni’s score, in fact, served as a model for numerous other manuscript copies of the opera as it spread throughout Europe before the publication of a full score in 1810. Woodfield has pointed out that several scores, such as the manuscripts used in Dresden, Copenhagen, Donaueschingen, and by the Lobkowitz family in Roudnice, must have been related to a Prague source that he suspects to exist. Guardasoni’s score represents this missing link between Vienna and many other cities that produced Mozart’s operas soon after their Viennese and Prague premieres. More importantly, the score emphasizes the importance of Prague as an early center of Mozart veneration and cultivation and as a place that has yet to reveal many Mozart-related treasures.
Martin Nedbal is Assistant Professor of Musicology at the University of Kansas. He joined the KU School of Music after earning his PhD from the Eastman School of Music in 2009 and serving on the faculty of the University of Arkansas. Nedbal’s book Morality and Viennese Opera in the Age of Mozart and Beethoven was published by Routledge in 2017. He has published articles on Mozart-related topics in Divadelní revue, Opera Quarterly, and Acta Musicologica. His edition of the first Viennese German translations of Don Giovanni and Così fan tutte is forthcoming in the journal Literatur- und Theatersoziologie.

NOTES

Many thanks to Matěj Dočekal and Aneta Peterová from the National Theater Archive in Prague for their erudite and friendly assistance in the preparation of this article. I would also like to thank Ian Woodfield for his advice and thoughtful comments during the writing process.

1. The Mihule production most likely opened already in the spring of 1791, because a poster for the opera is mentioned in a censor’s note from May 17, 1791. See my discussion of this note in Martin Nedbal, “František Šír’s First Czech Translation of Mozart’s Final Opera Buffa and the Reception of Così fan tutte in Prague 1791–1831,” Divadelní revue 27, no. 2 (Fall 2016), 53–70.


4. The title page bears the inscription “In Vienna presso Sukowatý Copista del Teatro di Corte / nella Piazza di St. Pietro Nr. 554, in terzo Piano,” and as Dexter Edge has shown, Sukowaty lived at that address until 1795. Dexter Edge, “Mozart’s Viennese Copyists,” (Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 2001), 1317.

5. For the later history of the score, see Nedbal, “František Šír’s First Czech Translation.”

6. The document is preserved in the theater poster collection of the Strahov Monastery in Prague.


8. For a list of the known performances of Così in Prague, see Nedbal, “František Šír’s First Czech Translation,” 55.

9. The possibility of Mozart’s involvement in the 1791 Prague production is discussed in Woodfield, Mozart’s Così fan tutte, 181–83. Elsewhere Woodfield notes that if Mozart was indeed involved in the 1791 Prague Così, it would have been “his last involvement with any of the three Da Ponte operas.” Woodfield, Performing Operas, 175.

10. These changes are listed in Woodfield, “Werktreue,” Table 2, 252–53.

11. See Woodfield, Mozart’s Così fan tutte, xvii.

12. On the Copenhagen score, see Woodfield, Mozart’s Così fan tutte, 185–86.


15. For a list of “agreed” cuts in the Vienna conducting score of Così, see Woodfield, Mozart’s Così fan tutte, 158.


17. Most prominently, such views appeared between 1794 and 1798 in the Brno magazine Allgemeines europäisches Journal, in a series of anonymous theater reviews that criticized the lack of taste and morality in Viennese operatic works produced in Prague. The anti-Viennese bent of these reviews is discussed in Tomislav Volek, “Repertoir Nosticovského divadla v Praze z let 1794, 1796–98,” Miscellanea musicologica 16 (1961): 8–9.

18. A somewhat similar, though unrelated, approach was taken by the creators of the 1804 Vienna court theater Singspiel production of Così (as Mächentrente). In the 1805 Vienna libretto, the adaptor, Friedrich Treitschke, combined portions of “In uomini” with portions of “Una donna.” See Woodfield, Mozart’s Così fan tutte, 94. It is unclear, however, whether the 1804 production actually used Treitschke’s hybrid text, because in the score associated with Mächentrente (A-Wn, Mus.Hs.59,321), “In uomini” is simply replaced with an earlier German translation, by Bretzner, of “Una donna.” See also Woodfield, Mozart’s Così fan tutte, 91–93, for a discussion of the possibility that “Una donna” was originally intended as Despina’s first-act cavatina.

