“Mozart’s Boswell?” by Paul Corneilson

A few years ago I was heavily involved with the Early Mozart Biographies project, which includes many of the biographies of Mozart from the end of the eighteenth century through the first two decades of the nineteenth century. I began to wonder what it would be like for us today if Mozart had had his own James Boswell? After all, Boswell’s Life of Johnson appeared in 1791, the year of Mozart’s death, though Samuel Johnson himself had died in 1784. What if Boswell had chosen to devote his life’s work to Mozart, instead of Johnson? Or better yet, what if Thomas Attwood had written down everything Mozart said and did, not only the two years he studied with him, but from, say, 1781 through his death in 1791? Would we revel in his pithy observations and opinions, or complain about the mind-numbing tedium of day-to-day life? Given his overall productivity in those years, Mozart must have spent a fair amount of time by himself with a quill pen and bottle of ink. But there were also practical concerns and distractions: private lessons; concert organizing, rehearsing, and performing; trips to Prague, Berlin, Leipzig, Frankfurt; socializing and raising children. If Attwood had written a life of Mozart, we’d know a lot more about his thoughts and activities; but then we wouldn’t have the fun of trying to figure him out ourselves.

The new Oxford Classics edition of the Life of Johnson (2008) is almost 1,500 pages long, basically the same length as the recent translation of Hermann Abert’s biography of Mozart (originally published in 1923–24; translated by Stewart Spenser with additional editorial material by Cliff Eisen, published by Yale University Press, 2007). It’s not really a fair comparison, since Boswell’s biography is a primary source, while Abert’s biography is based on Otto Jahn’s biography of 1860, which in turn was based on Georg Nissen’s biography of 1828, which incorporated material from Niemetschek and Schlichtegroll, along with a substantial selection of the family correspondence. Indeed, we are fortunate to have so much documentary evidence in the form of letters and personal reminiscences of Mozart, both by his wife Constanze and his sister Nannerl. Even as late as 1829, Vincent and Mary Novello were able to interview both women in Salzburg, where they lived a few blocks away from each other.

Nissen cites some fifty sources in his biography, some of which are included on the MSA website. (The recent edition of Abert has more than fifty pages of bibliography, or approximately 1,500 citations.) What you discover as you read the early biographies before Nissen, is how much material is repeated from Schlichtegroll’s obituary, which concentrates on a few anecdotes of Mozart’s youth. Naturally, such mythical tales are too good not to tell: the three-year-old boy finding consonant thirds on a keyboard; writing his first compositions at the age of six, including a concerto that was too dif-

continued on page 3
A Message from the Editor

At the MSA meeting in November, Paul Cornelison asked attendees to reflect on the importance of the Society, particularly what distinguishes it from the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music and the Haydn Society of North America. One attendee volunteered that he has heard others express skepticism about the Society because Mozart does not need a champion. Mozart is everywhere, after all. We encounter him in the concert hall and the opera house, fields like medicine and psychology are fascinated with him and his music, and his name even graces the cover of a recent issue of *Sports Illustrated*. Matthew Leone conceded that no, Mozart does not need a champion. But, as he eloquently opined, Mozart does need storytellers.

The Mozart Society of America—and by extension this newsletter—is uniquely situated to share, analyze, and critique stories about Mozart for its readers, from the scholar to the *Liebhaber*. This issue is a testament to Mozart’s influence throughout history. Ian Woodfield furthers our understanding of the early reception of *Figaro* and *Don Giovanni*, renowned scholars evaluate the significance of the recently published facsimiles of Mozart’s “seven great operas,” and Seattle-based poet Leszek Chudziński offers a fantasia on Mozart’s own words. Less obviously, this issue is the first edited by me—a scholar of opera in the twentieth century who’s currently writing a book on the production of Mozart’s operas at the Metropolitan Opera House in the 1940s and ’50s. I would argue that it is precisely because of the omnipresence of Mozart and his music that the MSA is important. As this issue demonstrates, Mozart is indeed everywhere and does not need a champion. But the MSA offers us an opportunity to consider why.

You’ll notice some changes in this issue—a new design (thanks to Dean Bornstein and the Packard Humanities Institute)—but I think you’ll also find that the stories we’re telling about Mozart are the same types of stories that the *Newsletter* has always told, and I thank my predecessor Stephen Fisher, Paul Cornelison, and the members of the Publications Committee for their guidance during this transitional period. Going forward, I hope that you will consider helping us tell Mozart’s stories. We welcome feature articles of 1,000 to 3,000 words and shorter reviews of books, recordings, scores, and performances. I invite you to consult the new bibliographic abbreviations and guidelines for contributors, which can be found on the MSA website, and to send submissions directly to me at clynch@fandm.edu.

—Christopher Lynch, Editor
Introducing Matthew Leone, MSA’s New Student Representative

The Mozart Society of America is pleased to announce that Matthew Leone has joined the Board of Directors as a Student Representative. Leone is a Doctoral Candidate and Visiting Lecturer in Musicology at Indiana University’s Jacobs School of Music, where he completed his Masters in Musicology in 2010. His research interests include historical constructs and reception, the genesis and meanings of musicians and musical works, and musicians and compositions as cultural icons. He has presented papers at the Crane School of Music’s Academic Forum, Indiana University’s Musicology Colloquium, North American Conference on Nineteenth-Century Music, and the Mozart Society of America. He has given guest lectures on Rossini’s *Italian Girl in Algiers*, *The Barber of Seville*, and Puccini’s *La Bohème* at IU Opera and Ballet Theater, and has also written numerous program notes and live blogs for IU Opera and other Jacobs School ensembles since 2010. Additionally, from 2010 to 2011, he assisted J. Peter Burkholder in researching and drafting the latest edition of *A History of Western Music*. Currently, he is working on his dissertation, which explores the historiography and reception of the pianist composer Jan Ladislav Dussek (1760–1812) in relation to the formation of the “great composer canon” of the nineteenth century.
Christian Gottlob Neefe and the Early Reception of *Le nozze di Figaro* and *Don Giovanni*

