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MSA’s Twentieth-Anniversary Celebration in Vancouver

MSA celebrated its twentieth anniversary at the 2016 conference of the American Musicological Society in Vancouver. Reports from president Paul Corneilson and members of the Board outlined a number of accomplishments for the organization this past year, reflected on the Society’s growth over the past two decades, and left many attendees optimistic about the future of MSA and Mozart studies in general.

Corneilson announced that the past year saw an increase in MSA’s membership, with nine new members and fifty-three renewals in the last quarter of 2016 alone. In total, MSA has nearly 140 individual members and sixteen institutional members, a substantial increase from the previous year. This year also saw a generous $10,000 donation from Daniel Heartz, which has been more than matched by other donors. Heartz, who could not attend the meeting, sent his warmest regards to the Society, expressing his gratitude that the organization continues to grow and develop. As reported by treasurer Beverly Wilcox, MSA’s non-endowment funds continue to grow at a steady pace as well. On another positive note, the Society presented this year’s Marjorie Weston Emerson Award to Justin Lavacek for his 2015 article “Mozart’s Harmonic Design in the Secco Recitatives.”

The anniversary celebration graciously acknowledged the contributions of its founding members and commemorated MSA’s founding in 1996. Corneilson read a letter from Isabelle Emerson, the Society’s founding president, which offered a warm and congratulatory greeting to honor its success and progress:

First, Congratulations to all of us who have made the Mozart Society of America the vibrant thriving organization it is today.

Second, I am proud and grateful to have played a role in the founding of the MSA, and I offer my special thanks to all the colleagues who joined our early efforts and to all those who continue the work of this Society.

Finally, I am very, VERY sad that I cannot be there to celebrate the end of the Society’s first twenty years—and the beginning of the next twenty. I rejoice with you in absentia with all my heart!

I’ll close with a toast to the most important one of all—Herr Mozart himself!

A good portion of the meeting also looked to the future of the Society and the future of Mozart scholarship. Adeline Mueller, MSA’s website editor, outlined some of the updates and changes to MSA’s website, which include plans for a more advanced search engine, an archive of past newsletters, and more visibility on social media. Review editor Emily Wuchner announced that members of MSA will collaborate to review “Mozart 225,” a new 200-CD box set. The reviews will be published in the Spring 2018 and Fall 2018 issues of...
At the business meeting in Vancouver, Justin Lavacek received MSA’s Marjorie Weston Emerson Award for his article “Mozart’s Harmonic Design in the Secco Recitatives,” which appeared in the 2015 issue of Theoria: Historical Aspects of Music Theory.

Mozart to confront historical and cultural issues. Speaking on mid-nineteenth-century conducting scores for Don Giovanni in Prague, Martin Nedbal of the University of Kansas demonstrated how Mozart’s opera was adapted, edited, and interpreted according to a wide range of musical, political, and nationalist motivations. Estelle Joubert of Dalhousie University and Emily Dolan of Harvard University addressed Mozart’s status as a central figure in Western civilization. Joubert described his ubiquitous historical presence and its usefulness for many humanities subjects, while Dolan discussed using Mozart as a case study for how musicians became “culture heroes” around the year 1800.

After the six presentations, Mary Hunter of Bowdoin College joined the scholars in a roundtable discussion on Mozart’s relevance in scholarship and music today. While the roundtable agreed that teaching and performing Mozart’s music are still essential to his relevance, Hunter noted that the speakers’ approaches focused less on the composer as a monolithic figure and more on Mozart as a means of addressing larger questions of history, theory, and culture. The roundtable speculated that this kind of approach opens the possibility that future Mozart scholarship might not be done specifically by eighteenth-century music specialists, but by scholars in other areas and fields who can use Mozart and his music for a diverse range of purposes.

With the roundtable concluded, Corneilson conveyed his gratitude to the Society’s Board and membership, the American Musicological Society, the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music, and all those in attendance for their continued support. With eyes pointed forward toward twenty more successful years, the members and guests in attendance adjourned to a reception and offered a toast to Mozart and the Society.

—Matthew Leone
**Announcements**

**MSA Joins the Mozart Community**

MSA has joined the Mozart Community, a new international group organized by the Salzburg Mozarteum Foundation to help coordinate efforts among its member societies. Further information can be found on the Foundation's website at www.mozarteum.at/internationale-kooperation/mozartgemeinden/go.

**Robert D. Levin Named Honorary Member of MSA**

This fall MSA’s Board voted to name acclaimed pianist, scholar, and editor Robert D. Levin an honorary member of the Society. Because of his contributions to Mozart studies and MSA, he joins other esteemed Mozart scholars who hold this honor, including the Society’s founding president Isabelle Emerson, Daniel Heartz, Christoph Wolff, and Neal Zaslaw. Levin was the keynote speaker at MSA’s 2003 conference at Cornell University on “Mozart and the Keyboard Culture of His Time.” His completions of Mozart’s Requiem, K. 626; the Mass in C Minor, K. 427/417a; and numerous pieces of chamber music have been widely acclaimed and have received performances all over the world. Levin’s recordings of keyboard concertos, have earned him a reputation as one of the principal interpreters of Mozart of his generation.

**Mozart in Prague**

*Essays on Performance, Patronage, Sources, and Reception*

This newly published collection of scholarly essays stems from a joint conference held in Prague in June 2009 by the MSA and the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music; it has been co-published by both societies with the Institute of Ethnology of the Czech Academy of Sciences. The purpose of the conference was to examine from diverse points of view the music of Mozart and his contemporaries within the rich cultural context provided by Prague. This volume offers critical discussions of musicians and performance in theatrical, concert, and private settings; important patrons of music in Bohemia and nearby; sources and repertoire that deepen our knowledge of contemporary practices in this region; the extraordinary cross-fertilization between Italy and its Central European counterparts; and the opera that is perhaps most closely identified with Prague, *Don Giovanni*, with new perspectives on its sources, structure, and reception. Members can purchase the book for a special discounted rate of $25, or receive a free copy with a contribution of $250 or more to the Daniel Heartz Endowment. Checks should be sent to Beverly Wilcox, MSA treasurer, at the business office.

**Call for Papers: “Mozart and Modernity”**

MSA’s seventh biennial conference, “Mozart and Modernity,” will take place from Friday to Sunday, October 20–22, 2017, at the University of Western Ontario. The conference aims to address questions about the place of Mozart’s music in the modern world. Above all, it considers how an appreciation of Mozart’s music can be sustained in a modern critical climate where beauty and convention have lost some of their cultural command.

