



as well as handwritten copies (especially in those cases where a handwritten libretto represents the sole surviving source for a text). What is more, the Institut's database includes additional information relevant to the political and cultural history of any particular work, information derived in some instances from primary sources at various archives, and in other cases from secondary sources.

As for Don Giovanni, basic research sources include Armand E. Singer's *A Bibliography of the Don Juan Theme, Versions and Criticism* (*West Virginia University Bulletin*, series 54 (1954)), *The Don Juan Theme, Versions and Criticism: A Bibliography* (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 1965) and *The Don Juan Theme: An Annotated Bibliography of Versions, Analogues, Uses, and Adaptations* (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 1993), as well as H. E. Weidinger's 'Il Dissoluto punito. Untersuchungen zur äußeren und inneren Entstehungsgeschichte von Da Pontes und Mozarts Don Giovanni' (PhD dissertation, University of Vienna, 2002). The Institut's bibliography, including all relevant primary and secondary sources, will be divided into two parts: the first accounts for all versions of the story up to c1800, when the Don Juan legend was essentially known from theatrical productions; the second, from 1800 to the present, takes into account Don Juan's increasing popularity not only as theatrical entertainment, but in literature, instrumental music, dance, painting, the graphic arts, films and television as well. The first part of the bibliography will serve in particular as the basis for an edition of all known seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Don Juan librettos, in Latin, Spanish, Italian, French, English, Dutch, German, Russian, Czech and Polish, whether intended for operas or ballets. It is hoped, too, to print scores of as-yet-unpublished Don Juan operas from before 1800; these include versions by Alessandro Melani (*L'empio punito*, Rome, 1669), Vincenzo Righini (*Il convitato di pietra o sia Il dissoluto*, Prague, 1776, Vienna, 1777, and Eszterháza, 1781), Giuseppe Calegari (*Il convitato di pietra*, Venice, 1777), Gioacchino Albertini (*Il Don Giovanni*, Warsaw, 1783), Francesco Gardi (*Il nuovo convitato di pietra*, Venice, 1787) and Vincenzo Fabrizi (*Il convitato di pietra*, Rome, 1787).

In addition to its research initiatives, the Da Ponte Institut has also sponsored several major international conferences and exhibitions. The conferences include 'Lorenzo Da Ponte in New York' (Columbia University, New York, 10–11 October 2005), 'Mozart und die geheimen Gesellschaften seiner Zeit' (Albertina and Universität Wien, 19–20 May 2006) and 'Der junge Metastasio' (Da Ponte Institut, Vienna, 21–22 February 2007 (for a report on this conference, see below, 343–345)); and the exhibitions 'Oper und Aufklärung im Zeitalter Joseph II. Lorenzo Da Ponte in Wien – Don Giovanni' (Vienna, Staatsoper, 5–30 June 2003), 'Salieri sulle tracce di Mozart' (Milan, Palazzo Reale, 2 December 2004–30 January 2005), 'Mozarts Da Ponte Opern. Lorenzo Da Ponte in Wien – Le nozze di Figaro' (Vienna, Staatsoper, 26 February–31 March 2004), 'MOZART 2006' (Vienna, Albertina, 17 March–17 September 2006) and 'Ein Zauberflöten Automat – Stephan von Huenes Klang–Licht–Skulptur' (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, 11 May–18 June 2006).

For more information visit <[www.daponte.at](http://www.daponte.at)>



## CONFERENCES

DOI:10.1017/S1478570607001078

ANTONIO SALIERI – ZEITGENOSSE W. A. MOZARTS, HOFKAPELLMEISTER UND MUSIKPÄDAGOGE

INSTITUT ANTONIO SALIERI, VIENNA, 7–8 NOVEMBER 2006

The 'Salieri year' (2000), marked by a conference in the composer's home town, Legnago, went by unnoticed in his adopted city, Vienna. But this central figure in Viennese musical life made it into the Mozart year,



thanks to the institution that bears his name, the Institut Antonio Salieri (a division of the Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien), and to a small but devoted group of Salieri enthusiasts. The name of the Institut honours Salieri's work as teacher, author of the textbook *Scuola di canto* and director of the new Vienna *Singschule* (*Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, 1817). The symposium 'Antonio Salieri – Zeitgenosse W. A. Mozarts, Hofkapellmeister und Musikpädagoge' was part of a larger event entitled 'Antonio Salieri im Mozartjahr'.

The symposium took place in the beautiful Alter Konzertsaal of the Salesianerinnenkloster, founded by Empress Wilhelmina Amalia (widow of Emperor Joseph I), which now houses the Institut Antonio Salieri. Things got underway on the first evening with a 'Festliche Eröffnung', including a champagne reception and Italian buffet. By tradition, Salieri events always feature wine with the Salieri label (white and red) and the composer's favourite sweets, a delectable concoction called 'capezzoli di Venere' (nipples of Venus) – all imported for the occasion from around Legnago. The festivities included greetings from a number of university officials as well as the director of Vienna's 'Mozartjahr' celebrations, Peter Marboe. In between these remarks, students of the Institut performed selections from Salieri's *La grotta di Trofonio* and *Armida*, and a trio by his pupil and later Hofkapellmeister Benedikt Randhartinger. The keynote address was given by Rudolph Angermüller, the dean of Salieri research, who spoke on 'Salieri, ein europäischer Musiker'. After setting the stage of world history at the time, Angermüller (Mozarteum, Salzburg) reminded us of Salieri's enormous achievements, the success of his operas and his importance as Hofkapellmeister and pedagogue. He also referred to the recent renaissance of interest in Salieri and concluded that Salieri was 'kein Kleinmeister', but one of the 'bedeutendste Musiker' of his time. Next came a performance of Schubert's *Gütigster, Bester, Weisester, Grösster*, a cantata for three men's voices written for Salieri's fiftieth-year *Jubelfeier*, and then a presentation of Elena Biggi-Parodi's thematic catalogue of Salieri's operas.