Ian Woodfield

When he became Elector of Bonn in 1784, Joseph II’s youngest brother, the music-loving Maximilian Franz, inherited a financial crisis as a result of which he had to close the stage.¹ During the five-year theatrical hiatus that ensued, Bonn missed out on public productions of the new wave of popular Viennese operas by Salieri, Martín y Soler, Mozart, and Dittersdorf. The delay was merely temporary; once the stage reopened at the start of 1789, this repertoire dominated the schedules. In the meantime, the commercial dissemination of Viennese opera was entirely unaffected, the local retailer Nikolaus Simrock having active links with copyists such as Sukowaty and Lausch. The range of what he had on offer is very clear from the advertisement he published in Münster, where Maximilian Franz was Prince-Bishop, late in 1786.² By the start of 1787, he was already at work on *Le nozze di Figaro.

On May 14, 1787, he reported in a letter to his erstwhile colleague Gustav Friedrich Wilhelm Großmann that a score he had been preparing was almost ready.³ The opera was complete, but he was now engaged in making a further copy.⁴ In preparing *Singspiel* versions of popular Viennese *opere buffe* for sale, Simrock worked closely with Christian Gottlob Neefe, who had been music director until the closure of the stage. His activities as an arranger mirror changing tastes in Bonn. In 1786, he was still preoccupied with original *Singspiele* and arrangements of *opéras comiques*, but the following year, he turned his attention to Mozart. Neefe’s first mention of *Figaro* came in a letter of November 13, 1787 in which he wrote that after much prompting he was thinking about making an arrangement of “Nozze di figaro”—he usually omitted the article—and he asked whether Großmann yet had the work. If that were the case, then he proposed a swap.³ The timing is significant; almost exactly one month after the festive performance in Prague on October 14, Neefe in Bonn felt himself coming under pressure to begin work on a German version. Großmann was also interested in Mozart’s new opera, but there was a significant delay because

MSA at the Annual Meeting of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies

The Mozart Society of America is sponsoring a session titled “Mozart and the Promise of the Stage” at the annual meeting of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, which will be held from March 31 through April 3 in Pittsburgh. The session, chaired by Edmund Goehring, will include the following papers:

“Silent Poetry, Epic Opera”
Katharina Clausius, Cambridge University

“The Senses in Mozart’s Da Ponte Operas”
Laurel E. Zeiss, Baylor University

“Rage and Restraint in Mozart’s Turkish Scenarios: Not Only the *Abduction*, but also *Zaide*”
Larry Wolff, New York University

Abstracts for the MSA session are posted on the MSA website.

Conferences and Events

“Mozart and Prague” Exhibit at the Klementinum

From April 14 through May 23, 2016 an exhibit of twenty-seven works of art by Mark Podwal, entitled “Mozart and Prague,” will be on display in the Klementinum Gallery at the Klementinum in Prague. The exhibit depicts events in Mozart’s life as well as legends about the composer in the Bohemian city. We are pleased to reproduce the eighth work in the series, titled “Prague Symphony.” According to the artist, the image represents how Mozart’s Symphony in D Major, K. 504 “highlighted the talents for which the wind musicians of Bohemia were famous.”

“Prague Symphony” by Mark Podwal. Colored pencil on paper.
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the translation he had decided to use was still not finished. In the event, it was not given in Hanover until May 18, 1789.6 Neefe asked about its progress on December 18, 1787.7 At the same time, he felt obliged to pass on a message from Simrock apologizing for the inaccuracy of the score supplied, the result, he explained, of a faulty original.8 When he replied on December 31, Großmann pointed out, reasonably enough, “Le nozze di Figaro is still not ready; it is a difficult piece of work.” With progress on Figaro on hold pending the receipt of material from Großmann, Neefe’s main priority in 1788 was to prepare German versions of other festive works certain to be requested by Maximilian Franz once the stage reopened. Martin y Soler’s new opera L’arbore di Diana naturally took precedence, as it had been presented at the Vienna gala. Its transmission time to Bonn was very fast. Only two months after the première on October 1, 1787, Neefe was already at work.9 Simrock acquired the score, listing it among the new operas he now had in stock on November 21, 1788, just six weeks before it received its first Bonn performance.10

In late 1788, Neefe turned his attention to Don Giovanni, commissioned as a festive work for the arrival of Archduke Leopold’s daughter Maria Theresia in Prague, although not ready in time. Although the Vienna performance run was underway, he acquired a score of the Prague version.11 By the end of November, Simrock was able to include Don Giovanni in a list of recent operas now available: “A quite new [opera] by Mozart, Don Juan or the Stone Guest, which was yesterday ready with the setting; it is also very large, yet still more beautiful than Nozze di Figaro.”12 His evaluation of the two works in favor of the latter—perhaps the earliest such comparison on record—clearly reflects the views of his colleague, who was one of the first musicians in Germany to engage seriously with the new work. On December 21, Neefe offered a copy of his new setting to Großmann, accompanied with a clear expression of his high esteem for Mozart’s music: “I have an opera Don Giovanni with excellent music by Mozart, and perhaps not unhappily set. I offer you the manuscript of the setting for four ducats.”13 He felt it necessary to explain that the reason for its high price was the prevalence of pilfering (i.e., copyright theft). A bookseller in Cologne had recently been pleased to print his version of Salieri’s La grotta di Trofonio entitled Zauberhöle des Trofonio. While not formally a festive work, this opera had been given its première on the name day of Maximilian Franz during his visit to Vienna. How the rogue trader came by the manuscript, Neefe did not know, but there was little to be done.14 The only effective response to the certainty of losses through piracy was to recoup costs upfront.