In addition to the slate of free papers, the conference will offer several special events. On Thursday, October 19, Robert B. Pippin of the University of Chicago will speak on Alfred Hitchcock and modernism. Later, a roundtable will be convened on Wye Allanbrook’s recent book *The Secular Commedia*. Participants will also have the opportunity to attend two performances. Ensemble Made in Canada, UWO’s resident piano quartet, will offer a program pairing the Piano Quartet in G Minor, K. 478, with Jean Lesage’s 2006 piano trio “Le projet Mozart.” Additionally, the Theatre Studies program at UWO will mount a production or reading of a play related to Mozart.

For individual papers and the Allanbrook roundtable, please submit electronic abstracts of up to 300 words; for full or half sessions, please follow AMS guidelines. No individual may present more than once. All proposals should be sent to the program chair, Edmund Goehringer (egoehrin@uwo.ca), by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, April 24, 2017. Participants must be members of the Society at the time the conference is held.

**New MSA Discussion Group and Public Page on Facebook**

The Membership Committee has created a new discussion group on Facebook. A trial Facebook page can be accessed here: https://www.facebook.com/mozartsocietyofamerica. Please consider joining the discussion group. Further details will be provided soon.
The Heartz Endowment Exceeds Its Initial Goal

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

We, the co-chairs of MSA's fundraising committee, began asking for contributions for the Heartz Endowment last spring, with the initial goal of matching Dan's gift. We approached members of MSA, as well of some of Dan's friends, colleagues, and students who are not members of our Society.

We are delighted to announce that we have exceeded our initial goal. As of January 27, 2017, donations totaled $11,260. We are confident that Dan, in perusing the list of donors, will be pleased and touched by your generosity and will join us in cordially thanking you.

The Heartz Endowment has already begun to benefit Mozart scholarship. It allowed the Society to subsidize the publication of Mozart in Prague: Essays on Performance, Patronage, Sources, and Reception, the proceedings of a memorable conference that took place in Prague, under the sponsorship of MSA and the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music, in 2009.

We continue to welcome donations, which will be recorded in future issues of the Newsletter. If you haven't already sent in a donation, please give generously so that Dan may have the pleasure of seeing that his donation has inspired you to join him in supporting our Society and helping to ensure the future of Mozart research. Send your contributions (preferably by check, but PayPal is also possible) to Beverly Wilcox, treasurer of MSA, 435 G Street, Apt. 207, Davis, CA 95616. Email: wilcox@csus.edu

—Bruce Alan Brown and John A. Rice
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Depending upon whom you ask, figure 1 depicts a string quartet, an aria, both, or neither. It is a plate from Jérôme-Joseph de Momigny’s analysis of the first movement of Mozart’s String Quartet in D Minor, K. 421, and one of the centerpieces of his *Cours complet d’harmonie et de composition* (1803–06). The top four lines depict the quartet itself, as written by Mozart. The next staves (*cadences mélodiques* and *harmoniques*) present Momigny’s analysis of the antecedent-consequent gestures in the quartet’s melody (on a single staff) and in the accompaniment (on the grand staff below). The next grand staff features Momigny’s transcription of the quartet for voice and piano, which adds text to the melody (taken from the first violin part), and leaves a reduced accompaniment in the left hand. Finally, the bottom staff presents a fundamental bass analysis drawn from the theories of Jean-Philippe Rameau.

Momigny’s texted analysis of K. 421 is the first and most extensive of three such analyses in the *Cours complet*. The other two deal with the first movement of Haydn’s Symphony No. 103 (“Drumroll”), and the fugue from Handel’s Sixth Keyboard Suite. Each of the three analyses adds words, in some form, to instrumental music in order to convey its meaning. Momigny himself calls this technique a “picturesque and poetic” analysis, though others have given it different names. Ian Bent has referred to the method as “affective analysis” and “analytical transformation,” while Byron Almén uses “expressive analysis,” and Malcolm Cole calls it “programmatic analysis.”

While texted analysis is one of the most distinctive features of Momigny’s work, it has received a mixed reception from modern music theorists, who greet it with skepticism and bemusement, or treat it as a primary source that reveals historical attitudes but offers little of use to contemporary analysts. For Roger Parker, Momigny’s method is characterized by “a directness and lack of self-consciousness that is thoroughly alien to us today.” As a result, he writes,

> [Momigny] presents us with two options. We may simply dismiss Momigny’s explanatory situation as quaint, irrelevant, merely silly. But we can also use the strangeness as a point of entry, a chance to measure the distance between others’ aesthetic attitudes and our own. … We can, in this case, pose Momigny as an extreme point of reference from which to test our unspoken assumptions about the vexed question of how words and music work together in a dramatic context.

Those “unspoken assumptions” comprise a deeply ingrained Wagnerian aesthetic, which holds that text and music should be unified—along with visual elements—into the *Gesamtkunstwerk*. Yet this need for unification arises, Parker argues, precisely because text and music are actually separated by a wide gulf. Because of our modern internalization of Wagner’s aesthetic, music and text—and thus, music and representation—are as separate as can be. Unifying them, and thus endowing music with the power to signify, is epistemologically fraught, and requires herculean creativity. For Momigny and his contemporaries, on the other hand, music and text were intimately intertwined—natural partners, or perhaps two sides of the same coin. Moving between them was as simple as translating between two languages; challenges may arise and nuance might be lost, but the two media are essentially the same.
Some commentators have criticized Momigny’s narrativ- 
ization of otherwise non-programmatic instrumental music. 
Byron Almén exemplifies contemporary skepticism toward 
Momigny in his critique of the analysis of Handel’s fugue. 
Momigny describes the fugue as a three-voiced argument 
between a daughter (whose pleadings constitute the subject) 
and her mother and father (whose remonstrations form the 
countersubject). While Almén takes Momigny’s attempts 
at narrative seriously, he argues that the mappings between 
musical elements and proposed characters, events, and re-
relationships are sometimes unclear. Furthermore, there is 
no evidence to support any given narrative for the piece, yet 
Momigny speculates about the composer’s intention in a way 
that would be rare today. He writes, “This, or something like 
it, is the range of feeling that we believe Handel might have 
experienced, or the image that he might have had in mind, as 
he composed this fugue.”

