Save the date!

The Mozart Society of America’s Biennial Conference will take place on 15-17 August 2013 in New York City, including a session on 17 August concerning Issues in Mozart Scholarship during the Mostly Mozart Festival at Lincoln Center. Details and the call for papers will appear shortly on the MSA website.

Mozart’s viola will be seen and heard in North America for the first time this June; see News in Brief (photo © Wolfgang Lienbacher).

News in Brief

With this issue, Isabelle Emerson is retiring as compiler of the calendar for the newsletter. We wish to thank her for her years of work on this, as well as her many other contributions to the Mozart Society of America. Anyone wishing to take on this important task for the Society should contact either the editor or MSA president Peter Hoyt.

In June 2013 for the first time ever Mozart’s violin and viola will travel to the United States. The Salzburg Mozarteum Foundation will send a delegation and the two original instruments to the Boston Early Music Festival. Besides being on exhibit, the instruments will be played by the internationally known Amadine Beyer and Milos Valentić, along with Christian Bezuidenhout (fortepiano) and Eric Hoeprich (baroque clarinet) in an all-Mozart program at New England Conservatory’s Jordan Hall at 8 PM on 10 June. Tickets: www.bemf.org.


Among Michael Lorenz’s recent Mozart discoveries is the location of Lorenzo Da Ponte’s residence in 1788, the first definite address that has been documented for the poet in his Viennese years. Perhaps not surprisingly, his apartment was not very far from Mozart’s at the time; the full story appears at http://michaelorenz.blogspot.co.at/.


MSA member Victoria Koursaros is an artist who tries to show her admiration for both Mozart and 18th-century art by meticulously recreating oil paintings (including the best-known Mozart portraits) using the traditional methods. A few of her recent paintings appear at:
Mozart at ASECS 2013

The Mozart Society of America is again sponsoring two sessions at the annual meeting of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, which will take place in Cleveland, OH, 4-7 April 2013. Several other sessions will include presentations of interest for Mozart scholars. Contents of these sessions are given below, with abstracts of the presentations specifically related to Mozart. For more information on the conference, including the complete program, see the ASECS website, asecs.press.jhu.edu.

April 4, Session 44. “Critical Issues in Theater and Performance Studies” (Roundtable)
Chair: Jean I. MARSDEN, University of Connecticut
1. Paula BACKSCHEIDER, Auburn University
2. Helen BROOKS, University of Kent
3. Lisa A. FREEMAN, University of Illinois, Chicago
4. Michael GAVIN, University of South Carolina
5. Edmund J. GOEHRING, University of Western Ontario
6. Jessica MUNNS, University of Denver

Professor Goering’s opening remarks:
One economical way of identifying the stresses and tensions within current opera criticism is through the individual study, and, in this regard, David J. Levin’s Unsettling Opera (Chicago, 2007) is especially revealing. One part of it looks to set up rather than dismantle boundaries for criticism. Thus, a recent staging of Mozart’s Entführung is faulted for “illuminating too narrow a swath of the piece” (xiv), while Peter Sellars’s production of Figaro missteps to the extent that it places “before the audience the mechanics rather than the effects of operatic discourse,” what amounts to “showing rather than merely effecting a change of scene” (86).

Such verdicts sit uneasily with Levin’s larger priorities, and I trouble to point this out because his priorities are also those of some leading academic opera criticism, including that touching on the eighteenth century. Despite his focus on the most recent theory and production, Levin follows a mode of thought resembling what A. D. Nuttall characterized a generation ago as Opaque criticism, which he describes in A New Mimesis as “external, formalist, operating outside the mechanisms of art and taking those mechanisms as its object” (80). That objectifying activity is at work in, for example, Levin’s claim that opera as a genre is characterized by “an excess of expressive means” (xi); more profoundly, it informs his taboo on using mimesis as a critical category, because mimesis, having no writ as an “absolute,” involves “merely a consensus about presumed correspondences between musical expression and stage representation” (81). The first argument posits an external norm against which opera is deemed excessive; the second conceives music and drama as distinct entities in an opera, as if an opera’s causes (from efficient to final) of necessity excluded the representation of an action.
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www.victoriakoursaros.com/. She has offered to make a contribution to MSA if any other MSA member commissions a painting from her.

Opera Theater SummerFest is holding Mozart Camp on 16-20 July 2013 at the elegant Twentieth Century Club in the heart of Pittsburgh. Mozart Camp includes lectures and workshops on Mozart’s life and works; three chamber and vocal recitals; premiere seating for the comic opera La finta giardiniera, written by Mozart at age 18; and two intimate dinners hosted by mezzo-soprano Mildred Miller Posvar. Also available are best seat discounts for the other SummerFest productions. Tuition for the week is $650, but MSA members receive a tuition discount of $150, and a 20% discount on any other SummerFest tickets: use promo code AMADEUS during checkout. For more information, please visit www.otsummerfest.org/mozart or call (412) 621-1499.
There are other things to say about opera and its possibilities—richer things—and one place to find them is in the eighteenth century. Heading this list of expanded possibilities is a challenge to the idea that “pronounced theatricality” by definition opposes “dramatic versimilitude” (Levin, 88). Of course, some factions in the Vienna of Mozart’s day would perpetuate the very old idea of theater as a form of deceit. What’s remarkable is the extent to which something like the opposite could prevail, including in the imperial city’s highest political and cultural circles: that theater was a social good whose very sensuality—that “excess of expressive means,” as it were—made it society’s most powerful instrument of practical philosophy. Mozart’s collected operas are hardly univocal on this (or most any) point, but a work like Figaro, for example, makes immediate and concrete the more harmonious relationship between the stage and the world that was theoretically posited by Austria’s clerical theatrophiles. Figaro draws its musico-dramatic ethos from the observation that social life, including rituals that publicize and institutionalize love, has an element of theater about it. No conflict between theatricality and mimesis rules here; theater imitates the world, but also the other way around. (In this equation, by the way, there is an influence of Stoicism that merits further inquiry.)

This one episode from recent criticism can help highlight other places one might look—or ways of looking—that can ease some of the strains in modern opera criticism. As Jane Brown has argued, “the history of European drama is a unity” (The Persistence of Allegory, x), which is to say that our disciplinary habits of separating opera from spoken drama and secular from sacred repertories are not entirely natural ones. And, for all of the high formalism permeating the kind of criticism outlined above, one of its main interpretive standards is that of psychological realism. I do not wish to misprize an extraordinary historical achievement of eighteenth-century theater, which saw music move from an element of external spectacle to an expression of the interior subject. Even so, in Mozart’s works and the wider repertory, not all is background, to use Erich Auerbach’s category, and their action can unfold along the vertical as well as horizontal axis.