19. The sensitivity of one Prague critic to moralistic issues in Mozart’s operas appears in a discussion of a performance of a German Don Giovanni on October 7, 1796, in the National (later Estates’) Theater, published in the Allgemeines europäisches Journal. Contrary to how most stage directors and commentators would feel just a few decades later, and how the Viennese court theater approached the work both in 1788 and 1798, the Prague critic complained that the German production cut the scena ultima in spite of its moralistic value. See Allgemeines europäisches Journal 1796, vol. 11, 189–90; see also Volek, 84.

Appendix 1. List of revised musical numbers in Guardasoni’s score, including musical cuts and adjustments compared to the *Neue Mozart-Ausgabe*

Guardasoni’s score, volume 1

Act 1

Overtura


No. 2, “È la fede delle femmine”

Only one folio of Guardasoni’s original score (mm. 1–9) remains in the manuscript. The rest was torn out after the number was cut in later productions. The number still must have been performed in two different German productions because it contains two German texts. The recitative “Scioccherie di poeti,” which originally followed the second trio, was also torn out of the score. It was replaced with an extra sheet of spoken dialogue in German that introduces the third trio.

No. 8, “Bella vita militar”

Vienna cut (present in the Vienna conducting score, though it is unclear whether it was approved by Mozart): measures 1–24.

No. 9, “Bella vita militar”

Prague repeat in pencil: measures 11–25. This repeat might have been added under Guardasoni, as is suggested by the fact that it was later cancelled with the penciled-in note “senza repe.” The note probably originated before the German company used the score, because most of the later performance notes are in German.

“Che vita maledetta”

Prague cut in pencil 1: “Che cosa è nato” to “Padrone dico” (m. 21). The cut requires an adjustment in vocal line in measures 19–20 and a revision of the phrase “Ah scostati.”

“Signora Dorabella, signora Fiordiligi”

Prague cut in pencil 2: “E credi che potria” to “Pianti perdere il tempo (mm. 32–43).

“Che silenzio! Che aspetto di tristezza”

“Agreed” Vienna recitative cut 1: “Ti vo fare del ben” to “Non c’è altro? Son qua” (mm. 29–37).

Guardasoni’s score, volume 2

No. 15, “Non siate ritrosi”

Prague pencil cut 3: measures 33–51.

No. 17, “Un’aura amorosa”

Parts of a Vienna cut: measures 50–56 and 64–66.

“Oh la saria da ridere”

“Agreed” Vienna recitative cut 2: “È buon che sappiano” to “Attendoendo mi stanno” (mm. 36–56).

Guardasoni’s score, volume 3

Act 2

“Andate là, che siete”

“Agreed” Vienna recitative cut 3: “Che diavolo” to “Par che ci trovin gusto” (mm. 20–45).

Prague cut in pencil 5: “Oh cospettaccio!” to “D’aver due cicis-bei? Di me fidatevi” (mm. 4–65).

Prague cut in pencil 6: “Non ebber la baldanza / Fin di chieder dei baci” (m. 69).

Alternative Prague ending in pencil: “Quel che volete: Siete d’ossa e di carne, o cosa siete?” (mm. 83–85). The recitative finishes on an F-major chord that seems to point to the first-act “In uomini, in soldati.”

“Sorella, cosa dici”

“Agreed” Vienna recitative cut 4: “E mal che basta” to “Non si manca di fè” (mm. 16–29).

Prague cut in pencil 7: “Oh, certo, se tu pigli” to the end of the recitative (mm. 8–41). To prepare the B♭ major of the following duet, the pitches of the vocal line in measures 6 and 7 are adjusted.

No. 21, “Secondate, aurette amiche”


“Oh che bella giornata”

Prague cut in pencil 8: “Io mi sento sì male” to “Fatevi uno poco fresco” (mm. 18–28).