Others have read Momigny’s texted analyses with respect 
to the social functions and implications of musical genres. In 
a chapter on the symphony, Momigny writes that it is a genre 
“destined for a large gathering of persons,” and thus “must 
have at once both grandeur and popularity. The composer 
should choose his subject from scenes of nature, or from 
scenes of society that are most capable of moving and engag-
ing the multitude.” Mark Evan Bonds reads this statement 
against Momigny’s proposed narrative for Haydn’s “Drum-
roll” Symphony, highlighting how Momigny’s symphonic 
interpretation appropriately turns toward a narrative involv-
ing a large community. In his account of the symphony’s first 
movement, Momigny interprets the opening timpani roll 
as the distant rumble of thunder. “The scene takes place in 
the countryside,” he writes. “We must imagine that a fearful 
storm has been raging for so long that the inhabitants of the 
village have betaken themselves to the Temple of God. After 
the clap of thunder, conveyed by the timpani, we hear the 
prayer begin.”

Edward Klorman, in his recent study of sociality in Mo-
Zart’s chamber music, has examined the analysis of K. 421 
in great detail. Klorman highlights Momigny’s surprising 
choice to render the string quartet not as some form of con-
versation—as string quartets were consistently described at 
the time—but instead as an aria, featuring the first violin as 
soloist, and relegating the rest of the ensemble to an accom-
panimental role. While he too takes Momigny’s work seri-
ously, he chronicles several moments when the metaphor of 
the aria breaks down, demonstrating, for example, that Mo-
migny is forced to gloss over several imitative passages in the 
development section in order to retain the focus on a soloist.

In contrast to modern assessments of Momigny’s texted 
analyses, I propose that instead of accepting them as merely 
 attempts to describe musical narratives or to give perform-
ance directives, we may also gain insights into Mozart’s use 
of harmony and form by taking a more abstract view and 
interpreting Momigny’s attempt to unify music and language 
as a proxy for other analytical concerns. By examining Mo-
migny’s retrospective text setting in the context of formal 
processes, we can learn several interesting lessons about how 
he heard Mozart’s music.

Momigny introduces his analysis of K. 421’s first move-
ment as follows:

The style of this Allegro moderato is noble and pathetic. I 
decided that the best way to have my readers recognize 
its true expression was to add words to it. But since these 
verses, if one can call them that, were improvised … they 
ought not to be judged in any other regard than that of 
their agreement with the sense of the music.

I thought I perceived that the feelings expressed by the 
composer were those of a lover who is on the point of be-
ing abandoned by the hero she adores: Dido, who had had 
a similar misfortune to complain of, came immediately to 
mind. Her noble rank, the intensity of her love, the re-
nown of her misfortune—all this convinced me to make her 
the heroine of this piece.

Momigny’s very specific description refers to Dido, the 
Queen of Carthage, best known for her role in a tragic epi-
isode from Book 4 of Virgil’s Aeneid, and numerous operatic 
tragedies. The Trojan Aeneas arrives in Carthage and falls in 
love with the queen. The two are subject to the machinations 
of the rival goddesses Venus and Juno, however, and Aeneas 
is convinced to leave Carthage by Mercury (the messenger of 
the gods) in order to continue his quest to build a new city for 
the Trojans in Italy. Heartbroken, Dido commits suicide. In 
Mozart’s “noble and pathetic” opening movement, Momigny 
hears elements of Dido’s persona and story: her noble status, 
his intense love for Aeneas, and her grave misfortune. In re-
response, he casts her as the heroine of the quartet, composing 
an entire text in French, based on her pivotal confrontation 
with Aeneas. Momigny’s text underlay accounts for nearly 
every note played by the first violin, along with a brief cello 
passage attributed to Aeneas, a single note assigned to her 
handmaid, and a lamenting chorus at the end. The analytical 
prose that accompanies the score parses through much of the 
quartet measure by measure, and sprawls across more than 
ninety pages.

Momigny begins his analysis from the premise that the 
added text reflects his impression of the music—his own as-
association of the “noble and pathetic” character of the quar-
tet’s first movement, with the tragedy of Dido and Aeneas. 
The quality of the text itself, he quickly asserts, is not at issue
(“these verses … ought not to be judged”). The text is a device for analysis (“the best way to help my readers recognize [the music’s] expression”), not a piece of art itself. Throughout the beginning of his analysis, Momigny frequently seems insecure about his own text. He proceeds in an apologetic tone, noting the moments when his poetry aligns with the music, but especially dwelling on the difficulties of fitting the text and the rhyme scheme to the music. Regarding the opening lines, he writes, “‘Displeasure’ [déplaisir] is a weak word, and is used only because I have not yet found a rhyme for ‘ir’ that could adequately replace it. The true meaning of the verse is rather: ‘Ah! when you cause me grief [me désole].’” Here, Momigny draws attention to the structure of his own text: a series of rhyming infinitives (attendrir, rougir, retenir, mourir) dominate the exposition and dictate the end of each line. This added text, then, is a departure from Momigny’s stated intention of writing text solely for the purpose of explicating the music; the aesthetic desire for a rhyming text seems to get in the way of analysis by forcing him to choose a weaker word. Continuing in the same manner, Momigny remarks upon other notable moments, such as the awkwardness of placing the French pronoun me on what he considers a strong beat (a downbeat rather than an upbeat, presumably) in measure 9 (shown in fig. 2). He also has more than the occasional success. He rejoices, for example, in the rhetorical strength of emphatic text-music matches like “Quoi!” at the beginning of measure 9, and “Fuis!” in measure 14 (fig. 2).

As Momigny’s anxiety over his text setting subsides, the presumed authorship of the text becomes cloudy. Momigny begins to speak as if he were not the author of these exegetical lyrics. Lines of text become signposts for musical events, as when Momigny writes of measure 51, “With the words voilà le prix de tant d’amour! Mozart resumes the free style exclusively until the fifth verse.” Here, Momigny’s poetry is closely aligned with—even conflated with—Mozart’s musical form. Furthermore, Momigny sometimes implies that Mozart has taken care to set Dido’s words to music intentionally, paradoxically crafting the music to express the emotional states suggested by a text composed many years after the fact. Momigny describes the passage beginning at measure 51 (fig. 2) as follows:

How the anger of the queen of Carthage bursts out in the music of the third musical verse! And how the last syllable of the word amour is felicitously placed on the B-flat, in order to express the grief that Dido feels at having rashly abandoned herself to this passion for a perjurer! The second time she repeats this word she cannot finish it, because she is choked by the grief that overwhelms her. It is here that the viola part, which represents her sister, con-

Figure 2. Notable Moments in Momigny’s Text Setting: measures 9–10; measures 13–14; measures 52–54

fidante, or maid, takes up the word to address to the Trojan the reproaches that Dido no longer has the strength to make herself.