While Neefe displayed unusual perception in his early enthusiasm for Mozart’s operas, it is nonetheless clear that his intensive engagement with Le nozze di Figaro, L’arbore di Diana and Don Giovanni was prompted by the anticipated reopening of the Bonn stage, after which Maximilian Franz would expect performances of the festive works. When the inaugural season of the Bonn National Theatre finally got underway in 1789, it was split into two sections beginning in January and October, and with obvious symbolism, each was headed by one of the works commissioned by the emperor for the wedding festivities for Maria Theresia. The reception accorded to Martin y Soler’s new work, given first to preserve its higher festive status as the Vienna commission, was good.15 Comparisons with Una cosa rara were inevitable. In view of the success of the earlier work, much was expected of Der Baum der Diana, but while certainly far from a failure, it did not enjoy quite the reception of its predecessor. Großmann was already aware of this, writing on the last day of 1787, “Una cosa rara is supposed to be even better than L’arbore di Diana.”16 The Bonn premiere of Mozart’s most recent opera marked the reopening of the theatre after the summer pause. Although short on detail, a long review rated the new work a triumph.17

Ian Woodfield teaches early repertoire and notation courses at Queen’s University Belfast, where he is also an active member of the viol consort. His ongoing research project, a detailed study of the early sources of the Da Ponte operas, has recently broadened to include the political context influencing the reception of Mozart’s late comedies in Vienna. A chapter on Figaro sources entitled “The trouble with Cherubino ...” has just appeared in Mozart Studies 2 (Cambridge, 2015). In his spare time, he enjoys playing chess in the local leagues and walking.

NOTES
1. A research project into the operatic scores of Maximilian Franz, currently being undertaken at the University of Vienna, is entitled “The Music Library of Maximilian Franz, Elector of Cologne: An Identification and Analysis of its Surviving Music-dramatic Sources.”
3. The Großmann correspondence is discussed in Michael Rüppel, Gustav Friedrich Wilhelm Großmann 1743-1796: Eine Epoche.
“Nozze di Figaro ist bald fertig, und wird sogleich abgeschickt worden … La nozza di Figaro ist bereits fertig, ich müß aber solche auch für mich noch einmal abschreiben lassen.” Simrock to Großmann, May 14, 1787, Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Sondersammlungen, Sammlung Kestner, I C III 118. On the first occasion, the spelling Le seems to have been altered from La. As amply demonstrated in the Münster advertisement, Simrock was prone to misspell Italian titles such as La condatina in corte [sic]. This letter is reproduced in Ian Woodfield, “Christian Gottlob Neefe and the Bonn National Theatre, with new light on the Beethoven family,” Music & Letters 93, no. 3 (2012): 304.


Possibly he was influenced by Großmann who informed him that he had established a cheaper conduit (“ein wohlfeilen Kanal”) with Prague than he had with Simrock. Großmann to Neefe, Hanover, December 31, 1787, Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Sondersammlungen, Sammlung Kestner, I C III 118.


“...das wieder eine Oper Don Giovanni nach der vortrefflichen Mozartischen Musik, und vielleicht nicht ungültlich übersetzt. Ich bitte Ihnen das Manuskript die Übersetzung für Vier Dukaten an.” Simrock to Großmann, November 21, 1788, Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Sondersammlungen, Sammlung Kestner, I C II 385.
Reviews

Facsimile Editions of Mozart’s Autograph Scores


When Nikolaus Harnoncourt—arguably the most important European conductor of Idomeneo during the last three decades—prepared his latest production of Mozart’s Munich masterpiece in Graz in 2008, he had the facsimile edition lying on a table in the hall, so that each musician could have a look at Mozart’s autograph, if necessary. He even told the singers to study the original score in order to be sure of Mozart’s intentions. Could there be any better acknowledgment of the inestimable value of a facsimile edition?

Since its first performance in Munich’s Cuvilliés Theatre on January 29, 1781 Idomeneo has burdened posterity with an almost irresolvable puzzle of source problems. Many of these questions can now be freshly evaluated with the help of the beautiful facsimile of Mozart’s autograph score, including all the necessary additions and some quite unexpected treasures. The edition includes the two libretti printed for Munich in 1781, the alternative beginning of act 2 (K. 490) and the duet from act 3 (K. 489) from the 1786 Viennese version, the complete ballet music with several dances that were never performed, the four different versions of the oracle from act 3, and even two sketches for the grand Quartet.

The wealth of additional insight provided by the graphically outstanding reproduction of all this material is overwhelming. Even music students without specific musicological knowledge can easily discern the different paper qualities in the score or the two layers of Mozart’s composing process (the major parts in dark ink, the instrumentation added later in light brown ink). For performers, the musical details are more important. When Ilia in the very first scene has arrived at the height of her bewilderment, her recitativo con stromenti ends with a highly emotional bar of Adagio (“sbranate, si, quest’infelice core”; vol. 1, p. 28). Mozart wrote the new tempo not only in the strings as usual, but also on top of the soprano’s line, which seems to be almost the equivalent of a romantic “molto espressivo.” In the next bar the G-minor aria “Padre, Germani, Addio!” starts practically without warning: no double bar line, no inscription like “Aria,” only a smooth transition to the new tempo “Andante con moto.” Mozart’s way of writing this passage demonstrates his constant shifting between recitativo, arioso, and aria, transcending the border lines between the different components of a classical opera seria, which Idomeneo in fact was never meant to be.