April 4, Session 60. “Cultural Counterpoints: Censors, Theatre, and the Arts in the Societies and Cultural Milieu of the Old and New Worlds” – I

Chair: Gloria EIVE, Saint Mary’s College of California
1. Frieda KOENINGER, Sam Houston State University, “‘Santos Diez González: Esthete or Bully? Theater Censorship in Madrid, 1788–1802?’”
3. Martin NEDBAL, University of Arkansas, “The Complexities of Theater Censorship in Late Eighteenth-Century Vienna: The Case of Mozart’s Don Giovanni and Così fan tutte”

Scholars often think of eighteenth-century censorship in Vienna as an institution through which the imperial government oppressed the supposedly free-thinking artists. Such notions circulate in scholarly considerations of how censorship influenced the creation and production of Mozart’s Italian comic operas. Several studies have suggested that Mozart and his librettist Lorenzo da Ponte had to be extremely circumspect in putting together their three collaborations (Le nozze di Figaro, Don Giovanni, and Così fan tutte) due to their fear of the censors. Other commentators, such as Otto Erich Deutsch, have claimed that after Mozart’s death, when the Da Ponte operas appeared on Viennese stages in German translations, the censors enforced further “mutilation” according to draconic measures of prudishness and reactionary politics. Complicating these widely accepted views are two rarely-studied, handwritten German translations of Mozart’s Don Giovanni and Così (titled Don Juan and Mächentreu), now in the possession of the Austrian National Library. These manuscripts were prepared for the German productions of the two operas at Vienna’s court theater in 1803 and 1804 and were commented upon by the longtime Viennese censor Franz Karl Hägelin. Hägelin’s “corrections” often reflect the principles that he himself outlined in his 1795 treatise on the tasks of theatrical censors. There are many passages, however, that Hägelin curiously does not rewrite although they
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Object
The object of the Society shall be the encouragement and advancement of studies and research about the life, works, historical context, and reception of Wolfgang Amadé Mozart, as well as the dissemination of information about study and performance of related music.

Goals

1. Provide a forum for communication among scholars (mostly but not exclusively American); encourage new ideas about research concerning Mozart and the late eighteenth century.
2. Present reviews of new publications, recordings, and unusual performances, and information about dissertations.
3. Support educational projects dealing with Mozart and the eighteenth-century context.
4. Announce events—symposia, festivals, concerts—local, regional, and national.
5. Report on work and activities in other parts of the world.
6. Encourage interdisciplinary scholarship by establishing connections with such organizations as the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies.
7. Serve as a central clearing house for information about Mozart materials in the Americas.
clearly offend his self-professed principles. Hägelin’s corrections, moreover, do not always distort the ideas of the original work but take issue with the elements added in the process of the German translation. Hägelin was only one of the many agents involved in the preparation of the libretto both before and after the censoring; various directors, translators, and actors added and deleted passages often for reasons that did not necessarily have to do with their fear of the censor’s disapproval but with their own aesthetic preferences and practical needs. In light of these manuscripts I argue that censorship was not a merely restrictive institution but one of the numerous creative agents involved in shaping up the constantly transforming works of theater.

April 4, Session 72. “Mozart and Concept of Genius” (Mozart Society of America)

Chair: Edmund J. GOEHRING, University of Western Ontario

1. Peter A. HOYT, Columbia Museum of Art, “Ideas and Memory in Mozart’s Accounts of Composition”

In a letter of 14 May 1778, Mozart tells his father of his difficulties in teaching composition to Marie-Louise-Philippine de Guines. The account is elusive in many ways, in part because Mozart seems to mistrust his own vocabulary, as if he is unsure whether it completely conveys the meanings he wishes to communicate. These doubts are most apparent in his presentation of idée as a synonym for gedancken (sic) and, a few lines later, in his redundant specification of gedancken as synonymous with idée. These appositions would seem unnecessary: his family’s correspondence had already used both terms in conformance with common eighteenth-century usage, in which ideas were regarded as the raw material that an artist collects through exposure to other artworks (rather than creates ex nihilo) and thereafter assembles—composes—to create new artworks. In this accepted perspective, creativity was closely linked to memory, for it was in the memory that an artist amassed a storehouse of ideas that could be drawn upon when needed.

This model, however, broke down in the particular case of Mlle de Guines: Mozart states that she played the harp magnificently and that “she has much talent and genius, particularly an incomparable memory [ein unvergleichliches gedächtniß], in that she can play all her pieces, of which she really knows about 200, by heart.” Despite her formidable memory, Mlle de Guines doubted “whether she also has a genius for composition,” and Mozart was also inclined to skepticism, for “she has no ideas at all” (sie hat gar keine gedanken).

This presents an acute interpretative problem, for then-prevailing models of composition assumed that a prodigious memory could not be void of ideas. This paper will explore the correspondence concerning Mlle de Guines, the vocabulary concerning creativity in Mozart’s writings, and—in the attempt to understand the nuances of his letter—attitudes concerning ideas and memory in contemporaneous accounts of genius.

2. Michael NICHOLSON, University of California, Los Angeles, “A Singular Experiment in Genius Reduction: The Creature as Scientist in Frankenstein”

3. Samuel BREENE, Rhode Island College, “Tuning the Passions: Mozart’s Imagination and the Embodiment of Genius”

In 1766, the Swiss physician Samuel Auguste Tissot met the “jeune Mozard,” a musical prodigy traveling through Lausanne with his family. As a leading intellectual and translator of Albrecht von Haller’s important Dissertation on the Sensible and Irritable Parts of Animals, Tissot was uniquely qualified to assess musicality according to the latest scientific theories of the day. In the case of Mozart, he discerned “in all his pieces, even in his fantasias, that forceful character which is the seal of genius, that variety which reveals the fire of the imagination, and that charm that indicates unerring taste; finally … the most difficult pieces executed with an ease and a facility which would be surprising in a musician of thirty years.” Tissot determined that an explanation for Mozart’s extraordinary abilities would emerge by probing “the relationship between moral and physical man.”

In this paper, I take Tissot’s scientific analysis as a catalyst for reconsidering Mozart’s genius within the culture of sensibility. Rather than occupying a transcendent realm, Mozart’s contemporaries saw his genius as inextricably linked with his embodied state, realized in the inventive play of physical gestures contained in fantasias, sonatas, and related genres. In this conception, the imagination functioned as a mediator between physical sensation and the moral faculty, receiving and transforming a constant flow of sensation into musical sound. Audiences interpreted a performer’s movements, down to the slightest quiver, as signs of entwined morality and musicality. Thus I argue that Mozart’s genius was understood as a product of his acute sensitivity to the world around him, manifested not in abstract compositional structures but in the sensory space of performance.