In this remarkable paragraph, Momigny seems to ventriloquize Mozart, reversing the order of the compositional decisions that produced this piece. He seems to get caught up in analyzing the aria that he has created, rather than focusing on the quartet itself. Even notable features like the first violin trailing off and passing its melody to the viola for completion are given hermeneutic justifications within the text. The viola is momentarily personified, giving voice to another character (a “sister, confidante, or maid”) in the scene, and signaling Momigny’s willingness to rely not only on text setting, but also stage direction.

The permeable boundary between Mozart’s music and Momigny’s text is also evident in Momigny’s flexible formal labels. As shown in table 1, Momigny’s Cours complet develops a system of labels for the components of phrase rhythm that is hierarchical (as are most analyses of musical phrases), but, crucially, not completely symmetrical. That is, while two notes are needed to form the most basic unit, a proposition or a cadence (the antecedent-consequent units analyzed in the center of fig. 1), the rest of his formal units have no fixed size—a phrase is simply a container for one or more cadences, while a verse contains one or more phrases, a pe-
The close relationship between music and text thus allows Momigny to craft a highly flexible theory of phrase rhythm, which describes not only the simple, mostly symmetrical pairings of subject and verb, but also more paratactic constructions that include several clauses. His model can thus accommodate not only the regimented symmetries of well-established “theme types” like the period and the sentence, which tend to be found at the beginnings of movements, but also the looser Fortspinnung of Baroque musical rhetoric, or the irregular constructions found in transitions, developments (here, recall Klorman’s critique), and other loose-knit formal areas.

The fluidity of the word verse lets it refer to both musical and textual units at different times, or even simultaneously. While the separation between musical and textual “verses” is clear at the beginning of each theme group, ambiguities arise as the pace of the phrase rhythm increases. For example, as shown in figure 3, many short phrases receive their own “verse” labels. Here, these verses indicate both complete lines of Momigny’s text, and discrete harmonic units. The tenth verse, for example, marks the arrival in the first movement’s secondary key (F major), and moves from tonic to dominant in that key. The eleventh verse marks a turn with which Mozart evades a clearly approaching cadence (discussed in greater detail below), instead prolonging V with a pair of chromatic chords. Verses 13 and 14 are each complete progressions (tonic–pre-dominant–dominant–tonic), with the latter more emphatic than the former. Momigny’s text is written to mirror these divisions, suggesting that the linguistic choices Momigny makes reflect aspects of the musical structure. The two “Je t’en prie” outbursts, for example, are each complete progressions, while the virtually identical “verses” in measures 9–10 and 11–12 receive the same text, and each prolong the same harmony. The ninth verse’s wandering chromaticism and modulation (mm. 14–16), however, sees its text fragmented, with some parts repeated several times. The corresponding transition music in the recapitulation (fig. 4, mm. 85–89) is recomposed so as to avoid modulating again to the secondary key. The result stretches out the section by two additional measures, and Momigny’s text repeats itself even more. The addition of the words “arrête! arrête!” connect Dido’s increasing desperation with a moment of intense tonal drama, just before the arrival of the second theme.

Momigny also uses his text setting to reflect formal considerations. Aeneas’s interjections in measures 18–21 (shown in fig. 3) are the most prominent example of how Momigny uses his dramatic narrative to analyze the music. Having already begun to modulate to the relative major, measures 17 and 18 seem to be heading for a strong cadence in F, to usher in the second theme. The pickup to measure 19 derails this path, however, prolonging the dominant with a pair of chromatic chords and forcing the cadential momentum to collect itself and “start over” again in measure 21. Momigny’s momentary addition of a new character dramatizes just how external this short digression around C is. Momigny’s text also returns to the idea from the interrupted cadence several measures before, repeating “je vais mourir” (“I shall die”) again in measure 24 when the cadence is finally accomplished. If we again look ahead to the recapitulation (fig. 4, mm. 89–90), we find that Momigny does not give this moment a text underlay. Perhaps, by this point, Aeneas has left, and Dido is singing only to herself. But perhaps Momigny is also reacting to the

---

**Table 1. Momigny’s Anatomy of Musical Form, after Cours complet, pages 397–98**

(larger) Movement/Piece (morceau), consisting of one or more parts
Part (partie), consisting of one or more periods
Period (période), consisting of one or more verses
Verse (vers), consisting of one or more phrases
Phrase, consisting of one or more cadences/propositions
Cadence/Proposition, consisting of two notes/chords

(smaller) Note/Chord (membre)
allowing us to experience Mozart's quartet, and Momigny's dramatic rendition of it, with new immediacy.

William O'Hara is a PhD candidate in music theory at Harvard University. He is the webmaster for the New England Conference of Music Theorists, and from 2013 to 2016 served as an editorial assistant for the Journal of the American Musicological Society. He can be reached at williamevanohara@fas.harvard.edu.

Notes

I am grateful to audiences at the 2015 MSA conference at Tufts University and the Mozart Colloquium (Cambridge, MA, 2016) for their thoughtful feedback, which helped to sharpen the arguments in this essay.


2. The musical example falls across the volume break in the set of plates that accompanies the Cours complet. The second half of the transcription abandons both the pretext of the aria and the additional analytical staves, laying the text simply under the first violin part.


4. Ian Bent traces Momigny’s approach to earlier experiments in adding text to existing instrumental music, such as Wilhelm von Gerstenberg’s addition of two different texts—one an adaptation of Hamlet’s “To be or not to be” speech, the other an imagined monologue from Socrates as he prepared to take the hemlock. See Bent, Music Analysis in the Nineteenth Century, vol. 1, 27.