As Daniel Heartz, the editor of the opera in NMA, never failed to point out, Idomeneo was planned as a highly sophisticated synthesis between opera seria and tragédie lyrique, alternating between stormy choruses and ballet scenes in the French style and traditional arias and ensembles in the Italian style. Even the latter were transformed by young Mozart into a new kind of musical drama, especially through his constant use of the “recitativo con stromenti.” In the history of Munich’s Cuvilliés Theatre, which had been a traditional opera seria stage up to 1778, this was quite a revolution and an ideal vehicle for the taste of the new Elector Carl Theodor, who had brought his Mannheim orchestra and singers with him to Munich. Bruce Alan Brown, in his musicological introduction to the facsimile edition, gives a brilliant summary of all those factors that favored Mozart’s stroke of genius. He also focuses on the most important findings of Mozart scholarship concerning Idomeneo and on the source critical questions.

The latter are manifold, but can now be quietly studied by comparing the facsimile with NMA. Just to pick out one example: the bass line underlying Ilia’s first entry in her G-minor aria as written at a legato over two bars by Mozart (vol. 1, p. 29), whereas it is divided in two bows in the NMA (p. 26). When Daniel Heartz finished his groundbreaking edition in 1972, the autographs of acts 1 and 2 were inaccessible in Kraków; neither could he use the Munich score copies for those two acts, which were only rediscovered by Robert Münster in 1980 in the archive of the Bavarian State Opera. Bringing together all the material that Heartz might have dreamt of in his meticulous scholarly work, the facsimile is a revelation and an indispensable addition to his edition. Back then he sometimes had to make daring editorial choices. One of these occurs at the very center of the dénouement, when Ilia offers herself instead of her beloved Idamante as a sacrifice to Neptune in the temple. At that point, immediately preceding the sudden entry of the Oracle, Mozart cut out forty-one bars of a highly emotional dialogue between the two lovers. Ilia’s last words before the Oracle, the short phrase “orsù mi svena” (NMA, p. 471) remained unchanged as a broken B-flat seventh chord resolved into E-flat. Heartz found this awkward and changed it into an unresolved diminished chord leading to C minor, which can be heard in almost all recordings of Idomeneo since then. Reading the facsimile of the autograph (vol. 2, p. 163), Mozart’s intentions seem quite clear.

In this instance as in many others
performers will now be able to make their own choices. And they will hopefully be more determined to obey Mozart’s cuts—as cruel as they might seem on some of the most beautiful pages of the score. Nevertheless, his artistic decisions in order to avoid an excessively long third act should be taken seriously—like all the other details of his score: his sforzati, crescendi, articulation signs, and phrasing. Idomeneo lovers will never get tired of studying these details in a score overabundant in musical inspiration.

—Karl Böhmer


The facsimile of the autograph score of Die Entführung aus dem Serail is especially welcome. This is evidently the first complete reproduction, making available a work whose original musical sources have hardly been known even as its libretto and other textual source materials have appeared in facsimile (for example, Gerhard Croll and Ulrich Müller, eds., Die Entführung aus dem Serail. Faksimile-Ausgabe zur Geschichte des Librettos [Anif/Salzburg: Ursula Müller-Speiser, 1993]). It also belongs to a group of Mozart sources split between two libraries, the result of the return of materials after World War II to different places after their dispersal from Berlin. (In the case of Abduction, the first and third acts ended up in the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków, the second in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek.)

And this is a work whose genesis has long been a subject of particular fascination, thanks largely to Mozart’s letters about his work (on the first portion, at least), where he is more explicit about his technical and esthetic choices in opera composition than anywhere else. The composer made substantial revisions in a couple of numbers, having given “free rein to [his] ideas” then cutting long numbers down to size before the work was produced; these changes offer a further glimpse into his workshop. All this has produced a particular fascination with the opera’s genesis, though until recently little attention has been paid to the documentation of the process in musical sources.

The two volumes published here (a big one reproducing the autograph score and a smaller one with essays and supplemental materials) present a somewhat contradictory picture. The accompanying volume presents an essay on the work’s source and genesis; a reproduction of the original Vienna libretto; facsimiles of pages removed from the autograph and now in private hands; images of sketches, drafts, discarded numbers, a handwritten libretto fragment and an autograph page of a keyboard reduction; information on the papers Mozart used; and a diagram of the manuscript’s physical structure. All this is very musicological, providing a basis for study.

The main facsimile volume is very different. It contains no modern title page or other material pointing to its status as a reproduction (though it self-evidently is one), nor any mention of the libraries that hold the sources—or that there are two of them. The only modern touch is a typeset table of contents at the end. The binding is luxurious, with a raised spine and gold lettering; an American dealer describes the volume as “hardbound in quarter dark brown leather, with beige linen boards” (http://www.omifacsimiles.com/brochures/images/moz_ope.pdf, accessed November 24, 2015). This represents the language and values of book collecting, and indeed the volume is arguably presented not as a scholarly facsimile but rather as something for a collector. It can stand in for the autograph itself, easily allowing the fantasy that each owner is a Pauline Viardot, the reverent nineteenth-century owner of the Don Giovanni autograph—the possessor and guardian of a treasure. (This is pretty harmless as fantasies go, to be fair.)

The beauty of the facsimile (excellently photographed) speaks for itself, but there are two puzzles in the accompanying volume. The first is the introductory essay by a literary scholar in a long tradition of evaluations of the Entführung libretto in its eighteenth-century context. This one offers a new perspective in considering the work in relation to Goethe’s operatic projects, but it is about the opera (mostly its libretto), not the source, and one wonders what the essay is doing in a facsimile of the autograph score.