April 5, Session 105. “Vernacular Opera and Popular Culture in the Eighteenth Century” (Society for Eighteenth-Century Music)

Chair: Martin NEDBAL, University of Arkansas

1. John RODRIGUE, Oklahoma State University, “From Page to Stage and Back Again: John Dalton and Thomas Arne’s Comus”

2. Gloria EIVE, Saint Mary’s College of California, “Luigi Boccherini’s La Clementina: Spanish Musical Theater in the Shadow of the Zarzuela and Opera Buffa”

3. John RICE, University of Michigan “The Hivart-Sheremetev Correspondence: A Little Known Source of Information about Operatic Production in Paris during the 1780s”

4. Julia DOE, Yale University, “Untangling the Origins of Revolutionary Opera”

April 5, Session 121. “Music and Material Culture”

Chair: Laurel E. ZEISS, Baylor University

1. Michael BURDEN, Oxford University, New College, “‘Arias on the loose’: Retrieving Musical Resources for the London Aria”

2. Emily GREEN, Yale University, “Memoirs of a Musical Object, Supposedly Written by Itself: It-Narrative and the Eighteenth-Century Title Page”

April 5, Session 135. “Mozart and His Contemporaries”
(Mozart Society of America)

Chairs: Isabelle EMERSON, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and Peter A. HOYT, Columbia Museum of Art
1. Laureen L. WHITEWELL, Northwestern University, “Beyond Spheres: Female Professional Composers of the Late Enlightenment”
2. Sydney BOYD, Rice University, “The Life and Death Situation in Mozart’s Operas”

In Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley’s The Last Man (1826), Perdita Verney insists that only the “Operas of Mozart” be performed because, unlike any other music, Mozart’s music “comes from the heart” (99). Lionel Verney, the narrator and last man on earth after an apocalyptic plague, writes that while listening to Mozart’s operas, “you enter into the passions expressed by him, and are transported with grief, joy, anger, or confusion, as he, our soul’s master, chooses to inspire” (99). The trio “Taci ingiusto core” from Don Giovanni (premiered 1787) penetrates Perdita, recalling “memories from a changed past” and filling her with regret and despair. Occurring early in the novel, this pointed and specific inclusion of Mozart’s operas opens the remaining plot, as it takes a turn to terror and destruction, to be curiously inspired.

Opera’s close relation to death is all too obvious for Catherine Clément, who describes the opera theatre itself as a coffin and the stage as the site of repeated death in Opera, or the Undoing of Women (1998). This paper will explore the legacy of Mozart and opera in the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century using periodical reviews (from namely The Examiner and The Morning Chronicle) and other records of its reception, as well as score analysis. Its final aim will essay the mutation of Mozart’s operas opens the remaining plot, as it takes a turn to terror and destruction, to be curiously inspired.

Operas’s close relation to death is all too obvious for Catherine Clément, who describes the opera theatre itself as a coffin and the stage as the site of repeated death in Opera, or the Undoing of Women (1998). This paper will explore the legacy of Mozart and opera in the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century using periodical reviews (from namely The Examiner and The Morning Chronicle) and other records of its reception, as well as score analysis. Its final aim will essay the mutation of Mozart’s operas opens the remaining plot, as it takes a turn to terror and destruction, to be curiously inspired.

April 6, Session 169. “Eighteenth-Century Opera in Production”
Chair: Karen HILES, Muhlenberg College
1. Majel A. CONNERY, University of Chicago, “Mozart as Meta-Production in the 2006 Salzburg Festival”

In 2006, the 250th anniversary of Mozart’s birth, the Salzburg Festival set itself an extraordinary (and truly operatic) challenge: the performance in 22 evenings of all Mozart’s operas, including fragments and juvenilia. Newly released in a 22-DVD set, this anthology of Mozart is not just a living monument to the composer’s legacy, but arguably the most important document of what Mozart’s operas mean to the 21st century. This paper examines a cluster of productions from the DVD collection, including Le nozze di Figaro, the Irrfahrten trilogy (comprising La finta semplice, L’oca del Cairo and Lo sposo deluso), Bastien und Bastienne and Der Schauspieldirektor. Attending specifically to the mise-en-scène of these performances, I contend that they exhibit a recurring directorial strategy in which “the opera” is framed by a second production, namely, the management and oversight of the opera—the production of the production. Key to this superimposition is the introduction of a new, non-singing character, non-native to the opera and recognizably outside it, who both produces and watches the opera as it unfolds. Ultimately, I argue that this strategy of production/meta-production offers 21st-century audiences an unusual gateway into the world of Mozart through the means of its perpetuation: the controlling vision and direction of the festival itself.

2. Edmund J. GOEHRING, The University of Western Ontario, “The Flaws in the Finale”
I lift my title from Umberto Eco’s “Flaws in the Form” (2002), an essay at a theory of critical decorum—steering clear of a strict separation of form from poetry, on the one side, and a Neoplatonic rapture over Pure Form (where any adjustment to the part destroys the whole), off to the other. Eco comes upon this course in the encounter with various felices culpa in literary forms. One species of them is what a former teacher of his, Luigi Pareyson, called the “stopgap” (“zeppa”). Stopgaps are literary devices that seem to possess only structural, not poetic impor. A clause like “she said” in a novel qualifies as a stopgap, the sort of thing barely noticed in reading but indispensable in keeping a dialogue from becoming “wearisome or incomprehensible.”

The notion of stopgap offers a useful perspective on how some criticism has related drama to musical form in Mozart opera. One passage that has drawn recent attention is a slender bridge in Figaro’s last-act finale: the three-measure instrumental transition joining the hymn of reconciliation (in G major) to the public exhalation that the “mad day” is finally at an end (this in D major, mm. 445–48). David J. Levin, in contemplating Peter Sellars’s production as a form of translation, notes that the passage does not look to draw attention to itself. It is, in other words, a stopgap. Levin helpfully amplifies the point by noting what would happen were a director to overcome the “banality” (as Eco puts it) of Mozart’s stopgap: “To stage that transition is to place before the audience the mechanics rather than the effects of operatic discourse—akin to showing rather than merely effecting a change of scene.”

Just so. And yet other aspects of Levin’s project (including his main task of “unsettling” opera) resent his cautions against reducing utterance to mechanism: the skepticism about mimesis as a useful critical category (because mimesis is “merely a consensus,” as opposed to an “absolute,” 81); the strong separation of drama and staging from music; and, specifically concerning Figaro, the acceptance of an ironic reading as axiomatic, even though that interpretation relies on the very separation of mechanism from discourse that Levin calls into question elsewhere.

To resolve some of these difficulties, we can once again conscript Eco’s self-effacing stopgap. Levin rightly notes that Mozart’s hinge bears dramaturgical values like economy and restraint. I would add that it also carries a mimetic function—namely, marking out the reconciliation scene as a space apart. It effects a transition, from a solemn time to a festive one. To follow Levin’s lead when he imagines Figaro’s plot as an allegory about fidelity in operatic interpretation, one might conclude that Mozart’s happy, formal fault corrects two kinds of Neoplatonist: the enthusiast for formal perfection, but no less its disappointed, objectivizing twin, who, unable to find absolute perfection, settles for a disorienting indeterminacy instead of a compelling ambiguity.
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The Soloists in “Martern aller Arten,” Mozart’s Sinfonia Concertante Movement for Flute, Oboe, Violin, Violoncello, and One-Eyed Soprano

Theodore Albrecht

Most of us have probably witnessed the commissioning of Mozart’s Abduction from the Seraglio, as it was depicted in the motion picture version of Amadeus: Emperor Joseph II, surrounded by his advisors, including Count Franz Xaver Wolf Orsini-Rosenberg, director of the Court Theaters, as well as the subsequent (fictional) Court indignation that Mozart would have begun composing such an opera without anyone in authority’s having seen or approved the libretto. Initially, the micromanaging Emperor envisioned a new opera to be premiered during the Viennese visit of Grand Duke Paul of Russia in September, 1781. Because Joseph hoped to forge an alliance with Paul’s mother, Catherine the Great, against the Turks, a light-hearted, exotic Singspiel, making jest of Turkish ways was just the right vehicle, and Court Librettist Gottlieb Stephanie the Younger set to work adapting an earlier play by Christoph Friedrich Bretzner into Die Entführung aus dem Serail. Mozart received the first act from Stephanie on 30 July, and he was already at work on it by 1 August.