Prague cut in pencil 9: “Crudele! Di sedur” to “L’accettate” (mm. 49–57).

No. 24, “Ah lo veggio, quell’anima bella”

Vienna cut: mm. 58–92.

No. 25, “Per pietà, ben mio, perdona”

Prague cut in pencil 10: measures 80–93. This cut is similar to Guardasoni’s cuts in the recitatives. Post-Guardasoni cuts in musical numbers are in red crayon. Also the Italian word “cor” on the downbeat of measure 94 is rewritten to “-dor.”

Prague cut in pencil 11: measures 114–16, later reinstated in red crayon.

No. 26, “Donne mie, la fate a tanti”

There are no cuts in this aria, but the manuscript was bound in a confusing page order. The music proceeds normally until measure 53 (corresponding to the first nine manuscript pages), then skips to measure 168, and the folio contains the ending of the aria; the next folio starts with measure 63, and the following pages continue to measure 167. The final folio contains the skipped measures 53–62.
Appendix 2. Black-ink revisions in Guardasoni’s score compared to the Viennese libretto, Mozart’s autograph score, and the Prague libretto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section (NMA measures)</th>
<th>Viennese libretto</th>
<th>Mozart’s autograph</th>
<th>Prague libretto</th>
<th>Guardasoni’s score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Dove son?” (mm. 10–11)</td>
<td>Fiordilig: “Se ne va quella barca!”</td>
<td>“Se ne va quella barca!”</td>
<td>“Se ne va quella barca”</td>
<td>“Se ne va quella barca”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Signora Dorabella” (mm. 3–4)</td>
<td>Despina: “Dite cosa è stato”</td>
<td>“Ditemi che cosa è stato”</td>
<td>“Dite cosa è stato”</td>
<td>“Ditemi che cosa è stato”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mm. 6–7)</td>
<td>Fiordilig: “Da Napoli partiti.”</td>
<td>“Da Trieste Napoli partiti” “Da Napoli partiti”</td>
<td>“Da Venezia Napoli partiti” [the vocal line in m. 6, which corresponds to the accentuation of “Venezia,” is not revised]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. “Che silenzio” (m. 60)</td>
<td>Despina: (“Per me questa mi preme.”)</td>
<td>[Only partially set. Missing from Court Th. Score]</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>[Added above the clef, without any notes.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Alla bella Despinetta” (mm. 132–33)</td>
<td>Fiordilig + Dorabella: “Di dispetto e di terror”</td>
<td>“Di dispetto e di terror”</td>
<td>“Di dispetto e di terror”</td>
<td>“Di dispetto e di terror furor.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. “Oh la saria di ridere” (mm. 8–10)</td>
<td>Despina: “Le povere buffone / stanno nel giardinetto / a lagnarsi”</td>
<td>“Le povere padrone / stanno nel giardinetto / a sognarsi”</td>
<td>“Le povere buffone / stanno nel giardinetto / a sognarsi”</td>
<td>“Le povere padrone buffone / stano nel giardinetto / a sognarsi lagnarsi”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m. 40)</td>
<td>Ferrando: “Ah non ci ho neppur dubbio”</td>
<td>“Ah non ci ho neppur dubbio”</td>
<td>“Oh non ci ho neppur dubbio”</td>
<td>“Ah Oh non ci ho neppur dubbio”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Donne mie, la fate a tanti” (mm. 141–43, 149–51, 156–70)</td>
<td>Guglielmo: “Hanno certo il lor perché”</td>
<td>“Hanno certo un gran perché”</td>
<td>“Hanno certo il lor perché”</td>
<td>“Hanno certo un gran il lor perché”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twin Portraits: Morichelli and Martín y Soler in Vienna, 1787

John A. Rice

The operatic fates brought two outstanding artists together in Vienna in 1787: the soprano Anna Morichelli and the composer Vicente Martín y Soler. Their engraved portraits, advertised simultaneously in the Wiener Zeitung in July 1787, serve as a reminder that in the world of eighteenth-century opera success always depended on the unpredictable interaction between composers and singers.