The second puzzle concerns the editor’s musicological introduction. Its focus on the genesis of the opera in relation to the autograph score makes sense, but its handling of earlier work on the subject raises questions. The editor discusses the genesis of the work in outline, particularly in relation to Mozart’s letters; refers (among other details) to a sketch leaf with numerical calculations that turn out to be the length of movements in Abduction; and examines Mozart’s work on the opera in relation to paper types and corrections in the autograph score. All this is presented as though it were commonly known, without citation, much in the manner of a critical edition in a composer’s complete works. But it rests on the work of others: the fundamental research on the opera’s genesis, drawing on the letters, is Thomas Bauman’s; the deciphering of those numbers in the sketch belongs to Gerhard Croll (along with a lot of other things that stem from his NMA edition, with a later critical

There is no doubt that *Le nozze di Figaro*—together with *Idomeneo*—is Mozart's greatest work with respect to the sheer number of pages the composer filled with his hasty but precise and almost error-free handwriting. This exuberant creativity is the more remarkable since large portions of the work were written within no more than six weeks in the fall of 1785. The facsimile edition published at the initiative and under the auspices of the Packard Humanities Institute consists of three heavy and lavishly equipped volumes, two containing 624 consecutively numbered facsimile pages to which a table of contents has been added in either volume, while the third provides several essays as well as illustrations and explanatory material. In the present review, all references relate to the page numbers in the facsimile edition. There are differences in the numbering of scenes and musical numbers between the main sources and editions (for a concordance see NMA II/5/16, Critical Report, 321–4).

The edition combines the two large sections of the autograph—acts 1 and 2 housed at the Berlin State Library - Prussian Cultural Heritage, and acts 3 and 4 preserved at the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków—in excellent reproductions with additional autograph material now preserved at the Juilliard School of Music and at Stanford University; the illustrations in volume 3 cover some, but not all, autograph sketches and drafts that happen to have survived. The autograph score of *Le nozze di Figaro* was not in Mozart's estate; it resurfaced only in the 1860s in Aue, Saxony. It finally came to the Berlin State Library in 1901, but acts 3 and 4 could no longer be retrieved after they had been sent for safekeeping during World War II to depositories in Silesia. Only in 1979, several years after the publication of the respective volume of the NMA, did they become accessible again at the Jagiellonian Library.

Those who are not used to dealing with Mozart autographs will be surprised that the opera does not contain a title page or an autograph header revealing the composer's name. (Unfortunately the original binding has not been documented in the edition.) The work opens with a Sinfonia, not with an overture. The score order deviates from modern practice throughout the opera insofar as the violins and viola are written on the top staves while the vocal parts are placed directly above the instrumental bass. The use of 12-staff (sometimes 10-staff) paper in oblong format forced the composer to write some of the instruments into an extra score in ensembles, particularly the finales of the second and fourth acts. Mozart hesitated to write more than absolutely needed and often indicated mere duplication between various instruments by verbal indications such as “unis.” or “col Basso.” Performance indications such as dynamics, slurs, dots or strokes were usually entered in all systems and leave little doubt about the composer's intentions. Revealing are the changes of slurring “beyond the bar line” in Figaro's famous “Non più andrai” (vol. 1, pp. 143ff.). In the late 1770s Mozart had developed a highly efficient compositional method by writing down the main parts first (these include the vocal parts and the bass and the “obbligato” portions of the instrumental parts), while the secondary parts were notated in a second step. Usually the main parts appear darker and the secondary parts paler.

With few exceptions the entire manuscript is in Mozart's hand. Notable exceptions are a consecutive pagination as well as a numbering of the arias and ensembles in red chalk, most likely relating to the premiere performances in 1786. Small gaps in the numbering can be observed and point toward changes that were made only after the piece had been finished. Sometime after 1800 a German text underlay for a Singspiel version was added to the arias and ensembles (which strangely is nowhere mentioned in the commentary volume). The hand of a copyist can also be observed in some references (e.g., the headers in vol. 1, p. 183, or vol. 2, p. 477) as well as in act 2, scene 3 (vol. 1, p. 214) and in act 3, scene 10 (vol. 2, p. 416); further a replacement copy for the *recitativo strumentato* “Tutto è disposto” before no. 27 (now at Stanford) was bound into the autograph score at some point.

Although Mozart composed with astonishing ease, a number of changes, small and large, can be observed. Most of them are minor and result from ad-hoc corrections, but substantial revisions are found, e.g., in volume 1 on pages 12, 80–1, and 171, or in volume 2 on pages 370, 372, 388, 519, and 591. Strikingly the entire instrumentation of Susanna's “Deh vieni non tardar” was altered (vol. 2, pp. 515ff.).

The autograph thus enables us to study in close detail Mozart's compo-

With the majority of the offerings in the series Mozart Operas in Facsimile, the greatest practical service the Packard Humanities Institute renders is of presenting under one cover facsimiles of autographs whose parts are not under one roof. One exception is *Don Giovanni* (the other is the *Magic Flute*). Not only has its autograph stayed intact but, further, it has already appeared in facsimile (in the Leasure edition, from 1967). Beyond its superior quality as a reproduction, the Packard *Don Giovanni* possesses other virtues that make it far from redundant. Supplementing the autograph of the two acts (reproduced, respectively, in volumes 1 and 2) is a third volume containing a wealth of documentation that will enlighten everyone from the scholar to the wider public. Some of that involves information about the status of the text, including tracings of watermarks, as well as a description of the autograph’s foliation. Some of it supplements the autograph with other texts, most notably two librettos for the opera: one for the Prague premiere in 1787, the other for the much-debated Viennese version from the following May. Giving a lucid account of what this source material can tell us is Wolfgang Rehm’s musicological introduction. It chronicles the genesis of the opera, provides a history of the autograph itself, describes some of the opera’s later reception as expressed through other works (especially Beethoven, who adapted some of its melodies for his own use) or productions (especially Wagner’s staging), and furnishes an abridged critical apparatus based on the NMA. There are also items that belong in their own class—supererogations like Giacomo Casanova’s reworking of Leporello’s act 2 scena, or photographs of the box that the singer Pauline Viardot had had made to house Mozart’s autograph (which she purchased in 1855).