The plot involves the Westerners, Constanze, Blonde, and Pedrillo, who have been shipwrecked in Turkey, and are held captive by Pasha Selim and guarded by Osmin. In the process, Pasha Selim has determined to add Constanze to his harem. Belmonte comes in search of them, and in their attempt to escape, they are caught by Osmin and subjected to Pasha Selim’s judgment. In a turn of plot, Selim magnanimously frees the Westerners to return home.

As Mozart wrote to his father in Salzburg, the cast was to include Catarina Cavalieri as Constanze, Therese Teyber as Blonde, Ludwig Karl Fischer as Osmin, Ernst Dauer as Pedrillo, and the celebrated Valentin Adamberger as Belmonte.

The second and third acts of the libretto required more extensive revision than previously estimated, and the opera was not ready for Archduke Paul’s visit. Postponed until the next season, that is, the next fiscal year which began on 1 April 1782, The Abduction from the Seraglio was finally premiered in Vienna’s Burgtheater on 16 July 1782. Only recently have we been able to examine the Court Theater’s account books for these fiscal years. The records of the regularly-employed personnel from the 1782-83 season through the 1792-93 season were published in 1998 in Dorothea Link’s fine The National Court Theatre in Mozart’s Vienna, and I have been able to examine the original documents for these and surrounding years, including the Extra Expenses that Professor Link was not able to publish. With these documents now co-ordinated to Mozart’s progress in composing, we can consider the score as reflecting the personnel available in each of the two affected fiscal years.

Table 1 provides evidence that, when Mozart composed Act 1 of The Abduction during fiscal 1781-1782, the Burgtheater’s orchestra was experiencing problems in its flute section: its principal flutist Thurner was frequently ill, possibly leaving them with but one player, even though the Extra Expenses indicate that a substitute flutist Prowos was hired, probably seven times. As a result, Mozart never scored for more than one flute (even though he sometimes played piccolo) in Act 1. Only in Act 2, composed during fiscal 1782-83, relatively close to the revised premiere date, did Mozart now score for a second flute, with one of them still doubling piccolo. Because the subject was Turkish and required the typical Janissary combination of bass drum, cymbals, and triangle, the Extra Expenses for 1782-83 indicate that the Court Theater hired band musicians from the nearby Artillery Regiment. Mozart surely learned that the virtuoso Stadler brothers played basset horn in addition to their clarinets, and he included a pair of these instruments, as well, in Constanze’s aria “Traurigkeit ward mir zum Loose” (Sadness was my lot) in Act 2.

Audiences at a Singspiel performance would customarily expect that the musical numbers within the light-hearted drama would be brief, with vocal numbers limited to simple song forms, usually simple strophic settings, such as Osmin’s first aria. In the middle of Act 2, however, Constanze bravely tells the enamored Pasha Selim that, if he insists upon retaining her for his harem, she would resist all kinds of torture, even unto death. Whether it was Stephanie’s idea in the libretto, or whether it was at Mozart’s prompting, the fourteen lines of text would provide an extensive aria—“Martern aller Arten”—for the star soprano, Catarina Cavalieri—ultimately, a vehicle far beyond the requirements of a simple Singspiel.

Despite her Italian-sounding stage name, soprano Catarina Cavalieri was born Catharina Magdalena Josepha Cavalieri, in suburban Lichtenthal, on 18 March 1755, the daughter of musician, choir director, and Redouten-Saal director Joseph Carl Cavalieri. Conflicting sources and scholars have identified her as Franziska Helena Appolonia Cavalier, born in suburban Währing on 9 February 1760, but that child seems to have died in 1761.
Although Cavalieri made her debut in the Court’s Italian Opera Company in 1775, she joined the German Company as soon as Joseph II established it in 1777, and became one of its leading lights. She was almost universally praised for her beautiful singing, and her acting was said to be improving steadily. The Deutsches Museum of 1781, however, provides a more candid, and possibly more accurate assessment, saying that she possessed “a strong voice with an individual quality, but is frightfully ugly, has only one eye, and acts extremely badly.”

The modern reader might take a moment to consider why Cavalieri had only one eye and was frightfully ugly to boot. In eighteenth-century terms, the answer is simple: she had had smallpox! When the Mozart family visited Vienna in October, 1767, an outbreak of smallpox killed one of the Imperial children and sent Leopold, Wolfgang, and Nannerl fleeing north to Olmütz in Moravia, where little Wolferl came down with a mild case of it anyway and had to remain in bed until nearly Christmas. Young Mozart was lucky. Both of Emperor Joseph II’s wives died of smallpox. Victims who survived were often severely pocked: realistic portraits of Haydn and especially Gluck show their scarred faces. Some victims lost an eye or were left entirely blind: Beethoven’s student Ferdinand Ries, for instance, was exempted from military service in 1805 because he was blind in one eye. Thus, the famous plumpish silhouette of Cavalieri by Hieronymus Löschenhohl tells only half the story of her appearance.

Nevertheless, she must have been attractive enough that Antonio Salieri took her as his mistress. In his Memoirs, though, Lorenzo da Ponte called her “a lady who had talent enough to have no need of storming the heights by intrigue.” When Da Ponte got an audience with new Emperor Leopold II in 1791, the monarch told him, “I know all of [Salieri’s] intrigues, and I know the intrigues of the Cavalieri woman. …. I don’t want either him or his German woman in my theater anymore.”

At the time of The Abduction from the Seraglio, she was receiving a salary of 1200 gulden per year; by the time she retired from the stage at the end of the 1792-1793 fiscal year, she was receiving 2133 gulden, compared to the 350 of the rank-and-file members of the orchestra, and she died a wealthy woman on 30 June 1801, at age 46.

The score of “Martern aller Arten” is very unusual indeed. Embedded within the orchestra are four concertante instruments—flute, oboe, violin, and violoncello—and its form is essentially that of a sinfonia concertante’s first movement, complete with the presentation of two contrasting themes or theme groups, first played in the orchestra before the soprano herself ever sings a note in her “second exposition.”

But this article is not musical analysis. Better to consider that Mozart, just as he was compensating for a single flutist in his earlier numbers, and writing for the Studler brothers and their basset horns later on, now could write for a quartet of prominent soloists in the orchestra, including Joseph Prowos, who was hired as the new principal flutist on 1 May 1782, ten weeks before the opera’s premiere.

The name of flutist Joseph Prowos is spelled differently in almost every surviving document, but evidence supports P-r-o-w-o-s as the most consistent spelling used in later life. At any rate, his birthplace is given as Bitt or Bill (possibly Bilina), near the Bohemian resort of Teplitz. Two census records after 1805 give his birth year as 1752 and 1753, but in any case, he lived—unmarried—until 10 May 1832, when he died of tuberculosis at ages varyingly reported in the Magistrat’s death record as 81 years, and in the Schotten Jurisdiction’s estate records as 80 years. He was still principal flutist in 1808, living on the Graben, only a five- or ten-minute walk from the Burgtheater. When he retired, probably the next year, as a very young Aloys Khayll joined the orchestra.