Anna Morichelli (ca. 1755–1800) began singing publicly in 1773. During a career of twenty-seven years she achieved great success in both serious and comic opera. She appeared as prima donna in most of Italy’s leading theaters, and in Vienna, Paris, Madrid, and London. In Vienna, where she sang from April 1787 to February 1788, she had the unenviable task of replacing the popular Nancy Storace. She largely succeeded, in part through the help of an influential patron. Count Daniele Andrea Dolfin, the Venetian ambassador, introduced her to the Viennese nobility by organizing a concert on April 28 in which Morichelli sang alone and with a young noblewoman, Victoire de Fries. But it was not until October 1787 that she had a role especially written for her in a new opera: Martín y Soler’s L’arbore di Diana.1

Vicente Martín y Soler (1754–1806) was about the same age as Morichelli. He was born in Valencia but studied composition in Italy. From 1777 he enjoyed success as a composer of serious operas, primarily at the Teatro San Carlo in Naples. In 1785 he moved to Vienna, where he probably took advantage of family relations between the courts of Naples and Vienna (Queen Maria Carolina of Naples was the sister of Emperor Joseph II) to establish close contacts with the Italian opera in the Burgtheater. By the time Morichelli arrived in Vienna, Martín had already written two operas for Joseph’s opera buffa troupe, Il burbero di buon cuore and Una cosa rara, both on librettos by Lorenzo da Ponte. It was probably shortly after Morichelli’s arrival that Martin and Da Ponte began their third collaboration, with the goal of providing Morichelli with a vehicle for the display of her abilities as an actor and a singer. Work on L’arbore di Diana was probably well under way by the time the portraits of Martín and Morichelli were advertised in the Wiener Zeitung.

We know the Viennese firm Artaria primarily as a printer and seller of music, and in particular as the publisher of music by Haydn and Mozart. But the company was equally well known as a publisher and seller of prints. The advertisement that Artaria placed in the Wiener Zeitung on July 28, 1787, took advantage of its prominence in the domains of both music and the visual arts. It announced the availability of three prints, two of which portray stars of the Viennese court opera:

Announcement
At Artaria Compagnie, art dealers in the Michaelerplatz, the following three portraits are available in octavo.

Portrait of Carl Theodor Baron v. Dahlberg, coadjutor of the electoral principality of Mainz and the archbishopric of Worms, engraved by Verhelft.

Portrait of Herr Kapellmeister Vincenz Martin, engraved by Herr Adam.

Portrait of Madame Morichelli, engraved by Herr Ernest Mannsfeld.

These portraits are all beautifully engraved and cost 24 Kreutzer each.

The advertisement neglects to mention that the engravings of Martín y Soler and Morichelli are based on portraits by the same artist. Below the portrait of Martín, on the left, we read “Joseph Kreüzinger del[iniavit]” (based on a drawing by Joseph Kreuzinger); below the portrait of Morichelli, on the left, we read “I. Kreutzingen p[inxit] (based on a painting by J. Kreutzinger).

Joseph Kreutzinger (1757–1829) studied under Friedrich Heinrich Füger at the Akademie der bildenden Künste in Vienna. As a portraitist he quickly developed close ties to the high nobility and the imperial family. In portraying Morichelli and Martín he put these musicians at the apex of Vienna’s theatrical milieu: that rarified place where artists and princes mingle. (One thinks of the concert given by the Venetian ambassador at which Morichelli was introduced to the Viennese nobility.) Kreutzinger showed the composer (fig. 1) and the singer (fig. 2) in similar poses, and the engravers emphasized the resemblance by placing the musicians in similar circular frames, each with a poetic quotation.

Below the portrait of Martín is a quotation from Ovid’s Metamorphoses: “You see Orpheus fitting songs to the vibrating strings”; and on the left the beginning of “Pace, caro mio sposo,” a popular duet from Una cosa rara. Below the portrait of Morichelli, a paraphrase of lines by Petrarch identifies Morichelli with Laura, the poet’s beloved: “They do not know how love heals and how love kills, who know not how sweetly she sighs, and sweetly she sings, and sweetly laughs.” The lines call attention to Morichelli’s success (unusual in the eighteenth century) in both serious and comic opera. The paraphernalia above the inscription make the same point. On the left, a torch, a crown, a dagger, and a chain allude...
to the world of *opera seria*; on the right, wind instruments, a mask, and roses symbolize the pastoral and comic side of Morichelli’s talents.