The second day opened with Elisabeth Fritz-Hilscher (Vienna) speaking on 'Antonio Salieri und der Wiener Hof'. Hilscher reviewed Salieri's life story, in particular how it related to his fifty-eight-year relationship with the court and the four monarchs he served, and occasionally how it intersected with Mozart's ambitions vis-à-vis the court. The history of Salieri's work with the court continued with my paper 'Musik *per tutta la funzione*: Antonio Salieris doppelchörige Kirchenwerke für ein kaiserliches Dankfest'. I (Rider University) focused on Salieri's Mass in C (with Gradual, Offertory and *Te Deum*), which he composed in 1799 and revised for an 1804 performance, adding numerous wind instruments.

The symposium title stressed Salieri's roles as Hofkapellmeister and music educator, but, as is appropriate, given his output of forty theatrical works, several of the papers dealt with Salieri as opera composer. In her paper 'Composing for the Singers: Salieri's *La grotta di Trofonio* and *Prima la musica, poi le parole*', Dorothea Link (University of Georgia) provided a fascinating look into the world of opera singers of Salieri's time. Some composers apparently wrote for specific singers, while others composed more 'generic' music. Salieri, for example, worked around the vocal needs of Nancy Storace, even to the extent of protecting her voice in ensembles. On the other hand, Salieri also tended to push singers beyond their usual limits. Otto Biba (*Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, Vienna) spoke on the intriguing topic 'Salieri verwendet Salieri'. Characterizing Salieri as a 'Kapellmeister im alten Sinne', Biba shed light on little known aspects of the composer's creative process, comparing it to those of Brahms and Mahler. Using the term 'Schaffensökonomie', he discussed Salieri's reuse of his own material and related annotations on the composer's manuscripts. A disputed question concerns whether the substitution of (religious or liturgical) Latin texts by secular words in opera arias originated with Salieri or derived from foreign hands.

After a lunch break (which several of us enjoyed at the *gemütlich* Salm-Bräu next door), the afternoon session began with Gerhard Kramer's treatment of 'Antonio Salieri und die Mailander Scala: *L'Europa riconosciuta* als Eröffnungsvorstellung 1778'. Kramer (Vienna) explored the history of this innovative opera, which Salieri wrote for the opening of La Scala (and which was revived for the reopening of that house in 2004) and delved into its unusual features (for example, extensive use of chorus, absence of secco recitative, interaction of chorus and soloists and two-act format). The programmatic overture, which paints a 'tempesta di mare', a favourite subject in eighteenth-century opera, served as a musical example. We next



heard from John Rice (Rochester, Minnesota), who spoke on ‘Salieri’s *Armonia per un tempio della notte* and the Tempel der Nacht at Schönau: Setting the Record Straight’. In his paper Rice gave a preview of the content of his forthcoming book on the subject. Rice’s research has sorted out a number of misconceptions of the ‘Tempel der Nacht’ at Schönau, including the theory that it was a Masonic temple associated with *Die Zauberflöte*. Rather, it was Salieri’s *La grotta di Trofonio* that inspired the grotto at Schönau, and the a cappella quartet ‘Silenzio facciasi’ from his *Palmira* was the music that sounded in the ‘Tempel der Nacht’.

Opera topics continued with Roberto Scoccimarro’s ‘*Il mondo alla rovescia* und *L’isola capricciosa*: Ein Vergleich’. The comparison provided insight into the history of an opera begun, but left unfinished, in 1779 (*L’isola*) and its revised version in 1792 (*Il mondo*) contrasting the latter with the setting by Giacomo Rust (1780). Noting Salieri’s extensive use of ensemble and chorus as well as his skilled exploitation of theatrical effects, Scoccimarro (Rome) credited Salieri with a decisive change in the concept of *dramma giocoso*. Michele Calella (Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien) took on the matter of ‘Salieris Einlagearien und die Praxis der Opernbearbeitung’. Calella reported that he had identified almost twenty autograph insertion arias in operas by Piccinni, Anfossi, Paisiello and Galuppi, among others. He cautioned that much work needs to be done in this little investigated area of Salieri studies. The final paper brought us back to Salieri as the namesake for the Institut. Hartmut Krones, director of the Institut für Stilforschung of the Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien and organizer of this conference, clarified Salieri’s influence on vocal pedagogy in ‘Antonio Salieri, das Konservatorium der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde und die Gesangspädagogik’.

Later that evening, the Congregazione Italiana in the Minoritenkirche hosted a book launch and lecture by Michael Jahn (RISM, Austria). The book, *Figaro Là: Figaro Quà. Gedenkschrift Leopold M. Kantner* (Vienna: Verlag der Apfel, 2006), honoured a scholar, composer, regens chori, organist, Catholic priest and beloved friend, who died unexpectedly in 2004.