Conclusions

Taken together, these brief vignettes illustrate not only the attention to detail that Momigny employed when composing his proposed “libretto” for Mozart’s music, but also the ways in which he carefully used techniques like repetition in his text setting in order to reinforce the metaphorical connections between music and language that underscore his theory of phrase rhythm and form. Choices that initially seem to be motivated for dramatic or emotive reasons—such as Aeneas’s interruption—can also be tied more deeply into harmonic and formal structures. Momigny’s texts, then, can be read—or heard—not only as an attempt to explicate the “true expression” of the pieces he analyzed, but also as contributions to more contemporary theoretical and analytical concerns—
Mozart, Linley, and Obbligato Oboe
Sarah E. Huebsch

It is well documented that Mozart and Thomas Linley Jr. met in Florence in the spring of 1770, while Linley was studying with Pietro Nardini.1 According to a letter from Leopold Mozart to his wife Anna Maria, the two boys performed together on at least three occasions.2 At the end of their encounter, Linley had Maddalena Morelli-Fernandez write the following sonnet, originally in Italian, titled “On the Departure of Signor W. A. Mozart from Florence.” Linley delivered it to Mozart on April 6, 1770.

E’er since I by Fate was divided from thee,
In thought I have followed thy journey in vain;
To tears then were laughter and joy turned for me,
Scarce aayed by the hope I may see thee again.

What ecstasies open to music my heart,
By harmony wafted to Eden, forsooth!
To Heaven transported by love of thy art,
I seem for the first time to contemplate truth.

O fortunate instant! O thrice blessed day,
When first I beheld thee, and wondering heard,
By thy music enchanted more than I can say,
Was happy to find myself loved and preferred.
May the gods grant that I shall remember alway
To resemble thy virtues in deed and in word.

In token of sincere esteem and affection
Thomas Linley.3

The affection was mutual. As reported by Leopold to Anna Maria, Linley “plays most beautifully,” and when he performed with Mozart the two boys were “constantly embracing each other.”4 Furthermore, according to Mozart’s contemporary Michael Kelly, Mozart said, “Linley was a true genius. … Had he lived, he would have been one of the greatest ornaments of the musical world.”5

There are many intriguing parallels in the lives of Mozart and Linley. Both were born into musical families in 1756 and were praised for exceptional musical skill at a young age. In the same way that Leopold was Mozart’s most prominent teacher and mentor, Thomas Linley Sr. was Linley’s first teacher and a significant mentor in his short life. And like Mozart’s sister Maria Anna, four of Linley’s sisters—Elizabeth Ann, Mary, Maria, and Jane—were musicians. Despite the fact that Mozart was an international composer while Linley wrote music primarily for performances in London, their compositions, like their lives, also contain interesting

20. Momigny uses the term “proposition” to describe pairs of notes or chords, which together form the basic unit for his musical “discourse.” Momigny emphasizes the second member of the proposition, echoing the consonance of the second member of a Rameauvian cadence (see Jean-Philipppe Rameau, Treate on Harmony [1722], trans. Phillip Gossett [New York: Dover, 1971], 59–91), and anticipating Hugo Riemann’s argument that metric units occur across barlines, moving from weak beats to strong (see Riemann, “Neue Beiträge zu einer Lehre von den Tonvor- stellungen,” Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters 23 [1916]: 1–21). Momigny’s most succinct explanation of this is in Cours complet, 435–440.


22. On such “precrux alterations,” which are often necessary to bring about the second theme in the tonic key, see James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth Century Sonata (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 239–42.

23. The effects of this metric displacement are not fully worked out until measure 103, when the secondary theme—now in the tonic—lands on a downbeat, at what Hepokoski and Darcy would call the “Essential Structural Closure.”
parallels. Among other similarities, they were among the first composers to write virtuosic obbligato music for the oboe that was decidedly non-Baroque. To be sure, their music continued the tradition of obbligato oboe exemplified in the music of Handel and Bach, but they wrote for specific players who exploited the unique qualities of the new, narrow-bore Classical oboe. Whereas some of Linley’s music in this new style of writing for the oboe predates Mozart’s, it is unlikely that it influenced Mozart. Therefore, rather than charting compositional influence, this article provides a broad panorama of the general development of oboe writing by considering the music of both composers. Since Mozart’s music has overshadowed much of Linley’s, bringing Linley’s music out of the shadows enhances our understanding of the context within which Mozart’s compositional style developed.

Linley’s *A Shakespeare Ode* (1776) and *Music in the Tempest* (1777) include arias for soprano and obbligato oboe. We know from contemporary reviews that the oboe music in *A Shakespeare Ode* was written for John Parke, a respected oboist in late eighteenth-century London. A *Morning Chronicle* review reads,

The music, we hear, is composed by Mr Linley, junior, who has (since his return from Italy) been a student under that most excellent musician Doctor Boyce. This composition must be allowed to be an extraordinary effort of genius in so young a man. … There is taste both in the Air and Accompaniments, that would not disgrace a Sacchini or [J. C.] Bach.—The oboe song in the second part was admirably performed by Miss Mary Linley and Mr Parks and shews this young Composer has that brilliancy and warmth of invention so peculiarly attendant on the spring of life.

Since John Parke was principal oboist at Drury Lane Theatre, it is almost certain that Linley also wrote the oboe music in *Music in the Tempest* for him. Linley composed *Music in the Tempest* as incidental music for Richard Brinsley Sheridan’s production of Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, which enjoyed a long run at Drury Lane from January 4, 1777, through the end of the season in 1787.

Although “Ariel, who sees thee now,” from *A Shakespeare Ode*, is Mozartean in its running sixteenth-note figures and ornamentation, the combination of text setting and structure recall earlier eighteenth-century music. In notes and rhythm, Ariel’s entrance (mm. 19–22) recalls Handel’s “Lift up your heads” from *Messiah*. The ritornello structure of the piece also harks back to Baroque writing. Unlike Mozart’s later arias, where the accompaniment may introduce material that is contrary to the general affect of the piece, Linley’s “Ariel” does not include material that is unrelated to the character, key, or affect of the soprano and obbligato oboe. The accompaniment is unobtrusive and simple, except between vocal episodes. In instrumental ritornellos, the parts are more rhythmically complex and melodically interesting, and toward cadences the instruments strengthen the sense of resolution.