Preceding all of this in the third volume is Hans Joachim Kreutzer’s “Don Juan—from Play to Opera” (translated, as with Rehm’s essay, by J. Bradford Robinson). Even going by the sheer number of topics it addresses, Kreutzer’s historical/critical account bears witness to the range of ways Mozart’s opera has fascinated his contemporaries and posterity, whether in its text/music relations; its treatment of time (in the opera, “time is ever-present—as a warning, if not a threat, and hence as a symbol” [p. 9]); its Romantic reception (“Hoffmann’s Don Juan is a self-portrait of its author, not an exegesis of Mozart’s opera” [p. 3]); the operations of its social world; or the ethical challenge the opera poses in linking its ravishing music to questionable actions. Even so basic a question as identifying the opera’s genre resists a univocal answer. On the one hand, Kreutzer argues that Don Giovanni’s “misdeed—the event that set the plot in motion—guides him to his doom. It is an idea truly worthy of tragedy” (p. 8). Shortly after that, however, he contends, with equal credibility, that “the hero’s demise is not tragic, nor is it cathartic; it is a warning that the others promptly spell out in the final scene” (p. 10). Indeed, Don Giovanni’s damnation does not seem to elicit that other all-but-obligatory response to tragedy, pity (unless the object of pity is meant to be someone else, like Donna Elvira). Don Giovanni expresses no remorse. He does not even feel the fatigue that can oppress other tyrannical souls—Macbeth’s sigh from act 5, scene 5, “I ’gin to be aweary of the sun, / And wish
th’estate o’ th’world were now undone,” is not a thought that occurs to him. Yet if Mozart’s opera departs from some conventions of tragedy, it conforms to others, especially in the pattern that its denouement follows. Just as Thebes was delivered from pollution by the expulsion of Oedipus, so, too, is the social world of Don Giovanni cleansed by the expulsion of the libertine.

One other virtue of Kreutzer’s essay can be found in its beginning, which develops the idea of the Don Juan tale as an instance of myth. That might seem too obvious a point to make, or, contrariwise, one might want more clarity on what is meant by myth as opposed to legend, history, or fable. (For example, we tend to think of myths as having hazy origins and corporate authors, whereas Don Juan lore has in Tirso more or less a point of origin in an author.) Even so, merely by taking the opera seriously as an instance of myth, Kreutzer implicitly resists a current, running strongly in recent Don Giovanni interpretation and production, that uses logos to erode mythos. A case in point comes in Dmitri Tcherniakov’s production for the Canadian Opera Company (2015), the most ill-conceived Don Giovanni I have ever seen. Tcherniakov meticulously scrubs from the opera every bit of improbability, at every level: there is no sublimity (neither the Commendatore nor Don Giovanni dies) nor any humor (in large part because there are almost no disguises: this Don Giovanni is nothing if not transparent).

Don Juans made unheroic have been around at least since Goldoni. The Venetian cast the demise of his libertine in theological despair: “What can I hope from deaf heaven? Long ago I lost the ability to speak with the gods” (act 5, scene 8). The Canadian Don Juan is, in contrast, merely a drunkard. Tcherniakov has used allegory to make Don Giovanni safe from myth. The grand drama of heaven and hell is miniaturized, packed up, and relocated in limbo, where, in a highly modernist conceit, all the richness of social and interior life is distilled into one emotional condition, that of trauma. Against such rationalizations, Kreutzer’s essay reminds us that, however difficult it is for us to wrap our minds around Mozart’s Don Giovanni, we can be sure that its eerie authority comes not from denying but from giving musical vision to the power that eros and thanatos continue to wield over the psyche.

—Edmund Goehring

Casanova’s reworking of a scena from Don Giovanni


Anyone who has had the privilege of examining a composer’s autograph, especially of an enduring masterpiece, will attest that it is a memorable experience. A holograph letter may convey a strong sense of its writer’s personality, but nothing places one in closer proximity to the act of musical creation itself than a score in the hand of its author. Shortly after the fall of the Iron Curtain, I was able to spend a month in company with the manuscript of Così fan tutte. The prospect of reliving the experience with a facsimile of the highest quality was an inviting one indeed. The commentary volume, following the pattern of the series, contains essays by Norbert Miller (on the background to the opera) and John Rice (on the sources themselves). Both are expertly done.

The basic facts of the autograph’s recent history can be summarized quite quickly. Act 2 was returned to Berlin after the end of World War II, whereas act 1 remained out of sight for decades before eventually appearing in Kraków. A small section of act 2, detached from the main autograph early on, is now in Frankfurt. Very little of substance is visible, and Tyson’s findings are thus reproduced in the commentary volume. The qualities (as opposed to the color) of the papers—thick or see-through, crumpled or smooth, rough or wax-surfaced—are also difficult to capture. Pages of the autograph are fully reproduced, that is to say complete with their edges, while fragments and extracts from early copyists’ scores (which supply elements missing from the autograph) are cropped. Easily the most noticeable difference between the autograph itself and its reproduction in the facsimile is the appearance of the inks. In my study of Così, I reported just how useful it had been to look at ink colors in a range of lighting conditions. By its very nature, a facsimile fixes colors in a controlled and uniform state of ambient lighting. Nonetheless, fine distinctions in tone are beautifully reproduced. On the first side of the act 1 duetto “Al fato dan legge,” one can distinguish at a glance the fine black (and very slightly scratchy) quality of the ink of the particella, the faded (and slightly fuzzier) grey of the string parts, and the warmer color of the wind lines, the distinctions especially evident in the part labels. But the first side of Fiordiligi’s great aria of resistance “Come scoglio” shows what can be lost. Its dramatic appearance in the autograph comes from the component in the black ink—possibly blotting sand—that glintens; it imparts a three-dimensional effect to the note-heads, which glint as the angle of vision is altered, a quality that cannot be reproduced.