The Congregazione Italiana also provided the space and sponsorship for the first modern performance of Salieri’s Mass in C, the featured concert of the conference, and the *Prefetto* of the congregation, Sergio Valentini, worked tirelessly behind the scenes to bring about the performance. The composer’s largest cycle of liturgical music, it consists of a plenary mass, introit, gradual (*Venite gentes*), offertory (*Cantate Domino*), two verses from the hymn *Pange lingua* and *Te Deum*, all for double chorus. These works received their first performance at a *Dankfest* in 1804, when Franz II assumed the *Kaiserwürde* of Austria, thus becoming Franz I of Austria. The performance was based on my critical edition, which will be published in the *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich*. Uwe Christian Harrer, artistic director of the Vienna Hofmusikkapelle (home of the Wiener Sängerknaben), conducted the choir of the Institut Antonio Salieri and the Webern Symphonie Orchester. A pre-performance lecture by cultural expert Walther Brauneis (Wiener Denkmalschutz) placed the works in historical context. It was a thrilling evening: magnificent performance, packed house, many notable guests, all come to honour Salieri, who until recently may have been considered a footnote in music history. Moreover, the Mass will be heard again, as the Österreichischer Rundfunk recorded the concert for future broadcasting.

This week of homage to Salieri ended with a *Festtag bei Salieri* at the Institut. This day-long open house featured student performances of music by Salieri and his contemporaries. We heard outstanding renditions of *Der Schauspieldirektor* and Peter Winter’s incomplete *Das unterbrochene Opferfest*, among other works. The fact that Salieri wrote poetry inspired the concept of ‘Salieri-heute’, a competition for student composers, who wrote settings of his Italian verses.

JANE SCHATKIN HETTRICK





## THE WORLDS OF VICENTE MARTÍN Y SOLER

VALENCIA, 14–18 NOVEMBER 2006

The coincidence of Mozart's and Vicente Martín y Soler's anniversaries in 2006 (250 years of the former's birth, 200 years of the latter's death) did attenuate the brilliance of the commemorations of the Spanish composer—no one can compete with Mozart's popularity—but it did not diminish the scholarly import of the congress held in his honour.

Impeccably organized by the Instituto Valenciano de la Música and the Instituto Complutense de Ciencias Musicales (Madrid) and hosted by the University of Valencia, the event gathered together some thirty scholars from the most diverse provenances – a truly international conference, which subjected to scrutiny many aspects of the composer's career and illuminated a number of areas of music-making in the late eighteenth century. This was the intention of the Directors, Dorothea Link (University of Georgia) and myself (Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET) and Universidad Nacional de Córdoba), who planned the sessions as explorations of the variegated environments that successively housed Martín's career.

In the inaugural address, Rainer Kleinertz (Universität des Saarlands) gave a general account of the European circumstances that surrounded the composer's career, and suggested a direct influence (beyond the well known quotation) of dramatic processes in *Una cosa rara* on *Don Giovanni*, labelling it as 'creative reception' on Mozart's part.

The regular papers began on Wednesday with a session on 'Opera in Spain during the Eighteenth Century', which, unlike the following sessions, was richer in general description of the scene than in its perusal of Martín's place within it. Emilio Casares (Universidad Complutense de Madrid) described the last decades of the century as a turning-point in the emergence of a Spanish national lyric theatre; Álvaro Torrente ((Universidad Complutense de Madrid)) argued the importance of a tradition of *intermezzi* of buffo character in the Madrid court around mid-century and produced a series of hitherto unknown details concerning their performance. Andrea Bombi (Universidad de Valencia) provided a comprehensive view of the Valencian music scene, emphasizing the interchange between operatic, religious and civic institutions, as reflected in documents of the musicians' guild. By contrast, Stephanie Klauk (Universität des Saarlands) focused more narrowly on the Spanish roots of some of the songs in *Una cosa rara*, maintaining that their placement within the action, their general thematic content and even some of their musical traits derive from the original Spanish play by Luis Vélez de Guevara and from the traditional songs presumably sung within it.

The afternoon session, on 'Naples and Opera Seria', was the shortest (because of last-minute cancellations), but perhaps the most substantial. Paologiovanni Maione (Università degli Studi di Napoli) discussed a large number of hitherto unknown documents, mostly from the archive of the Banca di Napoli, concerning payments by the administrators of the Teatro San Carlo during Martín y Soler's period of local activity. The most striking among them were the payments to a certain Giuseppe Benevento for the composition of the recitatives to one of Martín's opere serie. Since Benevento (according to Maione) was also hired as *maestro di cappella dei recitativi* at the Teatro del Fondo di Separazione (specializing in opera buffa), he can be considered a specialized craftsman who collaborated in the composition of musical dramas in both genres. This is, as far as I know, the first documentary evidence concerning the routine composition of recitatives by someone different from the composer of arias, overture and ensembles. It is significant insofar as this is not a student of the 'main' composer, as has been often surmised, but an employee of the theatre: there is a hint here of the existence of a hitherto unremarked specialization within the musical profession. Michael Robinson (Cardiff University) provided a lucid discussion of the handling of the plots of Martín y Soler's two Neapolitan opere serie by Luigi Serio, author of *Ifigenia in Aulide* and presumed reviser of Metastasio's *Ipermestra*. Within the context of Neapolitan operatic practice, he discerned a subtle reform of Metastasio's models, with an increased focus on the main action. His discussion showed that the general tone of the drama was highly dependent on the allocation of roles to particular singers. Robinson also presented a



document that reveals that Serio, like Metastasio before him, had begun his career as a courtly improviser of verse.