The soprano part in “Ariel, who sees thee now” is less challenging than the oboe part. The soprano sings in a comfortable range (E4 to A5), and the part does not contain virtuosic leaps or passagework. Conversely, the oboe part includes florid writing across most of the instrument’s range (E4 to D6), and the oboist is required to play large leaps and extended passages of trills in sixteenth-note patterns that are especially prominent when the voice is not singing. Passagework in “Ariel” is similar to Mozart’s virtuosic writing for the oboe, especially in the Concerto for Oboe in C Major, K. 314/285d, which Mozart composed in 1777. As shown in figure 1, the end of the opening ritornello of “Ariel” (mm. 11–16) is similar to measures 93–97 in the first movement of Mozart’s concerto. Measure 13 in Linley’s aria bears particular resemblance to measure 95 in Mozart’s concerto.

Linley’s music for *The Tempest* is operatic in complexity. Unlike in “Ariel,” in which vocal writing does not rival the difficulty of the oboe part, the soprano part in Linley’s *Tempest* arias is characterized by athletically long phrases and melismas over multiple bars that traverse non-scalar patterns. Linley wrote the part for his student Ann Field, who made her debut in the part of Ariel in this production. “O bid your faithful Ariel fly” and “Come unto these yellow sands” are demanding solos for both soprano and obbligato oboist. Like “Ariel, who sees thee now,” “O bid” opens and closes with
instrumental material that features trilled scalar passages in the solo oboe and simple accompaniment. As in much of Mozart's writing, the piece includes trills, turns, rapid scales, and florid passagework for soprano and oboe soloists, allowing performers to display brilliant mastery. For example, as shown in figure 2, trills on paired descending notes in measures 5 and 6 of "O bid" resemble Mozart's writing in measure 112 in the first movement of the Oboe Quartet in F Major, K. 370/368b. "Come unto these yellow sands" also involves florid obbligato oboe and solo soprano parts with simple accompaniment. The oboe range in this aria (F4 to E6) extends into the extreme high register where John Parke, among other virtuoso oboists, was known to perform. The use of notes in the extreme high register of the Classical oboe is rare outside of works written and performed by virtuoso players of the instrument. As with "O bid," "Yellow sands" includes an arsenal of difficult technical writing that bears resemblance to Mozart's writing in the Oboe Quartet and Oboe Concerto. The opening of "Yellow sands" includes thirty-second-note trills and turns that ascend from E♭5 to E♭6 (figure 3a). Similarly, in the recapitulation of the first movement of Mozart's Oboe Concerto, there is sixteenth-note passagework that combines short bursts of stepwise motion with turns, trills, and a decorated descending scale (figure 3b).

Unlike in Linley's music, in Mozart's compositions for soprano and obbligato oboe the soprano part is virtuosic and the oboe part is not markedly challenging. For example, the vocal part of the concert aria "Mia speranza adorata," K. 416, features a virtuosic range (G4 to F6), scalar runs, and long melismas, while the oboe has a limited range (B♭4 to C6) and the woodwind writing in general is relatively simple. "Popoli di Tessaglia," K. 316/300b, written in 1779 as a concert aria on a text from Gluck's Alceste, also involves vocal writing that is more virtuosic than the woodwind writing. The voice part, written for Aloysia Weber, is famously challenging. It reaches to G6 more than once and includes turns, trills, and extended melismas over six or more measures, requiring masterful breath control. The oboe part was written for Friedrich Ramm, who, upon performing the piece with Weber, may have been determined to extend his own high range up to F6. Mozart subsequently exploited E♭6, E6, and F6—a pitch to which Linley did not extend the oboe's range—in the Oboe Quartet, K. 370/368b, written for Ramm in 1781. While other oboists utilized the extreme upper register of the instrument, the F6 does not appear on a fingering chart until the early 1790s, about a decade after Mozart composed his oboe quartet.

In addition to the aforementioned passages that require agility and finesse, all three movements of the Oboe Quartet require the oboist to play notes in the extreme high range between D6 and F6. Measures 100–18 of the third movement, for example, include rapid turns, trills, and passagework across multiple measures culminating in one of several uses of F6 in the piece. The next virtuosic display (mm. 152–78) includes rapid jumps by third and octave leaps, cresting in an arpeggio from the lowest note of the Classical oboe (C3) to the high F6. The piece ends on an arpeggio up to F6 so that, at the end of this arduous work, the oboist is required to produce the F6 three times in a short space.

Linley and Mozart's music embodied the profound changes that occurred in woodwind writing in the late eighteenth century. Inspired by specific performers and the new classical oboe, both composers wrote virtuosic solo music that explored the extremes of the instrument's range. Bringing Linley's oboe music to light allows us to better see the context within which Mozart's music was written.
Sarah Huebsch, DM, is in demand as a period oboist and performance-practice specialist. This season her engagements include appearances with the Pacific Baroque Orchestra, Washington Bach Consort, Chatham Baroque, Haymarket Opera Company, and Festival Internacional de Música Sacra. Sarah writes for WFIU Public Radio’s Harmonia Early Music and is a founding member of the Renaissance loud band Forgotten Clefs.

NOTES

1. See travel notes for March 30–April 6, 1770, MBA, vol. 1, 332. Mozart and Linley’s encounter is also described in Maria Anna Mozart’s reminiscences written for Friedrich Schlichtegroll in 1792, which can be found in MBA, vol. 4, 194. It is translated into English in MDB, 459.

2. Leopold Mozart to Anna Maria Mozart, April 21, 1770, MBA, vol. 1, 337–38.


4. MBA, vol. 1, 337–38. Only one letter from Mozart to Linley (dated September 10, 1770) is extant, but it indicates that there was other correspondence. See MBA, vol. 1, 388–89. For an English translation, see LMF, 160–61.


7. Morning Chronicle, March 21, 1776. In his introduction to Shakespeare Ode in Musica Britannica 1951–2001, Beechey claims that this review referred to William Parke. However, considering that William would have only been fifteen at the time of this performance, it is more likely that this performance was by William’s older brother, John Parke. Furthermore, John Parke had been appointed principal oboist at Drury Lane in 1771, where the premiere of Shakespearean Ode took place.


9. Sheridan’s Tempest was critically acclaimed in London, and it was performed eighteen times in the first season alone. Some music was used in later Georgian productions, including those affiliated with John Kemble and John Davy. Irena Cholij, “Music in Eighteenth-Century London Shakespeare Productions” (PhD diss., King’s College University of London, 1995), 85–89. See also Bryan N. S. Gooch, David S. Thatcher, Odean Long, and Charles Haywood, A Shakespeare Music Catalogue, vol. 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), entries 14950 (1806 MS) and 14855 (1821 production).