Prowos moved across the Danube Canal to the suburb of Leopoldstadt, and by the time he died, was living in the near-western suburb of St. Ulrich, close to the church in which Gluck had been married in 1750.

The very first of the Theater Account Books that survive in Vienna’s Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv indicates that principal oboist Georg Triebensee had joined the Burgtheater’s orchestra on 1 January 1777, as a replacement for Georg Käffer. Unlike most theatrical musicians of the time, Triebensee actually merits a brief article in MGG and New Grove, shared with his son Joseph, who became a prominent composer after 1800. At any rate the elder Triebensee was born in Herrndorf, Silesia, on 28 July 1746, remained in the orchestra through at least the Summer of 1806, but had retired by the time the Hof- und Staats-Schematismus (the Court and State Directory) of 1807 was compiled, to be replaced by Joseph Czerwenka. Although Triebensee earlier lived in the nearby Wieden suburb (to the south of the Wien River), by the time he died, of a stroke, on 14 June 1813, he had moved just north of the river in House No. 152 (at the sign of the Hungarian King) in the equally-near suburb of Laimgrube, on the south side of today’s Mariahilfer Strasse, not far north from the Theater an der Wien.

Violoncellist Joseph Weigl, who also merits an article in MGG and New Grove with his sons, was born in either Vienna or Bavaria, on 19 March or May 1740, and in 1761 (upon Haydn’s recommendation) joined Prince Esterházy’s orchestra in Eisenstadt. In 1769, he became principal cellist at the Kärntnertor Theater in Vienna, but, through the Court’s many musical reorganizations, ended up at the Burgtheater by at least 1776. He remained there through at least 1808, but had retired from that position by 1814. Meanwhile, however, he had joined the Hofkapelle (Imperial Chapel) in 1792, and remained there through his death of a stroke at his apartment in the Himmelpfortgasse, about 6 blocks south of the Theater and Hofkapelle, on 25 January 1820, at 4:30 in the afternoon. Both of

continued on page 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violin I</th>
<th>Violin II</th>
<th>Violin I</th>
<th>Violin II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wobozil, Thomas, concertmaster, German Singspiel</td>
<td>Hofer, Michel, concertmaster, German Theater</td>
<td>Wobozil, concertmaster, German Singspiel (450 fl.)</td>
<td>Hofer, Michael, concertmaster, German Theater (400 fl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinhard, Leopold</td>
<td>Klemp, Johann</td>
<td>Reinhard (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Klemp, Johann (350 fl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheidl, Joseph</td>
<td>Müller (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Scheidl (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Müller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaschke [Blaska], Joseph</td>
<td>Pirlinger (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Blaschke (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Pirlinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofer, Franz</td>
<td>Milechnier (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Hofer, Franz</td>
<td>Milechnier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klemp, Leopold</td>
<td>Bachner, Michel, died in March, 1783 (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Klemp, Leopold</td>
<td>Maratschek, Carl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viola</th>
<th>Viola</th>
<th>Viola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huber, Thaddäus</td>
<td>Huber (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Huber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofer, Mathias</td>
<td>Hofer, Mathias (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Hofer, Mathias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurscher, Jacob</td>
<td>Nurscher (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Nurscher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borghi [Porghi], Anton</td>
<td>Borghi (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Borghi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachner, Michel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violoncello</th>
<th>Violoncello</th>
<th>Violoncello</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weigl, Joseph</td>
<td>Weigl (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Weigl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orsler, Joseph</td>
<td>Orsler (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Orsler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacher, Joseph</td>
<td>Pacher (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Pacher, died 2 March 1784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrabass</th>
<th>Contrabass</th>
<th>Contrabass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balday, Franz</td>
<td>Balday (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Balday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schillinger, Johann Nepomuk</td>
<td>Schillinger, died 15 October 1782 (204 fl. 10 xr.); in his place: Kammermeier, Joseph, from 1 November (145 fl. 50 xr.)</td>
<td>Kammermeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenig, Heinrich</td>
<td>Wenig (350 fl.)</td>
<td>Wenig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risser, Johann, often ill</td>
<td>Risser, often ill (200 fl.)</td>
<td>Risser, often ill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flute</th>
<th>Flute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thurner, Franz or Johann</td>
<td>Prowos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menschel, Martin</td>
<td>Menschel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grubner, until 31 August 1783, then dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Name 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oboe</strong></td>
<td>Treibensee, Georg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Went, Johann Nepomuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarinet</strong></td>
<td>Stadler, Anton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stadler, Johann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bassoon</strong></td>
<td>Kauzner, Wenzel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drobney, Ignaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horn</strong></td>
<td>Scrvaneck, Anton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leutgeb, Ignaz (Joseph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trumpet</strong></td>
<td>[not listed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Meyer, Jr.] (below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timpani</strong></td>
<td>[not listed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[not listed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percussion</strong></td>
<td>[not listed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra Expenses, selected (pp. 56-66)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie the Younger, for directing opera (426 fl. 40 x.r.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie the Younger, for 3 Singspiel libretti @ 150 fl. and 1 comedy @ 394 fl. 22 x.r. (total 844 fl. 22 x.r.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provos, flutist, substitute for ill Thurner, c. 7 times (7 fl.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurner, musician, [paid] for 2 piccolos (8 fl. 32 x.r.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Extra Expenses, selected (pp. 52-57)** |
| Stephanie the Younger, for libretto Entführung (100 fl.) |
| Tyron, Franz, for musicians from Artillery Band, for opera Entführung (32 fl.) |
| Mayer, Karl, Court Trumpeter, for trumpeters and timpanist, April, 1782-March, 1783 (226 fl. 20 x.r.) |
| Mozart, Wolfgang, for composing Entführung (426 fl. 40 x.r.) |
| Stadler, Felix, substitute for ill Schillinger (27 fl.) |
| Stadler Bros., Anton & Johann, for 2 C-clarinets and tuning pieces, purchased by Court Theaters (102 fl. 24 x.r.) |

| **Extra Expenses, selected (pp. 52, 56-59)** |
| Leutgeb, Leopold, former hornist, 3 mos. salary as severance (87 fl. 30 x.r.) |
| Scrvaneck, N. N., former hornist, 3 mos. salary as severance (87 fl. 30 x.r.) |
| Prowos, Joseph, for obtaining two middle pieces for flutes (2 fl.) |
| Tyron, Franz, Kapellmeister, for musicians from Artillery Band (6 fl.) |
| Leutgeb, Joseph, hornist, substitute for ill Eisen [probably two months] (62 fl.) |
| Mayer, Karl, Court Trumpeter, for trumpeters and timpanist, for ten months (total of 456 fl. 30 kr.) |
| Scrvaneck and Orner, extra services (2 fl.) |
Wolfgang Amadè Mozart

Die Entführung aus dem Serail
(The Abduction from the Seraglio)

Cast at the Premiere, Burgtheater, Vienna (Tuesday, 16 July 1782), and Salaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Performer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmonte, tenor</td>
<td>Valentin Adamberger (2133 fl. 12 xr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constanze, soprano</td>
<td>Catarina Cavaliere (1200 fl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedrillo, tenor</td>
<td>Johann Ernst Dauer (1200 fl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blonde, soprano</td>
<td>Therese Teyber (800 fl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmin, bass</td>
<td>Ludwig Carl Fischer (1200 fl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasha Selim, speaker</td>
<td>Dominik Jautz (800 fl.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further Performances through March, 1784:

19, 26, 30 July 1782
3, 6, 20, 27 August 1782
6, 20 September 1782
8 October 1782
10 December 1782
7 January 1783
4, 16 February 1783
25 January 1784
1 February 1784

Other Personnel and Fiscal Year Salaries:

Stephanie the Younger, actor (1400 fl.)
Lang, Aloisia, geb. Weber (1706 fl. 36 xr.)
Lang, actor, her husband (1400 fl.)
Umlauf, Ignaz, Kapellmeister (800 fl. + 50 fl.)
[Salieri, Kapellmeister (853 fl. 12 xr.)]