Thursday morning ('Opera in North Italy') began with Dinko Fabris's (Università della Basilicata, Potenza) general evaluation of Martín's reputation in Italy, which, going by the number of preserved sources, does not seem to have matched that of the foremost composers of the day; Fabris also provided a more detailed overview of the sources kept in Milan. Margaret Butler (University of Alabama) situated the two opere serie written by the composer for Turin within several appropriate practices: literary precedents, financial arrangements, the hiring of composers and singers, rehearsal schedules and the evolving formal traditions of seria ensembles. Annarita Colturato (Università di Torino) complemented the picture for Turin with her thorough examination of the sources for the four extraordinary theatrical evenings of September 1783, monopolized by Martín y Soler's music, and signalled by the exceptional presentation of an opera buffa at the Teatro Regio. In my paper, taking a more general view of the composer's career, I argued that the reception of Martín's person and *oeuvre* was strongly tinted by his status as a picturesque foreigner. The label 'Spaniard' is ubiquitous in references to him in contemporary documents, and the librettos given to him contain a high proportion of Spanish subject matter. He took advantage of this label, employing Spanish melodies and rhythms in many of his operas, and perhaps writing the text for a Spanish episode in *In amor ci vuol destrezza*.

The afternoon session shifted the conference's attention to 'Vienna and the *dramma giocoso*'. Otto Biba and Ingrid Fuchs (both from the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Vienna) combined the change in *locus* with a change in focus: the subject was the dissemination of Martín y Soler's music beyond the walls of the opera theatre. Biba's discussion of fragmentary copies, *contrafacta* and arrangements of Martín y Soler's music produced by the Vienna copyists' workshops and by publishing houses there and elsewhere showed the extent of his popularity. Fuchs's discovery and analysis of a series of letters from a doctor in Vienna to his patron in present-day Slovakia not only served as a mine of information concerning domestic musical life in central Europe, but also included a bonus prize: a revised date and location for the first performance of Martín's *L'arbore di Diana*, now shown to have been presented at the Laxenburg royal country residence before its Vienna premiere.

Felicity Baker (University College London) happily put in a dose of interpretive reading, from a literary point of view. She described structural relationships between *L'arbore di Diana* and *Don Giovanni* (written simultaneously by Da Ponte) that concern patriarchal order and authority, chastity and Christian morality, and the human need for love. In a way, Baker said, *L'arbore di Diana* speaks directly to *Don Giovanni* and 'corrects' its social world. Finally, Jaroslaw Mianowski (Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznan) proposed an approach to the analysis of eighteenth-century opera based on the 'affections'; the appropriateness of such a conception for opera buffa in the 1780s was contested and debated.

Friday morning's session, 'Italian Opera in London', was symmetrically arranged, with two outer papers that focused on the relationship between composers and singers serving as a frame for two presentations mainly concerned with librettos. The central pair consisted of Gian Giacomo Stiffoni (Universidad de La Rioja) and Pierpaolo Polzonetti (University of Notre Dame). Stiffoni explored the continuity of the idea of a 'reformed' *dramma giocoso* between the Da Ponte/Martín collaborations in Vienna and those in London. Polzonetti situated the plot of *La capricciosa corretta* within the political circumstances of Revolutionary Europe as viewed from London, discovering a multilayered web of meanings relating to Jacobinism, aristocratic decadence and domestic virtues. The initial paper by Christine Martin (Neue Schubert-Ausgabe, Tübingen) provided a thoughtful review of the roles of Nancy and Stephen Storace in preparing the way for Martín y Soler's triumphant entry into England; this included not only their performances of his music but also the modelling of many of Stephen's most popular compositions on Martín's 'song style'. Dorothea Link presented a rough sketch of the career of Anna Morichelli, a first-rate singer who has been side-lined by modern musicology because she premiered no Mozart roles. Re-reading and combining a number of snippets of information (and offering new data that place the beginning of a Morichelli–Martín relationship



as early as 1775), Link was able to draw a convincing tableau that incorporates composer, librettist and singer: the problems they faced, the decisions they took and the effect these decisions had on each other's careers.

The last two sessions, 'Ballet Music' and 'Opera and Ballet in St Petersburg', both surrounded by an aura of *terra incognita*, had awakened great expectations, and both fulfilled them, each in its own way. Michael Malkiewicz's (Freie Universität Berlin) comparison of three ballets on the subject of Dido (Noverre, Angiolini, LePiq) illuminated many of the issues involved in the reconstruction of theatrical dances of the period: practical and theoretical sources, the different styles of various choreographers, matters of genre and character and so forth. One of the LePiq–Martín ballets, *Il ratto delle sabine*, received concentrated attention on account of the abundance and variety of preserved sources. Anthony DelDonna (Georgetown University) was most specific in his analysis of the music and the clues it offers for a reconstruction of the choreography; Elena Previdi (Milan) put it in the context of the practices of Padovan theatrical evenings, comprising operas and ballets. She offered illuminating comments concerning the division of the Padovan ballets into standard sections, and the differences between the practices there and in the Teatro San Carlo during Martín's and Lepicq's appointments. Angela Romagnoli (Università di Pavia), also using *Il ratto delle sabine* as a point of departure, proposed a vastly improved catalogue of ballet music by Martín and described a new musical source: a London anthology of the early 1780s, containing keyboard versions of the music to the ballets presented there by Lepicq. The session on Russia also offered some new information, in particular the participation of Giuseppe Sarti in arranging *Fedul* and perhaps some of the other Russian operas by Martín y Soler, as detailed by Maria Shcherbakova (Mariinsky Theatre, St Petersburg). Irina Kryazheva (Chaikovsky Conservatory, Moscow) contributed a more systematic survey of the Russian ballets and their sources than has been available hitherto, and Larissa Kostioukhina (Moscow Institute of Art Studies) provided an account of how Martín's activities at the Czar's court fitted in with the cultural policies propounded by Catherine II, as well as furnishing some of the sources for the Russian folk songs in his operas.