Having spent more time than I care to remember carting around the bulky and invariably filthy volumes that constitute the earliest copyists’ scores, it is gratifying to see how well the facsimile affords insights into the challenges of working with these indispensable materials. Even when obviously later elements are disregarded, it can be extraordinarily difficult to account for what one sees. A copyist wrote out “Ei parte,” Fiordiligi’s accompanied recitative leading into “Per pieta,” which cadences in E major. Someone else (presumably) later scrawled at the end “Segue amor un ladroncello,” making a connection with the B flat aria sung by the other sister later in the opera. (The same implausible tonal connection links the copyist’s recitative leading into Dorabella’s aria itself.) Some exchanging appears to have gone on, but when, why and upon whose authority? Tyson suggested that some of these early theatre scores contain additions in the composer’s hand. It was a reasonable decision to omit this

Compared to Mozart’s other late operas, *Die Zauberflöte* had a relatively straightforward gestation. As Christoph Wolff explains in his insightful introductory essay to this volume of *Mozart Operas in Facsimile*, most of the work was probably composed in the spring of 1791 and finished in July of that year, with the two instrumental movements that open each act added shortly before the premiere in late September. In his introduction, Wolf also briefly traces the fascinating history of the autograph as it moved from Constanze Mozart to the music publisher Johann Anton André, to the Dresden banker Eduard Sputch, to the Royal Library in Berlin (later Prussian State Library), to various hiding places in Silesia during World War II, to the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków, and finally back to the Berlin Staatsbibliothek.

The facsimile edition keeps with the twentieth-century binding that separates the autograph (originally consisting of loose fascicles) into two volumes, each corresponding to one act. A third volume is appended to the facsimile. This supplemental volume opens with two introductory essays. The first, by Hans Joachim Kreutzer, places the opera in the cultural context of the late eighteenth century. The author sometimes gets lost in the overwhelming number of stage works that have been viewed either as influencing or influenced by *Die Zauberflöte*. For example, he lists *Das Sonnenfest der Braminen* and *Das unterbrochene Opferfest*, two Viennese exotic operas from the 1790s that mostly avoid references to the supernatural, as belonging to a group of works he calls “Zauberopern.” At another point, he claims that a triumphal war song of the Incas in *Das unterbrochene Opferfest* was intended as comical, simply because it contains the image of devouring one’s human enemies; the chorus in question is in fact a rather serious representation of the Incas’ pride at (temporarily) defeating the Spanish invasion. Kreutzer also raises the specter of doubt about the authenticity of the autograph’s text when he gives partial credence to Michael Freyhnan’s “conspiracy theory” (thus referred to by Paul Corneilson in a 2009 issue of this newsletter), according to which Mozart’s preferred text for the opera appears not in his own autograph but in the 1814 Simrock first edition of the full score. By contrast, the ensuing essay by Wolff is a concise and erudite introduction into the major musicological issues surrounding Mozart’s final *Singspiel*. Similar to Kreutzer, Wolff devotes a portion of his essay to *Die Zauberflöte*’s cultural context; he traces Mozart’s relationship to Schikaneder and discusses three important sources of the opera’s plot: the contemporary fascination with fairy tales, Egyptian cults, and the power of music.

The two essays (presented in an English translation by J. Bradford Robinson and, in the original German) are followed by a series of additional facsimiles. The first is a facsimile of the first edition of the libretto (published in Vienna by Alberti in 1791). This is followed by an extra facsimile of the opera’s overture. In the autograph score of the overture, the ink was so faded that the editors of the facsimile found in volume 1 used digital methods to make it clearer; the more faded original manuscript is reproduced in the supplementary volume. Also included are several sketches for the opera: a page with the fugato subject from the overture, and the two sides of a folio with the continuity draft for the opening sections of the first-act finale, the conclusion to the Duet no. 11, an earlier and the final versions of the melody for the Song of the Armed Men, and the flute march from the second-act finale. The supplemental volume concludes with a note on watermarks, and a table about the pagination and structure of the folios that make up the autograph.

The autograph score is an extremely important source of information about the opera’s inception, especially because so little is known about the exact nature of Mozart and Schikeneder’s collaboration on the work. For example, Schik-
neder’s initial commission for the opera from Mozart for the Wiednertheater has not survived and neither have any of the musical materials used during early performances, with the possible exception of some instrumental parts discovered by David Buch in the Austrian National Library. Wolff points out numerous traces of the compositional process in the autograph score. The facsimiles of the sketches demonstrate that Mozart needed to “map out” certain passages (particularly the Song of the Armed Men in the second-act finale and the Speaker’s Scene in the first-act finale) independently from the autograph and that he conceived other passages differently at first (the overture was probably more conventional). One confusing part of Wolff’s essay is that in his discussion of the Speaker’s Scene, he misattributes Tamino’s maxims to the Speaker (similarly, at another point, Papageno’s phrase is mistakenly attributed to Pamina). The introductory essay also evaluates some of the discrepancies between the first edition libretto and the autograph text that illustrate Mozart’s unusually strong commitment to word-music relations.

In an engaging way, Wolff also describes how the autograph gradually materialized, with Mozart first writing out a two-part vocal-instrumental skeleton of each number in one type of ink (darker) and later orchestrating it in lighter ink. The autograph also makes obvious various small-scale deletions and revisions, and makes it possible to see whether they were done before or after orchestration. Wolff presents a particularly clear-cut account of the rebarring in the duet “Bei Männern, welche Liebe fühlen.” In general, the easily approachable facsimile of the autograph and its introductory material represent a welcome and low-cost alternative to the critical edition for any Zauberflöte enthusiast.