13. See also the insertion aria “Vorrei spiegarvi, oh Dio!” K. 418, which Mozart wrote for a production of Pasquale Anfossi’s Il curioso indiscreto in Vienna in 1783.


**Performance Review**

Milo, Sylvia. *The Other Mozart.*

Directed by Isaac Byrne. The Players Theatre, New York City.

*The Other Mozart,* written and created by Sylvia Milo, is a spellbinding theater piece inspired by the life of Maria Anna “Nannerl” Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus's sister. The work consists of a monologue lasting around seventy-five minutes, during which Nannerl discusses her life, from childhood to the grave. Some of Nannerl's reflections derive directly from factual events, and others are based on Milo's own speculations regarding what Nannerl could have felt or experienced. Much of the text comes from letters by the Mozart family, often so deftly woven into the monologue that it is not always obvious when Nannerl is reading from a letter or simply musing aloud.

Naturally, *The Other Mozart* is not about the actual Nannerl so much as it is about a character named “Nannerl” whose experiences are similar to those of the real Maria Anna Mozart. Like the actual Nannerl, the character in this work is a brilliant and accomplished woman who was overshadowed by a male sibling and whose enormous potential was stifled. An analogous scenario has been experienced by countless other women, and surely a similar story could have been told effectively by using characters who are entirely fictional. However, it would have been difficult to invent a character for such a narrative whose experiences are as compelling as those of Nannerl Mozart.

As the character of Nannerl reads letters or relates incidents that are well known from biographies of the Mozart family, the audience is encouraged to reconsider these familiar events by reflecting on their effect on Mozart's sister. Nannerl reacts with a mixture of joy and jealousy to accounts of her brother's triumphs. When hearing about his disappointments, on the other hand, she responds with sadness and fear—not only out of sympathy for her brother, but also from her realizing the strongly adverse effect his setbacks might have on her own fate.

*The Other Mozart* fills in the holes in Nannerl's biography somewhat differently than do some other speculative accounts. For instance, it does not pursue the notion that Nannerl might have been the actual composer of Mozart's first symphony. Leopold Mozart, while not depicted as a saint, comes off somewhat better in this work than in many other portrayals. In particular, *The Other Mozart* suggests that Leopold's apparently overprotective attitude toward Nannerl might have been provoked by sincere anxieties concerning her welfare, especially considering the options available for a woman at the time. The production hints that tensions between Nannerl and her sister-in-law resulted partly from Nannerl's envy upon realizing that her frisky young brother had opportunities for sexual fulfillment that she was denied, emphasizing that Nannerl's own celibacy endured until her marriage at the advanced age of thirty-two. Also, Nannerl's allowing Leopold to raise her first-born son during the child's earliest years is explained as an attempt to help her son escape the isolated and unpromising existence into which she herself had been forced.

*The Other Mozart* is best described as a “theater piece” rather than as a play or a one-woman show. This is because it artfully integrates various theatrical elements, such as spoken text, staging, incidental music, and scenery (the latter of which occasionally serves double duty as part of Nannerl's costume). Music is heard almost constantly throughout the performance, sometimes presented as background music, sometimes coming to the fore. The skillfully wrought score incorporates recorded fragments of pieces by Leopold Mozart, Mozart, and Marianna Martines, along with original music/sound design by Phyllis Chen and Nathan Davis. In addition to electronically produced sounds and pre-recorded music for the clavichord, the score includes music for the toy piano and the music box (media for which Chen often composes), as well as for “instruments” such as a fan and a teacup, which are used as percussion. Tension results from the contrasts between the frilly, childlike effects typically associated with such instruments and the haunting music composed for them in this production. This creates a sense that the music is struggling to break free from the confines of its instrumental medium, thereby powerfully evoking Nannerl's desires to break free from her own confinements.

—L. Poundie Burstein

**Recording Review**


*Die Zauberflöte* had a protracted, bumpy journey from Vienna to Paris. The score first appeared in Paris in its original form (more or less) only in 1829, and it was not until the first decade of the twentieth century that Pari- sian theaters featured anything like the Singspiel's now-familiar narrative. Before any of that, however, there was *Les Mystères d'Isis.* Now mostly regarded (when it is regarded at all) as a curiosity at best, and a sacrilege at worst, *Les Mystères* was an 1801 attempt to adapt
Die Zauberflöte for French audiences. The French playwright Étienne Morel de Chédéville (1751–1814) penned an entirely new libretto (only very loosely connected to Schikaneder’s), and the composer Ludwig Wenzel Lachnith (1746–1820) undertook a massive adaptation of Mozart’s score.

“Adaptation” may be too mild a word, in fact. It would have been standard practice, for instance, to replace spoken dialogue with recitative, divide the acts in ways more in keeping with French opera, or to rework the music to better suit new singers and a new language. In this case, however, the changes are even more dramatic. The Queen of the Night becomes a mezzo-soprano role. Entire acts are rearranged or spliced together. And perhaps most strikingly, Lachnith interspersed well-known music from La clemenza di Tito, Don Giovanni, and Le nozze di Figaro throughout the opera (with a bit of a Haydn symphony thrown in for good measure).

After a fairly lukewarm response, Les Mystères was largely forgotten, becoming a quirky footnote in Mozart’s French reception history. Thanks, however, to a new recording from Le Concert Spirituel, under the direction of Diego Fasolis, modern listeners are given a chance to evaluate the work for themselves. The vocal performances are for the most part engaging throughout, with particular outstanding work from Tassis Christoyannis as Bochoris (Papageno) and Jean Teitgen as Zarastro. The orchestral work from Le Concert Spirituel is sparkling, and offers fresh perspectives on even the most familiar musical territory, notably the overture (one of the few numbers left untouched and in the same place). Ultimately, however, the results are difficult to gauge. Die Zauberflöte is so well known to modern listeners in its original form that Les Mystères frequently becomes jarring, or even unsettling—a familiar playlist unexpectedly on shuffle.

Yet even if Les Mystères d’Isis is unlikely to become anyone’s preferred version of The Magic Flute, this recording is of tremendous value as both a historical document and as a catalyst for new conversations about historical performance. As a scholarly and pedagogical tool, the recording is a useful window onto early nineteenth-century French performance practices, a rare opportunity to sonically experience the types of adaptation that exerted a profound influence on how audiences understood Mozart and other composers of the time.