Unfortunately, the round table on performance practice that capped the conference stayed on the surface of general issues of aesthetics, taste and the personal involvement of today's musicians, and failed to address the many thorny problems that arise in the performance of late eighteenth-century opera and ballet. But the excellent programme of concerts that conference participants had been able to hear in the previous days functioned as a practical compensation for these missing discussions. One buffa and one seria opera (*L'isola del piacere*, concert version, Accademia Bizantina; *Andromaca*, contemporary version for voices and string quartet, Cuarteto Canales), plus an evening of songs performed by Erika Escribà and Carles Magraner, provided a balanced musical diet to accompany the scholarly sessions and illustrated different approaches to Martín y Soler's music.

Two hundred years after his death and subsequent near-complete oblivion, the memory of this Spanish master is slowly coming alive again: in recent years we have seen the publication of a biography (Giuseppe de Matteis and Gianni Marata, *Vicente Martín y Soler* (Valencia: Institució Alfons el Magnanim, 2001)), a comprehensive monograph on the dissemination of his best known work (Christine Martin, *Vicente Martín y Solers Oper Una cosa rara: Geschichte eines Opernerfolgs im 18. Jahrhundert*, Musikwissenschaftliche Publikationen, ed. Herbert Schneider, volume 15 (Hildesheim: Olms, 2001)), modern editions and complete recordings of many of his operas. The findings of this congress, scheduled for publication in Spanish during 2007, will constitute an indispensable new platform for the launching of new explorations into Martín y Soler's life, his work and his place in history.

LEONARDO J. WAISMAN





LA RECEPTION DE L'ŒUVRE DE MOZART EN FRANCE ET EN ANGLETERRE,  
JUSQUE VERS 1830

UNIVERSITÉ DE POITIERS, 16–18 NOVEMBER 2006

Arriving at Poitiers railway station one rainy morning last November was a mélange of musicologists who were about to attend a three-day symposium in this old university city on the reception of Mozart's music in France and England in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The event, initiated and chaired by Jean Gribenski (Université de Poitiers) and Patrick Taïeb (Université de Rouen), under the auspices of the Laboratoire GÉRHICO, in collaboration with the Société Française de Musicologie among other organizations, aimed to open up dialogue between French and English scholars in the worthy spirit of comparative history. Comparative history is an important mode of inquiry missing from much current work in the cultural study of music, where boundaries are typically defined nationally and where critical judgements concerning both the primary sources and the historiography have often been coloured by national bias. At Poitiers there was the intention of not just comparing and contrasting the immediate afterlife of Mozart's music in France with that in England, but of finding both broader perspectives on trends in each country and new points of connection and influence between Paris and London, the pre-eminent centres of musical activity during the period in question.

The meeting opened with a 'welcome' address by Jean Gribenski, which segued appropriately into the first paper – by Gribenski himself – on the publishing of Mozart's music in France up to 1830, about which he commands unrivalled knowledge (his *Catalogue des éditions françaises de Mozart, 1764–1825* recently appeared from Olms: Hildesheim, 2006). His talk, illustrated with title-pages and extracts from ledgers and catalogues, revealed that the issuing of Mozart's music in France came about in three distinct phases: up to Mozart's death (keyboard works); up to c1804 (mostly orchestral and chamber music); and thereafter the vocal music (operas and sacred works). A paper by Patrick Taïeb (leader of the French concert history project *Répertoire des programmes de concerts en France*) that same afternoon explored the relationship between the publication of Mozart's symphonies and overtures in Paris and their performance from those editions on the local concert platform, also demonstrating the value of concert history to bibliographic dating. Scholarship on the printing and publishing of Mozart's music in England has not yet reached such comparable levels of detailed engagement with the source material, as Rupert Ridgewell (British Library), an expert on the Viennese firm Artaria, explained in his discussion of London publications of Mozart issued up to c1800 (mostly keyboard works or vocal items arranged from operas, and based on imprints from abroad). However, he suggested possible future lines of inquiry through a case study of the collective volumes of keyboard music (including piano sonatas and trios by Mozart) issued by the English composer Stephen Storace between 1787 and 1789, in association with Birchall and Andrews, which may have given rise to copycat publications from other London publishers.