—Martin Nedbal


In mid-July 1791, Mozart received an important commission from Prague impresario Domenico Guardasoni to write “a grand Opera Seria” based on “Metastasio’s Tito” for the coronation of Emperor Leopold II as King of Bohemia. Mozart and librettist Caterino Mazzolà refashioned the great poet’s fifty-year old text and consequently altered many of its musical and dramatic structures. Mozart finished La clemenza di Tito on September 5, 1791. The work premiered a day later, as part of an elaborate series of festivities celebrating Leopold’s ascension to the Habsburg throne. Critical appraisals of the opera have waxed and waned since its initial performances, partly due to changing perceptions of opera seria. Mozart, though, evidently was pleased with the work. When he entered it in his personal catalogue he commented, “Ridotta à vera opera” (reduced to a true opera)—the only remark of this kind his catalogue contains.

The composer died three months after the work’s premiere. The autograph score, which probably was never bound, became part of his estate. Portions of the opera became separated from the main body early in the manuscript’s history; for instance, when Mozart’s widow sold the score in 1799 the duet “Deh prendi” was already missing from its contents. The Packard Humanities Institute’s handsome facsimile edition reunites manuscripts that now reside in Berlin, Kraków, and London.

A companion volume includes two thoughtful essays that place the opera into a broader context. One titled “Mozart’s Opera of the Future: La clemenza di Tito” by Hans Joachim Kreutzer explores the opera’s intellectual and political underpinnings. Kreutzer admirably shows that “a wide range of political views could be found among the spectators” at the opera’s premiere (vol. 2, p. 9) and explicates how competing political agendas influenced the opera’s reception from the outset.

The second essay, a musicological introduction by Sergio Durante, covers the opera’s genesis, circumstances surrounding the first performance, its dramatic and musical construction, and posthumous reputation. Durante stresses that the visual aspect of the production was central to the work’s inception. The impresario’s original contract stipulates that “two new decorations [stage designs] expressly for this performance” and new costumes for the main characters be prepared (vol. 2, p. 31). (In the end, four new designs were created.) Durante argues that the librettist, composer, and stage designer Pietro Travaglia must have worked closely together, particularly on the work’s scenic requirements and stage effects. Earlier operatic settings of Metastasio’s libretto briefly describe the attempted coup against the emperor Tito. Mozart and Mazzolà’s adaptation, in contrast, depicts the rebellion onstage. A set change precedes this crucial point in the story; the libretto calls for fire to break out in the capitol and gradually spread. Other adjustments and late additions to the score also attest to the creative team’s concern for the coordination of text, music, and stage action.

Therefore it is fitting that the facsimile brings to light a stage direction in one the opera’s most praised scenes that is not included in the NMA and other modern scores. The “Quintetto con coro” that closes act 1 weaves together dramatic action, solos and ensemble singing by the principal characters,
passages of *accompagnato*, choral interjections, and sharp musical contrasts to vividly portray the consequences of the rebellion. After a turbulent Allegro (mm. 1–121), the number concludes with a solemn Andante that features interlocking statements for the soloists and chorus. The stage direction “Coro in distanza” (Chorus in the distance) appears before their first entry at bar 47. Traditionally this has been interpreted as the chorus should be offstage during the Allegro and then enter as the Andante commences. However, the autograph contains an additional stage direction: the phrase “Coro in lontananza” (which also means Chorus in the distance) appears immediately prior to the Andante. How should these directions be interpreted? Should the chorus be offstage or on? Durante believes the notations indicate the chorus should be at the rear of the stage, not offstage, throughout the scene. A collection of Travaglia’s set designs, which was rediscovered in 1994 (after the publication of the NMA), seems to support his assertion (Sergio Durante, “Le scenografie di Pietro Travaglia per *La clemenza di Tito* [Praga, 1791]: Problemi di identificazione ed implicazioni,” *Mozart Jahrbuch* [1994]: 157–69).

What else does this facsimile edition reveal about the opera? Readers can now readily see what is in Mozart’s hand and what is not. Only a few bars of simple recitative survive in the autograph. Who wrote the rest of the simple recitatives for *La clemenza di Tito* remains a mystery to this day. Various eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century accounts claim that, due to time constraints, Mozart entrusted their composition to one of his students. Durante’s essay retraces the evidence (vol. 2, pp. 24–5) and the companion volume reproduces the opera’s simple recitatives, but from a different manuscript than the one employed by the NMA: a copyist’s score that is the “only secondary source that numbers the musical items exactly as in Mozart’s score” (vol. 2, p. 89). Therefore the facsimile edition makes another source for the simple recitatives widely available.

The companion volume also includes a facsimile of the libretto printed for the opera’s premiere (with Mozart and Mazzolà’s names conspicuously absent), a transcription and an English translation of the original contract between the impresario and Bohemian officials, facsimiles of sketches and drafts, and information about the structure and paper types of the autograph. The latter shows that some music must have been composed after Mozart arrived in Prague on August 28.

The quality of the images, the paper, and the binding of the facsimile and the companion volume are all superb. Durante’s musicological introduction is very readable and comprehensive, the essay by Kreutzer less so, but both provide thoughtful and thought-provoking commentary on one of Mozart’s last works.

—Laurel E. Zeiss
Mozart’s Starling
Leszek Chudziński

How just a bird, if nothing else,
Could steal Herr Mozart’s high romance
Sweetly perched up on his shoulder,
Clearly not to be a scolder.

To whistle into Mozart’s ear
A tune before it disappeared
And take concerto for a spin
Around the room or on a whim.

Just to mimic, to entertain,
A starling can be pretty vain,
And to avoid a disaster
Must be cast in alabaster.

It’d like a poem now and then
Exacted in Herr Mozart’s pen,
And be his dear Vogel Staar,
Either up close or from afar.

And in return ein Vogel Staar
Will praise his master’s every bar
And each concerto he composed—
Either unfinished or supposed.

Leszek Chudziński is a Seattle-based writer currently seeking a publisher for his collection of fifty-five “humorous and whimsical” poems, titled Mr. Mozart and his Orchestra. The Newsletter is pleased to print the opening poem, which borrows the phrase “ein Vogel Staar” from a poem Mozart wrote for his pet starling’s funeral in 1787.