The Soloists

continued from page 7

his sons, Joseph and Thaddäus, became composers, and the latter supervised the Imperial music publishing business.

Perhaps surprisingly, the most elusive member of the solo instrumental quartet is the concertmaster Woborzil. From the records of the Tonkünstler Societät (the Society for the Widows and Orphans of Musicians), as published by C. F. Pohl in 1870, we learn that his first name was Thomas, that he entered the Society among its groups of charter members on 8 May 1771 (presumably as a member of the Burgtheater’s orchestra), and that he died on 14 January 1800, leaving no widow or orphans. Over the years, because it was basically an insurance organization, the Society kept fairly accurate records of the dates of birth of its members, but in this case, no such date is to be found.

Thus, the researcher, armed with Woborzil’s date of death, would (as in the case of Prowos, already discussed) proceed to the Viennese Magistrat’s Totenbeschauprotokoll (its official death records), where one could expect to find occupation, marital status, place of birth, residence, place of death, cause of death, and age at death—detail accurate to the extent that the deceased’s survivors knew them for official purposes. But, no—there is no death record for Woborzil on 14 January 1800.

Fortunately, over 50 years ago, Viennese City Archivist Gustav Gugitz compiled an index (admittedly hit-and-miss) of the estate records (the Verlassenschafts-Abhandlungen) of individuals active in Vienna’s cultural life from 1783 to c.1850, and Gugitz does indeed note an estate record for Woborzil in 1800. That document, in turn, reveals a number of valuable details. Firstly, Woborzil died in Nussdorf, a village with fashionable residences about seven miles northwest of urban and suburban Vienna—therefore, his death would customarily not have been noted among the city Magistrat’s records. The document notes that his permanent residence, however, was in the suburb of Alservorstadt, only about a thousand feet west-northwest of the walls, in Schloßgelagasse No. 15. He was single and left no children, but his nearest relative and sole heir was a brother Johann, a weights-and-measures official in Sowar, Hungary, suggesting that the violinist himself (despite his Czech surname) might have come from Hungary. While most orchestral musicians died with few taxable possessions, worth nothing or at most maybe 25 gulden, Woborzil’s estate was worth a total of 9,460 gulden 20 kreutzer, and included 3 violins and 2 cases. The downside is that the estate record notes Woborzil’s death date as 15 January, as opposed to 14 January (as reported in the Tonkünstler Societät’s records), and, likewise, nowhere gives his birthdate or his age at death.

Fortunately, the Sterbematrik (record of deaths) in the Parish Church in Nussdorf recorded Woborzil’s death from inflammation of the intestines on 14 January, that his residence was House No. 15, and that he was buried on the 16th. This, then, accounts for the confusion that, in the Verlassenschafts-Abhandlung, erroneously noted his death on the 15th, and confirms that, in this case at any rate, the Tonkünstler Societät’s records, as published by Pohl, are indeed accurate. Fortunately, Thomas Woborzil’s death record in Nussdorf also indicates his age when he died—65. Even if this age is approximate, which it might have been, depending upon who supplied it, it provides us with an approximate birth year of 1734—probably about as close as we are likely to get without considerably more intensive research.

Woborzil’s date of retirement from the Burgtheater also remains open to question, but it must have taken place during the theater’s fiscal year from April, 1792, to March, 1793, for which there is no surviving account book. Even so, he remained active as a violinist in the Hofkapelle through 1797.

* * *

According to Franz Xaver Niemetschek’s Leben (Biography), which appeared in Prague in 1798, Emperor Joseph II commented to Mozart: “Zu schön für unsere Ohren, und gewaltig viel Noten, lieber Mozart!” Mozart’s reply was said to have been, “Gerade so schön für unsere Ohren, und gewaltig viel Noten, Eure Majestät, als nöthig ist.” A little liberty of phrase notwithstanding, the motion picture Amadeus reproduces this encounter as it is so often interpreted, with Noten meaning “notes.” Thus: “Too beautiful for our ears, and very many notes, my dear Mozart,” with the reply: “Exactly as many as were necessary, Your Majesty.”

Niemetschek’s account of “gewaltig viel Noten” could also be translated as “a great deal of music, my dear Mozart,” to which
the composer would then have replied: “Exactly as much as was necessary, Your Majesty.” Residents of the American West might have translated Joseph’s comment a little closer to the German and known exactly what he meant: “a powerful lot of music”!

Whatever translation of this anecdote one prefers, Mozart had composed a masterpiece of a Singspiel, with a show-stopping aria—indeed virtually a sinfonia concertante movement—for new flutist Joseph Prowsos, the veteran oboist Georg Triebensee, violinist Thomas Woborzil, violoncellist Joseph Weigl, and soprano Catarina Cavaliere—in the middle of Act II. And perhaps we can be grateful that Cavalieri had only one eye, because if she had had two, Mozart might have written “Martern aller Arten” twice as long!

**A Note on the Sources**

The most valuable source materials to begin this study are the Viennese Court Theater Account Books, 1776-1802, housed in the Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv on the Minoritenplatz. Neatly copied and formatted, and generally in modern Latin script, they are relatively easy to read and interpret (though sometimes deceptively so). Fortunately, Dorothea Link’s fine *The National Court Theatre in Mozart’s Vienna, Sources and Documents, 1783-1792* (Oxford, 1998) transcribes the regularly-employed personnel in these Account Books from S.R. (Sonder-Reihe) 19 (1782-83) through S.R. 27 (1793-94), but understandably includes no Extra Expenses. I have verified all of Link’s published citations or personally transcribed others using the manuscript sources themselves; my thanks to Dr. Joachim Tepperberg there. Most personnel are listed by their surnames only, but I have silently added given names to most of the personnel listed in S.R. 18 (1781-82), as well as several orchestral musicians added in the subsequent years.

During this period, the spelling of family names was often phonetic, and the Court Theater’s scribes were particularly careless in this respect. Moreover, the account books were initially compiled in draft form, then “refined” across several re-copyings, with each successive generation (like the game of “gossip” around summer campfires) adding more variants and outright mistakes. Within the surviving Court Theater account books, it becomes clear that S.R. 30 and S.R. 31 are essentially the same book (covering from August, 1796, through July, 1797), but that S.R. 31 (with names largely in German Gothic *Kurrentschrift*) is a slightly earlier copy of S.R. 30 (with a neater format and names now converted to Latin script). With this in mind and to avoid unnecessary distractions, I have also silently standardized surnames across the three personnel lists in Tables 1-3.