The similarities between these portraits, and Artaria’s simultaneous announcement of their publication, called attention to the collaborative nature of operatic production, in Vienna as elsewhere. In doing so, they helped to lay the groundwork for the triumph, about three months later, of *L’arbore di Diana*, the opera in which Morichelli and Martín encouraged and enabled each other to outdo themselves.

*NOTE*


*John A. Rice is founding member of the MSA and a former president of the Society. His most recent book is Music in the Eighteenth Century, in Norton’s series Western Music in Context.*

All theater, it is probably safe to say, pursues a multiplicity of ends: to move, instruct, admonish, astonish, correct, entertain, delight. What set Viennese opera in German apart from contemporaneous French and Italian practice in “the Age of Mozart and Beethoven,” Martin Nedbal claims in this study, is an especially intense engagement with “moral uprightness” (p. 3). This thesis, spawned and developed over the years by a succession of German theorists, aestheticians, and historians from the eighteenth century to the inter-war years of the twentieth, bears looking into anew if for no other reason than that Anglo-American scholarship has until quite recently taken a wholly different tack—to universalize and normalize, rather than particularize, the themes embodied in *Die Entführung aus dem Serail, Die Zauberflöte*, and *Fidelio*.

Nedbal concentrates his fire on three prominent themes: morality, didacticism, and nationalism. The first two of these are pervasive; they crop up on virtually every page of his study, and almost always with the adjective “intense” in tow. The moralistic and didactic impulse in German opera stretches fairly comfortably across the divide that separates cosmopolitan Vienna from the small-court, free-city world of German lands to the north. A sizeable segment of Vienna’s intelligentsia read the theatrical critiques of Joseph Christoph Gottsched and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing with approval, and drew on northern literary talent with alacrity when Joseph II established the National Theater and National Singspiel to promote German spoken theater and opera in the later 1770s.

German nationalism seems a more problematic concept, if taken in its later, political accetpation. But Nedbal construes it in terms more appropriate to both the eighteenth century and his project—as an awareness among German-speaking peoples of a shared character and temperament. Nedbal neatly sums up the baleful effects of the co-opting of this cultural form of nationalism for political ends in the nineteenth century in his comments on Hans Sach’s notorious homily at the end of *Die Meistersinger*: “In the earlier operas, maxims gave advice about how to become better human beings, whereas Wagner only preaches about being better Germans” (p. 226).

Based on extensive archival work in Vienna, Nedbal’s methodology shares an approach to eighteenth-century Viennese operatic culture centered on texts and documents found in some of the best work being done today by scholars including John A. Rice, Dorothea Link, and Bruce Alan Brown. Scores and librettos figure prominently, but so do protocols, memoranda, and letters related to theatrical administration and censorship. Especially gratifying is the serious attention paid to Mozart’s contemporaries—Ignaz Umlauf, Wenzel Müller, Peter Winter, Paul Wranitzky, and Franz Xaver Süssmayr. Although focused largely on the moralistic moments in their operas, discussion and analysis serve not simply as foils to similar moments in *Die Entführung* and *Die Zauberflöte*, but as windows on Viennese theatrical affairs during the ascendancy of the National Singspiel, its court-sponsored sequel at the Kärntnertor Theater, the suburban theaters of the 1790s, and the contemporaneous court-supported company under Peter von Braun.

Chapter 1 begins not with Mozart but with Christoph Willibald Gluck, and not with a German opera, but a French one, *La Rencontre imprévûte* (1764). Nedbal’s aim, here as elsewhere, is to compare versions—and in this case there are not two, but four: the 1726 Lesage-D’Orneval opéra-comique for the Foire Saint-Laurent (*Les Pèlerins de la Mecque*), Louis Hurtaut Dancourt’s adaptation for Gluck, a German version of Gluck’s setting by Johann Heinrich Faber (Frankfurt, 1771), and a 1780 revision of the same for the National Singspiel. Nedbal focuses not on these German versions but on Dancourt’s French text, and rightly points out that its toning down of suggestive moments and amplifying of didactic ones were both compulsory in a work for an imperial court theater closely monitored by a prudish empress.