Day two was mostly devoted to Mozart's operas, and inevitably raised issues of how particular works were adapted to local conditions and publics. Herbert Schneider (Universität des Saarlandes, Saarbrücken) presented a comparative analysis of the singing translations of *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* that were made into French and Italian for Paris use, demonstrating that Italian versions were usually made from a French translation, not the German original, and highlighting the musical and poetic problems inherent in the resettings of this libretto. Later on there was discussion of the infamous French adaptation of *Die Zauberflöte*, when Juliette Valle (Université de Rouen) spoke of the radical changes made to the work by Lachnith and Morel in transforming it into *Les mystères d'Isis* (1801). Some of the same issues came to the fore, and were enhanced by consideration of matters of staging, in the paper by Andrea Fabiano (Université Paris IV) on productions of *Don Giovanni* in Paris: in 1805 by the Académie Impériale de Musique (a French adaptation which embraced the national propensity for heightened spectacle and grand décor in opera) and in 1811 (by an Italian troupe at the Théâtre de l'Impératrice, a more conventional *dramma giocoso*). Fabiano's contribution was aptly followed by an exploration by Rachel Cowgill (University of Leeds and currently chair of the *Concert Life in 19<sup>th</sup>-Century London* database project) of the staging and reception of Mozart's operas at the



King's Theatre in London, 1806–1829, with *Don Giovanni* (1817) as the focal point. This paper moved the discussion towards a number of broad themes, including selection of repertory and performance values, the practical and intellectual challenges that Mozart's operas presented to performers and audiences who were well versed in the bel canto tradition, and the eventual shifts of repertory and taste. With Alexandre Dratwicky's talk, the role of the popular *ballet-pantomime* in disseminating and popularizing Mozart's instrumental music during the Empire, when concert life was still developing, came under scrutiny. Dratwicky (Université Paris IV) demonstrated how fragments of Mozart's (and Haydn's) symphonies, concertos, instrumental transcriptions of opera airs and orchestrated chamber music were patched together to form scores for dancing, and argued that the genre played an important early role in the reception of Mozart symphonies, seeing a relationship between the gestures of music and the gestures of dance. Meanwhile, although no paper tackled operatic transcriptions directly, a concert of string chamber music at the local *médiathèque* on the final evening was carefully programmed to include works not so frequently performed. It included the violin–viola duo K423 and an anonymous and highly effective transcription for string quartet of numbers from *La flute enchantée* (c1795), the likes of which were extremely popular in their day.

Much of the remainder of the conference focused on concert history, a growth area in French musicology thanks in part to Taïeb's database team, from which several of the speakers on French concert life were drawn. Detailed accounts of the concerts given by Mozart during his visits to France were presented by David Hennebelle (Université Lille III), speaking on a range of cities, 1764–1778, and by Joann Elert (Université de Rouen), speaking on Paris, 1778, the former showing the difficulty of generalizing about the early tours, the latter demonstrating how ill-judged was the timing of Mozart's visit in terms of the capital's concert season. Cécile Duflo (Université de Rouen) concentrated on Mozartian repertory heard at Paris concerts in the first fifteen years or so of the nineteenth century, documenting the growth in the number of performances of particular genres (symphonic music, the Requiem, vocal music) and outlining trends of performance practice. The discussion afterwards pointed up the absence of Mozart's concertos for one or more instruments in Paris concerts of the time, despite the fact that French editions of several of them were available. Guy Gosselin (Université de Tours) complemented this presentation with a talk on concert life in northern France during the early nineteenth century, focusing on performances of the Requiem and the operas, observing that Mozart's music was still seen at this stage as making such special demands on both performers and listeners that it appealed to a minority audience only. In fact, this point reverberated in a number of contributions at the conference, including the survey by Simon McVeigh (Goldsmiths, University of London) of Mozart's music in London concert life, 1784–1812, which followed. He explored how Mozart's public profile was slow to develop in eighteenth-century London, in sharp contrast to the popularity of Haydn and, even more so, Pleyel; and he explained how the composer's reputation was in fact first established in the private sphere. (This same idea of private–public progression came out in my own paper, a discussion of chamber music performance in London.) From 1800, though, Mozart's works gradually found their way onto the London concert platform, albeit with individual repertories (quartet, orchestral, sacred music, operatic excerpts) journeying at different rates.

In the final session of the conference, two papers assessed the development of Mozart myths. The first, given by Henri Vanhulst (Université Libre de Bruxelles), examined discussions of Mozart's music and the development of 'genius' stories that appeared in the early nineteenth century in a hitherto unknown source for Mozart reception: *L'esprit des journaux*. This journal, founded in 1772 and published in Paris, Liège and Brussels, included substantial articles on Mozart from 1803, following on from its review of J. E. F. Arnold's *Mozarts Geist*. The second, by art historian Marie-Pauline Martin (Université Paris I), considered the idea of Mozart as divine genius and purveyor of miracles, with special emphasis on painting and sculpture, including the placement of Mozart in J. A. D. Ingres's *L'apothéose d'Homère* (1827) and his *Apollon couronnant Gluck et Mozart* (1864).

This colloquium ended as it began: at a railway station, this time at the Gare du Montparnasse in Paris, where the contributors concluded conversations about Mozart research and parted for the final legs of their



journeys. The event had opened up different and common (national) approaches to documenting and writing reception history and it had flagged possibilities for collaboration and dialogue, which, it is to be hoped, will be strengthened in the future. Linguistic shortcomings on both sides of the Channel may have limited the amount and depth of discussion at times, but plans are afoot to publish the proceedings, and that process is likely to yield still more long-term gains.