Thereafter, I often turned to materials in the Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv, now housed in the Gasometer: the *Verlassenschafts-Abhandlung* or *Sperr-Relation* (essentially an estate record), the *Totenbeschauprotokoll* (official City death record), the *Conscriptions-Bogen* (census sheets begun in 1805, and very easy to misinterpret). Fortunately, in the 1950s, archivist Gustav Gugitz made lists of individuals active in Viennese cultural life who appeared, variously, in the *Abhandlungen* from 1783 to ca. 1850, not only for the majority of addresses covered by the Magistrat, but also for those administered through the Schotten Church and the Cathedral Chapter. He made a separate index of deaths among cultural personalities in the Eighteenth Century, and still another of the census records from 1805 to 1850. These indexes, along with the Portheim-Katalog of prominent personages up to c.1825 (original in the Wien Bibliothek in the Rathaus, but a microfiche at the Gasometer), were of great help. Indexes to marriages in Vienna during this period have been compiled by Herbert Mansfeld and Felix Gundacker, and lead the researcher to the city’s churches. If they had not done so earlier, most all parishes kept records of baptisms, marriages, and deaths by at least 1783, and I have often been grateful to Frau Stella Pfarrhund of Vienna’s Karlskirche for her encouragement as I worked there.

Among other printed sources pertinent to this period are the personnel lists in Ludwig von Köchel’s *Die kaiserliche Hof-Musikkapelle in Wien von 1543 bis 1867* (Vienna, 1869), based on documents in today’s Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv, and Carl Ferdinand Pohl’s *Denkschrift aus Anlass des hundertjäh- rigen Bestehens der Tonkünstler-Societät* (Vienna, 1871), based on documents now in the Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv. While both of these small volumes have become the pet whipping boys for modern musicologists feeling their oats, their hundreds of obscure dates and other figures remain remarkably accurate after 140 years. To place these matters in proper perspective, we need only recall that the latest edition of *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* lists Beethoven’s death date as 29 March (rather than the correct 26 March) 1827.

Taken together, the sources themselves are often wildly inconsistent, but allow the researcher to develop mini-sketches of otherwise almost anonymous musicians working in Vienna during its “golden age” of Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven, and Schubert. The account above of evaluating the sources for the four instrumental soloists in “Martern aller Arten” is not unusual, and in the case of violinist Woborzil, I would like to thank hornist Dr. Bernhard Paul for transcribing the Nussdorf church materials on my behalf. Opera singers are generally outside my area of research, but Dr. Michael Lorenz of the University of Vienna has sifted through much of the evidence concerning Cavalieri’s birthdate, birthplace, and name, and has reached the conclusions noted in the text, and for which I am grateful. Catarina Cavalieri’s illness is treated in Donald R. Hopkins’ book *The Greatest Killer: Smallpox in History*, rev. ed. (Chicago, 2002).

In the end, it is both frustrating and comforting to know that a random detail like the mention of a witness in a musician’s church marriage record, or the recommendation of a co-guardian for minor-aged children in an estate record, or the listing of a widow’s birth-name in her death record can lead to unsuspected new depths in biographical research. It means that studies like this one are hardly finished products, but instead are merely stepping stones to further research and a greater understanding of Mozart and his music.

Review

David Damschroder,
Harmony in Haydn and Mozart
Cambridge University Press, 2012. xii, 298
Reviewed by Jan Miyake

David Damschroder’s newest book closely examines the harmonic practices of Haydn and Mozart. “The tonal world I propose for Mozart’s (and Haydn’s) music is characterized by a range of hierarchical relationships among pitches. No markings in the score confirm definitely that what I propose actually exists. Only through analyzing music—lots of music—can one become convinced that such relationships do abound.” (p. 92) Damschroder has an affinity for details and has developed a style of harmonic analysis that blends the traditional approach (Roman numerals for roots and Arabic numerals for inversions) with Schenkerian principles to create a harmonic notation with “hierarchical richness” (p. 230). In expressing hierarchy of harmony within an analysis, Damschroder uses his own, less common notational conventions, clearly described in the preface. While I found these conventions initially cumbersome, as I read the book they quickly became intuitive and helpful because they facilitated my ability to recall musical sounds while reading prose.

An accomplished Schenkerian analyst, experienced writer, and long-time pedagogue, Damschroder’s book is replete with musical and beautifully rendered graphs that are clearly explained. Furthermore, his notational conventions facilitate description of his graphs’ beautiful nuances. When he makes choices that many would find non-intuitive, he takes extra time to explain and/or acknowledge other interpretations (e.g., pp. 137-38).

Harmony in Haydn and Mozart is divided into two parts: four chapters on methodology followed by six analyses that respond to and engage with famous analyses of the same work by prominent scholars.

PART 1: Methodological Orientation, Chapters 1 through 4
Chapter 1 presents twelve analyses of excerpts from string quartets. These detailed analyses, focused on phrases and periods, demonstrate how his methodological approach will reveal beautiful details about small-scale harmony and connections between non-adjacent pitches. He draws heavily on the concepts of Heinrich Schenker as laid out in Free Composition, and echoes much of Carl Schachter and William Rothstein’s work on normalizing displaced pitches.

Chapter 2 addresses issues of sonata form by analyzing twelve expositions from Haydn’s keyboard sonatas. He draws heavily on the work of James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy as presented in Elements of Sonata Theory (Oxford University Press, 2006). These sonatas were chosen because their modulations to the dominant share the same harmonic trajectory. To ease comparison, all examples have been transposed to C major and discussion is organized by zone of the exposition, rather than by piece. While one of the challenges of this repertoire concerns locating the moment of essential expositional closure (EEC), Damschroder instead relies on his Schenkerian graphs to locate this moment. This decision is at odds with Hepokoski and Darcy who are undecided on whether or not the EEC should coincide with the conclusion of the linear progression in the dominant.

Chapter 3 analyzes six arias in G minor by Mozart, where he pays exquisite attention to the relationship between form, harmony, and text analysis. Chapter 4 examines three sonata-rondos in D Major by Mozart and Haydn. Again, he draws heavily on a blend between Hepokoski and Darcy’s theories, Schenkerian analysis, and his own harmonic conventions.

continued on page 13
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3. Annelies ANDRIES, Yale University, “Substitute Arias in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Century: Unsettling and Reappropriating Performance Traditions”

Since its premiere in 1998, much ink has been spilled over the Metropolitan Opera’s ‘controversial’ production of W. A. Mozart’s Le nozze di Figaro. The controversy did not lie in the particular staging, but rather in Cecilia Bartoli’s decision to perform Mozart’s substitute arias for Susanna. Both music critics and scholars have debated whether or not this alteration was musically, dramatically, and historically appropriate. Hilary Poriss has defended Bartoli’s choice from a historical perspective, since in previous centuries, performers, and in particular prima donnas, had a considerable authority over the performance; they were often allowed to repeat, alter, and/or insert arias of their own liking. Thus, by singing Mozart’s substitute arias written for the 1789 revival of Le nozze di Figaro, Bartoli was simply confronting her audience with a common aspect of 18th-century performance practice.