Chapter 2 is devoted to Mozart and *Die Entführung*. Nedbal steers clear of the overwrought composer-as-dramatist syndrome and credits not Mozart but Stephanie the Younger for providing the dramatic situations in the closing numbers of acts two and three. In both numbers, suspicion and vengeance eventuate in “maxims,” sung in a kind of hymnic homophony that Mozart had exploited as early as *La finta semplice* (1769). As a didactic motif par excellence, maxims seem to step outside their dramatic context as moral asides. In opera, they fairly cry out for special musical attention, a proclivity adumbrated here and later given its full bent in *Die Zauberflöte* and *Fidelio*. Nor were they something special that Stephanie and Mozart brought to the National Singspiel. Nedbal explores in welcome depth their presence in Umlauf’s *Das Irrlicht* (1782), another Christoph Friedrich Bretzner text that Stephanie adapted for the enterprise.

In his two chapters devoted to *Die Zauberflöte*, Nedbal sets the opera in stark contrast to the “moral ambiguity” of Mozart’s three Da Ponte *opere buffe* and to the “subversive morality”
of many contemporaneous German operas (mostly of the “heroisch-comische” ilk) that were produced at Vienna’s suburban theaters. It is here that the book’s project weakens. For one thing, Die Zauberflöte itself has proved anything but immune to charges of ambiguity and subversion. And for another, both here and in the case of Fidelio, too much had changed after 1789 to support the claim that their maxims carried on the National Singspiel’s purported commitment to the ideal of German “moral uprightness.” Joseph founded the National Singspiel not as a school for German morality, but as a vehicle for German composers and performers. The National Theater, which preceded the National Singspiel and survived it, better served that end. Opera in any language embraces didacticism at its peril, for as an essentially musical art it cannot instruct if it fails to delight.

—Thomas Bauman


While Mozart has been the subject of many recent biographies, none is as “hands-on” as The Mozart Project. In this new iBook, readers may not only read Mozart’s story, but also interact with it through audio, video, and visual materials that are embedded in the book. With the tap of a finger, Mozart’s story becomes an experience from which everyone from the novice to the scholar can learn.

The brainchild of two college friends, James Fairclough and Harry Farnham, who serve as the book’s producers, The Mozart Project is billed by iTunes as “the first interactive book on Mozart.” The main goal was to create a book that would appeal to both “the curious outsider” and “the seasoned fan” (p. 211). Indeed, the accessible and non-technical manner in which the authors present the complexities of Mozart’s life and music makes the iBook particularly useful for younger scholars and enthusiasts. What enhance the text are the digital extras embedded into each page. Across the iBook’s 200 pages, readers gain access to three hours of music, twenty-five video clips, and eight hours of audio commentary. With so many elements to experience, readers can navigate their own course through the book, engaging with as many or as few features as they see fit. The result is what editor Cliff Eisen describes as “both a multi-media presentation and a comprehensive guide to the composer in all his guises,” from Mozart’s time through the present (p. 5).

The book divides into ten chapters arranged in chronological order to provide a general overview of Mozart’s life and music. In the chapters “The Grand Tour,” “Mozart in Vienna,” both by Eisen, and “The Europe of Mozart,” by Derek Beales, readers learn about Mozart’s travels and life in the eighteenth century. Several chapters shed light on Mozart’s contributions to particular genres, including John Irving’s chapters on the concerto and chamber music, Neal Zaslaw’s chapter on the symphony, and Nicholas Till’s on opera. These chapters not only delve into individual works, but also consider issues of performance practice and form. In other chapters, readers learn about Mozart as a person. In the chapter “Prodigy,” for example, David Henry Feldman considers Mozart’s musical aptitude and incorporates interviews and performance clips featuring the young Alma Deutscher, a contemporary child prodigy. In the next chapter, William Stafford seeks to understand “Mozart the Man” by reevaluating some of the most common themes in Mozart biographies, including his debts, interest in gambling, and the letters involving “bathroom humor” that he sent to family members. The book fittingly closes with Simon P. Keefe’s look at the Requiem and its reception up through the twentieth century.