CHRISTINA BASHFORD



## PERSPECTIVES ON BEETHOVEN'S 'TEMPEST' SONATA

SCHULICH SCHOOL OF MUSIC, MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL, 8–10 FEBRUARY 2007

'Lesen Sie nur Shakespeares Sturm.' Just as with many other scraps and quips from the Master's hand and mouth, Anton Schindler's pithy anecdote, amongst others, was quickly taken up with gusto by nineteenth-century commentators. First appearing in 1840, the story goes that Schindler was telling the Master of the great impression Czerny's playing of Op. 31 No. 2 and Op. 57 had made on the audience, and 'as he was in a good humour [guter Stimmung war], I asked him to give me the key [Schlüssel] to these Sonatas. He answered: "Just read Shakespeare's *Tempest*." Thus there he is to find it; but in which place? Questioner – read, ponder and guess!' (*Biographie von Ludwig van Beethoven* (Münster, 1871; reprinted Hildesheim: Olms, 1970)). (Schindler apparently took Beethoven at his word; Theodore Albrecht has pointed out that a copy of an 1825 *Der Sturm* is to be found in the remnants of Schindler's estate.) In that Op. 57 had been known as the 'Appassionata' since 1838, the 'Tempest' nickname fell to Op. 31 No. 2, and from then on, like Schindler, theorists, performers and musicologists have been attempting to uncover the key to the work.

Organized by Tom Beghin and William Caplin (McGill University), the symposium 'Perspectives on Beethoven's "Tempest" Sonata' was a cross-Atlantic collaboration with Pieter Bergé (Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven) and Jeroen D'Hoe (Lemmensinstituut, Leuven) as part of a broader research project supported by the Research Platform in the Arts of the K. U. Leuven Association. Conceived as a series of workshops, lectures and performances, the event was aimed at stimulating discussion in preparation for a forthcoming publication 'Performance Through Analysis: A Collection of Analytical Essays on Beethoven's "Tempest" Sonata Op.31 No.2' (edited by Bergé, co-edited by Caplin and D'Hoe). As Bergé explained, the book is 'not meant solely for theorists'; the editors also have in mind the young performer who might be apprehending the piece for the first time.

The proceedings were inaugurated with two performances on a Chris Maene copy of an Anton Walter piano from around 1797. The first performance, by myself, was of Daniel Steibelt's *L'Orage précède d'un rondeau pastorale* (from his concerto Op. 33 No. 3, 1798) and was inspired by the writings of Owen Jander, who takes seriously the presence of tempestuous topics in the 'Tempest'. Of the many and varied storm pieces for piano in the first half of the nineteenth century, Steibelt's *L'Orage* was undoubtedly the most popular, and so it seemed appropriate to have this work function as our cultural and topical 'prelude' to the subsequent performance of Op. 31 No. 2. This was a passionate rendition by Tom Beghin, heightened in immediacy by the intimate proximity of the symposium participants. (Tom and I, in the spirit of many mid-to late eighteenth-century descriptions, removed the lid of the instrument and so faced our gently encircling audience.) Beghin – whose prowess in Beethoven was established through participation in the groundbreaking complete recording of the sonatas on period instruments under the supervision of Malcolm Bilson (Claves 50–9707) – brought some original pedal effects into play in the outer movements; at times I was reminded of the memorable image of E. T. A. Hoffmann's 'storm harp' in his *Automata* of 1815. 'Made of thick cords of wire, which are stretched out at considerable distances . . . in the open country, [they] give



forth great, powerful chords when the winds smite them' (*Best Tales of Hoffmann*, ed. E. F. Bleiler (New York: Dover, 1867), 97–98).

The opening scholarly presentation was by Jeroen D'Hoe, whose title, 'Playing (with) Harmony in Beethoven's Op. 31 No. 2', underscored his interest in relating issues of harmonic theory to the interpretative choices made by performers. In describing the structural dualism and tonal contrasts of the exposition, D'Hoe spoke of the 'added value' of harmony in the 'Tempest'. An awareness of the functional prominence of the dominant in the first movement, for example, might potentially inform performances with a broader sense of meaning. Bergé, who also investigated the connections between analysis and performance, followed with a paper entitled 'To Play or Not to Play: Motivic Connections in Beethoven's "Tempest" Sonata'. Undertaking a motivic analysis of important sections in the first and second movements, Bergé distinguished three types of motive: the *explicit* motive, which can be clearly and distinctly perceived; the *implicit* motive, which is more structural than active; and the motive as 'fundamental idea', a term taken from Dahlhaus. Some of the explicit motives in the first movement of the 'Tempest' include the arpeggio figure (bars 1–2), the *Seufzer* figures (bars 2ff) and the famous 'turning' motive of bars 23ff. Bergé spoke of the frequency, functionality and interactivity of these kinds of motives and then turned to a broader explication of the saturation of the turning figure in the exposition. Dwelling on the metrical displacement and third-beat emphasis that occurs in these passages (bars 55ff), Bergé pondered whether the more implicit motives (like the left hand at bar 41) should be attenuated or accentuated in performance. And could it be possible that metrical distortion is a kind of 'fundamental idea' of the entire work (in other words, a 'mover' in the Latin sense of motive: *movere*)? Bergé thus initiated what would be a long-running discussion over the weekend on the 'problem' of the opening bars of the middle movement.