Perhaps even more importantly, the subtly subversive act of recording Les Mystères—and with a period ensemble like Le Concert Spirituel, no less—takes aim at foundational concepts of Werktreue. Why, it seems to ask, do we endlessly revisit the original version of Die Zauberflöte rather than exploring whatever musical richness may lie in its countless incarnations across more than two centuries and multiple continents? What insights, in other words, might we gain from a series of recordings guided not by a fidelity to Mozart’s score, but to its afterlives? By providing a well-wrought period performance, Fasolis and Le Concert Spirituel accomplish more than relocating Les Mystères d’Isis from the dustbin of history into, say, the recycling bin of the obscure. They open the door onto a whole world teeming with the possibilities of the authentically inauthentic.

—William Gibbons

Score Review


As a performer I am a devotee of Henle Urtext editions, so it comes as no surprise to me that this one is superb. Henle combines scholarship with a performer’s eye in a way that makes their scores reliable and rewarding to use. This edition, containing a flute part, harp part, and piano reduction, is prefaced and edited by the distinguished flutist András Adorján, and includes cadenzas by Robert D. Levin.

This edition is based on Mozart’s autograph housed in the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków, with minimal editorial suggestions in parentheses. It succeeds in its goal of being performer-friendly: page turns can be executed comfortably in both solo parts; cues are added judiciously to assist with entrances; and as Adorján indicates in his preface, this is the first time the harp part has included the flute part in a performance score. As familiar as the piece is, this is a helpful addition that enables the harpist to see the flute part, as in a traditional format for a duo.

The edition does not always address inconsistencies in the autograph score. In the opening movement, measure 63 of the flute part contains an articulation as it appears in the autograph, despite it being different from the articulations of the same figures in the previous measure. When this music returns in measure 184, the articulation matches the autograph score, the previous measure 183, and measure 62, strongly suggesting that measure 63 should be played like measures 62 and 183–84. I would appreciate seeing an editorial note to this
effect, since one was included in a similar situation in the third movement. I prepared my most recent performances of the concerto from the Bärenreiter edition (1990), in which the articulation in measure 63 has been made to match measures 62 and 183–84, with an asterisk and note at the bottom of the page indicating the aberrant articulation in the autograph. Bärenreiter's handling of this is easier to read, and I hope that Henle will add a note about measure 63 in its next printing.

In the Rondeau, at the Allegro (m. 227) the articulation in the flute part matches Mozart's autograph. When this cadential figure appears again as the final bar of solo material (m. 388), Mozart omitted the articulation. Henle includes the missing legato and staccato in parentheses, appropriately handling this inconsistency. This raises the interesting question of whether Mozart's omission was due to intentional shorthand or a hurried oversight at the end of the piece. I suspect it was the latter, based on the very detailed markings he included throughout the score, which mostly repeat articulations and dynamics in recurring passages.

The piano reduction, which is intuitive to read and to play, evokes the sparse instrumentation of Mozart's orchestral accompaniment. The left hand is faithful to the basso part, which in Mozart's time was sometimes performed at the keyboard, so that historically inclined pianists might embellish or re-voice above it according to taste and period practice. A particular strength of the Henle edition is the inclusion of cues indicating oboe, horn, or string lines, giving users a sense of the original orchestra.

The preface describes Levin's cadenzas as "intended to inspire the performers' own improvisations and to stimulate their compositional inventiveness." They are dedicated to Doriot Anthony Dwyer and Ann Hobson Pilot, both formerly of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, and are fully rendered enough to be performed as they appear. The cadenzas are stylistically convincing, as is to be expected from a scholar of Levin's caliber, and feature the flute and harp playing alone as well as together in a satisfying way. To my taste, however, they do not seem adequately elaborated, lacking a certain level of creative inspiration. They might have benefitted from using more of Mozart's own material as starting point. The cadenza for the second movement is rather short, somewhere between an Eingang and a full cadenza. Having encountered numerous cadenzas for this concerto over the years, including those by Carl Reinecke, Carlos Salzedo, Nino Rota, and André Previn, I find myself partial to the slightly Romantic but very effective cadenzas by Reinecke.

The cadenzas are presented at the back of the flute and harp parts, and wisely include the tutti through the end of each movement so that a duo reading these cadenzas does not have to turn pages back to the movement proper. In the harp part, the cadenzas are printed with pull-out pages to eliminate page turns.

In addition to the impeccable score, this edition includes a preface that provides valuable insight into the piece and Mozart's writing for the flute more generally. In 1778 Mozart traveled to Paris, and that year was his year of flute. En route to Paris, he stopped in Mannheim, where he composed the Concerto for Flute in G Major, K. 313, as well as the C-Major Oboe Concerto, K. 314, which was soon thereafter arranged as the Concerto for Flute in G Major. In Mannheim he also wrote several flute quartets on commission from the Dutch flutist Ferdinand Dejean, which probably at least partially funded the rest of his journey to Paris. During his six-month stay in the French capital, Mozart met the Comte de Guines, a nobleman and flutist, who commissioned the Flute and Harp Concerto to perform with his daughter, who was a pupil of Mozart, on the harp. In a letter to Leopold dated May 14, 1778, Mozart wrote that the Duke plays the flute "incomparably, and she the harp magnifique." The resulting work is a unique entry in Mozart's catalogue for a then-unusual combination of solo instruments, and one that beguiles with its melodic refinement and moments of operatic lyricism.

The preface also points out that the autographs for Mozart's two flute concertos are lost, making the Flute and Harp Concerto—and Henle's edition—an invaluable resource for flutists. Most editions of the flute concertos use articulations from early printings, and are thus much more heavily articulated than K. 299. This suggests that performers might strip away some of the articulations in the flute concertos in emulation of Mozart's lighter articulations in the Flute and Harp Concerto.

—Mimi Stillman

Call for Reviewers

The Newsletter is seeking members to review portions of the Mozart 225 CD collection for its Spring 2018 and Fall 2018 issues. Released in 2016 to commemorate the 225th anniversary of Mozart's death, the set includes recordings of Mozart's complete works, fragments, and arrangements, as well as a new biography written by Cliff Eisen. Those interested in reviewing a part of the collection should contact review editor Emily Wuchner at wuchner2@illinois.edu.