What is most striking about The Mozart Project is the number of interactive options built into each page. Readers can peruse images, engage with timelines and maps, and learn vocabulary terms. Musical examples are carefully placed throughout the text, giving readers the chance to listen to the works as they are being discussed, and videos allow a glimpse into Mozart’s world and a front-row seat at several performances. With Eisen as a tour guide, readers are taken on a twenty-first-century video tour of Mozart’s Salzburg and Vienna, while in another video, they are given a peek into a vault in the basement of the Mozart-Wohnhaus, which holds some of Mozart’s autograph manuscripts and letters.

Among the book’s greatest contributions are its audio examples, which include interviews, panel discussions, and performances. Each chapter holds several two-minute clips that allow the authors to elaborate on various issues by providing their own personal insights. Nearly all of the chapters close with a discussion, each around an hour in length, in which a panel of experts further engages with issues addressed in the chapter. The final chapter of the book features an audio recording of a new performance of Alexander Pushkin’s short play Mozart and Salieri (1830). Through both audio and video examples, readers can also hear from conductors, instrumentalists, singers, and actors describing the nuances and challenges involved in interpreting Mozart.

Though the impressive use of technology enhances this book in many ways, this same technology introduces
some of the book’s drawbacks. Unfortunately, the book is only available on Apple’s iBook platform, which means it can only be used on iPads, iPhones, and other Mac products. The audio examples pose some inconvenience, as readers cannot flip through pages while simultaneously listening. In addition, the presence of scores is limited to photographs of Mozart’s manuscripts rather than longer excerpts that readers could follow along with. This may have been deliberate, however, so as not to deter those unable to read music. Despite these minor issues, the book’s extra features enhance the experience of the book overall, and draw readers further into Mozart’s life and music.

The Mozart Project provides an excellent overview of Mozart’s life and music, but its creators still embrace the notion that it is far from complete. Readers are encouraged to email questions to the authors—the answers to which will be incorporated into quarterly updated editions of the book. This initiative further reinforces The Mozart Project’s creators’ goal of engagement and interactivity, and allows twenty-first-century readers further opportunities to engage with Mozart’s story in new ways.

—Emily Wuchner


Imagine yourself as the violinist in a trio of musical friends who have arranged to sight-read some unfamiliar pieces. At a certain point, you find yourself (that is, your violin persona) descending toward a hard-won cadence. But just as you reach that goal, you sense a subversive move by the cello: instead of leaping to the tonic note as you had expected, he quietly slides up a step. What does that maneuver signify? Momentary disagreement? A mischievous undermining of your authority? An act of playful subterfuge, just where you thought your friends would join you in forming a harmonious closing punctuation?

The inherently whimsical, performer-oriented view that leads to such questions is the basis for this book’s novel argument, which centers on the possibilities of what Klorman calls “multiple agency,” whereby members of a chamber ensemble are heard to act autonomously, willing their parts into being as they interact with one another. Strictly speaking, of course, this is pure fantasy: no matter how artful their manner of phrasing, dynamics, or embellishment, performers are generally expected to honor the parts on their music stands. But if we attend closely
to those parts, hearing from inside the music as elements of initiative and response pass among the participants, we can perhaps unlock a vital musical energy that a more conventional, top-down formal analysis might overlook. From this alternative, in-the-moment vantage point, the deceptive-cadence situation described above opens up to interpretation not only as a manifestation of avoided closure but as a musically and emotionally charged moment of friction, surprise, or discord in the instruments’ engagement with one another.