Nevertheless, in contemporary operatic performances, these substitute arias have a rather “unsettling” effect and stand in a strained relationship to the established tradition. First, they no longer function exclusively to showcase the singer’s vocal and dramatic ability. Even though they reinforce the tradition of a prima donna culture, these arias serve not only to celebrate a singer’s virtuosity, but also to display her intellectual prowess by demonstrating sophisticated engagement with historical practices. Second, by inserting relatively unfamiliar arias into a well-known operatic work such as Le nozze di Figaro, the substitutions also challenge the concept of the ‘work’ as established by an operatic performance tradition. Subsequently, by making multiple versions available on CD and/or DVD, the recordings of a new production with substitute arias contribute to the creation of a more flexible performance tradition.

4. Laurel E. ZEISS, Baylor University, “The ‘Persistent’ Eighteenth Century in Two Recent Metropolitan Opera Productions: The Enchanted Island and The Ring Cycle”
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Review continued from page 12

These four chapters illustrate two ways that Damschroder’s harmonic approach introduces hierarchy: (1) broaden the conception of harmonic function to include a wider range of chords, and (2) recognize that sequences are not driven by harmony. This first point benefits from additional explanation; two examples caught my attention as unusual. First, whenever musically possible, Damschroder prefers a reading of a $I^6$, sometimes with an unfurled 6-phase. This technique refers to how a C major chord changes into an A minor chord in first inversion by a 5-6 shift (G moving to A while holding the C and E constant). By unfurled, he means that the A minor chord occurs in root position rather than first inversion, which obfuscates the 5-6 motion of G to A. In other words, Damschroder prefers to read I-VI or I-VI$^{6}$ (where VI$^{6}$ functions as II$^{6}$ in the key of the dominant) as expansions of tonic and labels them I$^{1}$. Second, Damschroder has a broad conception of the supertonic chord that includes ninth chords missing the root ($\text{VII}^{9}$) and many of its chromatic inflections. For example, in C minor, D-F-A$^{4}$-C is a typical supertonic chord and D-F$^{9}$-A-C is a typical chromatically inflected supertonic chord. D-F-A$^{4}$-C-E$^{9}$ would be a ninth chord, and F-A$^{4}$-C-E$^{9}$ would be a supertonic chord missing the root. This approach is most striking when he combines missing roots with chromatic inflections to derive the following two chords: F-A-C-E$^{9}$ (vii$^{9}$ of the dominant) and F$^{9}$-A-C-E$^{9}$ (an inverted augmented-sixth chord). Overall, by broadening the conception of the tonic and supertonic chord, he reveals similarities in harmonic paths within a composition and between sets of compositions.

PART 2: Masterpieces, Chapters 5 through 10

Each of these chapters tackles a masterpiece analyzed previously by a well-known scholar. Damschroder begins with a brief overview of the similarities and differences in analytical approach, and then presents his own analysis. At key moments, and in helpfully shaded text boxes, Damschroder comments on the similarities and differences in analytical outcomes. His engagement and commentary on such a wide variety of analytical approaches is a notable strength of this book.

Haydn: Symphony No. 45 in F-sharp Minor ("Farewell"), movement 2 (in response to James Webster, Haydn’s "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style, Cambridge University Press, 1991, pp. 57-64). Here, Damschroder reveals tension and differences between Webster’s prioritization of motive and his of harmony. One notable difference is where they start the transition. In determining the moment of formal change from primary theme to transition, Damschroder prioritizes cadences and Webster texture and harmonic instability. While both scholars communicate a hierarchy of harmony, Damschroder writes "Webster and I are at loggerheads regarding the hierarchical relationships among chords" (p. 159).

Haydn: String Quartet in G Minor, Hob. III: 33 (Op. 20, No. 3), movement 3 (in response to Robert O. Gjerdingen, Music in the Galant Style, Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 369-97). Damschroder is concerned with the way Gjerdingen categorizes bass lines without accounting for the nuances of how they are harmonized, stating “Musical progressions of only superficial similarity are lumped together within a single schematic category." (p. 166). His main criticism, however, involves the “clash between his and my musical sensibilities, rather than his apparatus.”


Mozart, Symphony No. 40 in G minor, K.550, movement 3, Trio (in response to Leonard B. Meyer, “Grammatical Simplicity and Relational Richness: The Trio of Mozart’s G Minor Symphony,” Critical Inquiry 2 [1975-76], pp. 693-761). This analysis and commentary encapsulates the differences between a literalist approach to harmony and Damschroder’s more nuanced but also more subjective approach.

Review
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caesura and so secondary theme).

David Damschroder’s *Harmony in Haydn in Mozart* will be a thought-provoking book for several types of scholars: those heavily invested in the topic, those interested in a clearly explained, solid, and musical application of Schenkerian analysis, and those wishing an overview of differing analytical approaches. Its strengths include clarity of writing, attention to detail, musicality, and transparency of agenda. Its main weakness, clearly stated by Damschroder himself, is that he is not nearly as invested or expert in the analytical methods of others as he is in his own. Thus, some of his responses to others’ analyses ignore those analysts’ larger priorities. I can imagine this book influencing future work in at least two ways: his broadening of harmonic categories may catch on and impact analyses that draw on harmonic hierarchy, and additional discourse over the masterpieces he analyses will hopefully take place.
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**Society of Early Americanists**, 28 February–2 March 2013, Savannah, Georgia. Biennial conference; for further information see the website www.cla.auburn.edu/sea, or the main SEA website: www.societyofearlyamericanists.org.


**Mozart Society of America**, during annual meeting, 2–7 April 2013, of American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, Cleveland, Ohio.


**Mozart Society of America**, 15–17 August 2013, New York City. Biennial conference including a session concerning issues in Mozart scholarship during the Mostly Mozart Festival, Lincoln Center, New York City, 17 August 2013.


**Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies**, 16–19 October 2013, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario. Theme: “Enlightenment Constellations.” Send 200-300 word abstracts by March 1, 2013 to contact@cseecs-sechls2013.ca.
Friends of Mozart, Inc. New York City. P.O. Box 24, FDR Station, New York, NY 10150 Tel: (212) 832–9420. Mario Mercado, President; Erna Schwerin, Founding President. Friends of Mozart sponsors concerts and also publishes newsletters and informative essays for its members. Admission free to all events. For further information, see the website: www.friendsofmozart.org; or contact Mario Mercado, mario.r.mercado@aexp.com.


FESTIVALS


Long Beach Mozart Festival, 5450 Atherton Street, Long Beach, CA 90815. Website: www.longbeachmozartfestival.org.


Mainly Mozart, San Diego. P.O. Box 124705, San Diego, CA 92112-4705 Tel: (619) 239-0100. David Atherton, Artistic Director. Performances by the Mainly Mozart Festival Orchestra, chamber music, recitals, educational concerts, and lectures. Call for information about other series offered by Mainly Mozart. Website: www.mainlymozart.org.
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Woodstock Mozart Festival, Woodstock, IL Website: www.mozartfest.org.
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