 Armed with references to correspondence, contemporary accounts, and other documents, Klorman constructs a framework for his concept by examining Mozart’s reasons for composing various duos, trios, quartets, and quintets, and by considering the circumstances under which those works were initially performed. The accent falls on what the author identifies as music of friends—compositions intended for enjoyment by the players themselves, and likely to be part of an evening of musically enriched socializing. Such an environment invites parallels between the music’s interweaving lines and the give-and-take of animated conversation. This in turn leads to images of the music as an uncannily well-coordinated endeavor in group improvisation—improbable in any literal sense, but useful in capturing impressions of spontaneous interaction. As the author suggests, it helps that extemporization at the keyboard was a feature of Mozart’s own music-making within his circle of Viennese acquaintances.

 From this historically attuned perspective, Klorman strives to draw out the lively intermingling of thought and feeling that arises as individual lines jostle one another, vie for attention, play tricks, or confront one another with their differences. Thus we read that early in the last movement of the String Quartet in G Major, K. 387, “suddenly (m. 17) the first violin changes the topic, breaking out into a flurry of virtuoso fiddling. … Not wanting to be outdone, the second violin immediately jumps in (m. 23),” as if to say “anything you can do, I can do better.” Before long, the cello “seems to be fed up with this time-consuming rivalry, which has delayed the necessary modulation,” and therefore “barges in (m. 31), subito forte, turning the fiddling figure into the model for a sequence that leads the way toward the new key” (p. 118). Contemplating a deeper, more searching melodic exchange in the first movement of the Clarinet Quintet in A Major, K. 581, Klorman observes that “as the violin completes the first ‘pass’ through his carefree theme, the clarinet enters with his own, more affecting version, … offering his wisdom and experience as a response to the violin’s innocence” (pp. 143–44).

 Not content to limit his study to the personified interaction of melodic lines, Klorman devotes a long chapter, richly interlaced with theoretical commentary, to aspects of conflict, change, or ambiguity in phrasing and metrical accent. For example, he notes that in the second movement of Mozart’s Violin Sonata in G Major, K. 379/373a, after measure 77 “a lively hypermetrical exchange ensues between the piano and violin,” pitting the piano’s left hand (even-strong) against the violin (odd-strong)—a disagreement that gets sorted out several measures later when the piano defers to the violin’s metrical accents (pp. 250–53). Elsewhere, a discussion of the second movement of the Trio in E-flat Major, K. 498, for piano, clarinet, and viola, finds us inside the minds of the three instrument-personas, eavesdropping on their snippets of imaginary monologue as they work their way through a thicket of metrical confusion: “‘oops, did we play too long? … What a gaffe! If we enter here, that should set things right and we can just move on. … Hmm, … it’s all jumbled. I guess I should just play now and see what happens’” (pp. 260–61).

 Klorman crowns his inquiry with a revealing, descriptive analysis of the three-movement trio cited just above (K. 498), a composition evidently written for Anton Stadler, Franziska von Jacquin, and Mozart himself in connection with the Jacquin family’s Wednesday musical salons. He imagines a narrative in which relationships among the three instruments, coy and wary at first, become warmer as things progress. By the time we get to the finale, a “flamboyant piano revels in the limelight,” and a frustrated viola “chimes in with ‘me too’ imitations” before venting frustration in a stormy C minor and eventually finding itself in the midst of a “three-way dispute” (pp. 286–87). As tensions subside in the course of a final, conciliatory episode, where a clarinet-viola duet is shadowed an octave below in the piano, the clarinet asks, “‘What exactly was our earlier disagreement about?’” … ‘Oh, it hardly matters anymore,’ replies the cheery viola, ‘and besides, it’s more fun to play together this way anyhow’” (p. 288).

 Engaging, entertaining, and thought-provoking, this volume is informed by scholarly zeal as well as by a keen musical sensibility as Klorman traces the sociable intricacies of Mozart’s chamber-music textures from the dual standpoint of late eighteenth-century custom and present-day theoretical insight. The book thus makes a significant contribution to the Mozart literature, its usefulness enhanced by a wealth of quotations from pertinent sources as well as by an attractive, well-stocked website (mozartsmusicoffriends.com), where analytical videos help bring the author’s multiple-agency scenarios to life.

—Floyd Grave