William Caplin, whose book *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions in the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998) informed many of the ideas and concepts presented at the symposium, began the Friday morning session with his paper 'The "Tempest" Exposition: A Springboard for Form-Functional Considerations'. Caplin began by exploring the problem of the formal function of the opening unit (bars 1–21), long a topic of controversy amongst theorists. Is it an introduction or a main theme? What happens at bar 21? Caplin noted a common misunderstanding associated with how we categorize main themes, additionally commenting that there is a tendency (unfairly) to compare the structure of the 'Tempest' with Beethoven's other iconic turbulent minor-key sonata, the 'Pathétique'. The slow introduction of the latter is unmistakably delineated by formal barline, tempo change and *Affekt*, and it heightens our impression of a subsequent main theme that is teleologically charged and forward-moving, traits not always associated with the main themes of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven. Caplin concluded that (by analogy to similar situations in Op. 2 No. 3 and Op. 10 No. 2) the formal role of bars 21ff might be better understood as a transition rather than partaking in any main-theme function. Further, Caplin presented recomposed versions of the 'standing on the dominant' at bars 41ff in order to highlight the unusually loose quality of the subordinate theme group.

Robert Hatten's remarkable close reading of the 'Tempest' formed a kind of natural nexus to the three-day event; his expressively delivered talk synthesized many theoretical and hermeneutic attitudes under the umbrella of 'topics, gestures and agency'. Continuing his work on Beethoven from his book *Musical Meaning in Beethoven: Markedness, Correlation, and Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), Hatten focused here on the divergence of musical styles that were probably recognized by the experienced listener, topics that would have held immediate communicative agency for performer and audience alike. In this context, Hatten's explication of gesture as a 'potentially expressive shaping through time' was especially cogent as he proceeded to outline the differing and often contradictory nature of such gestures in a work such as the 'Tempest'. Whereas some gestures seem readily embodied, others are less precise. Dialogic gestures that imply the presence of more than one agent can be found in stark contrast to those that force the listener/performer into shocked awareness with a sudden rupture in a previously unmarked flow. Bars 63ff of the first movement, for example, represent a notable concentration of such effects. Amongst other insights, Hatten spoke of the muffled funeral drums of the slow movement's



left-hand *tremolos* and the ritualistic impulse to assuage grief that comes after the tumult of the opening movement.

Beghin's visually rich and finely thought-out paper ('Orating the Oracle: The Rhetorical Paradox of Beethoven's "Tempest" Sonata') came from the perspective of the performer. Noting his own reluctance as a musician who has adopted eighteenth-century principles to ally himself to a new historical phenomenon of 'one work, one composer, one nickname' (a phenomenon in which Beethoven unwittingly participated, by issuing an 'Edition tres Correcte [*sic*]' of the 'Tempest'), Beghin contrasted this situation with earlier traditions. In the burgeoning music criticism of the time the 'clever orator' Haydn, who can wittily convince us of anything, was contrasted with the seriousness of Beethoven's music, which, in the words of Mark Evan Bonds, 'reflects a form of truth that we, as listeners, must strive to understand' ('Rhetoric and Romanticism: Listening to Haydn in the Age of Beethoven', in *Haydn and the Rhetorical Tradition: Essays on Performance*, ed. Tom Beghin and Sander M. Goldberg (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, forthcoming)). Of great interest was a small sampling of research stemming from the forthcoming book *Haydn and the Rhetorical Tradition*. Beghin showed how Haydn's autograph of the 'Genzinger' sonata (H XVI: 49) reveals a demonstrable affinity with the actions of the performer using the score.

Although the 'Tempest' offers much in terms of rhetorical delivery – spontaneity (the loosely rolled opening arpeggio), feigned uncertainty (how exactly does one play a *Seufzer* where the second note of the slur is dissonant?), deliberately mixing 'prelude' and *Hauptsatz*, readdressing earlier issues (the recitative as the transformed prelude that never actually happened) – the performer, through the course of the whole sonata, seems forced eventually to give up his orating persona, his gestures more and more experienced and understood as 'reactive' rather than expansive of his own oratorical intent. But reactive to what? Cast in a play without a script, the performer is caught in the web between an older rhetorical tradition and the new and more overwhelming composing persona of Beethoven. And so Beghin, with the rhetorical flair that so defined his own presentation, 'declared defeat', and concluded that the best thing was to take the composer's advice after all, and 'simply read Shakespeare's "Tempest"'.

Markus Neuwirth (Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven) presented a many-layered paper on the 'Tempest' as experienced through an expectancy-based cognitive music analysis. This approach attempts to account for the temporal dimension of music by means of a listener-oriented analytical process, predicated strongly on the concept of expectation as determined by specificity, strength and temporality. Neuwirth focused on the 'point of attraction' in the coda of the slow movement, an unusual moment or 'key event' that takes the experienced listener by surprise (bars 91–92). Here a sudden and radical fracturing brings everything to a halt as the listener 'expects' to apprehend a continuation of the motive, which has already repeated twice. Placing the moment in harmonic and melodic context, as well as fleshing out theoretical concerns, Neuwirth presented some intriguing sketch material in addition to a brief discourse on the extreme metrical ambiguity of the final movement. The final talk of the symposium, 'Hesitant Openings and Tempestuous Transitions: Ways of Organizing Sonata-Form Expositions in the Nineteenth Century', was given by Steven Vande Moortele (Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven). Vande Moortele explored the sometimes hazy categorical differences between main themes and transitions, following a line of thought by Dahlhaus, who remarked in reference to the formal challenges of the 'Tempest' that we 'would do better to understand these "antitheses" as a vehicle of a dialectics, by means of which the form of the movement comes into being as a musically perceived transformational process'. Moortele highlighted this 'transformational process', with its attendant issues of potentially ambiguous formal functions, in several close readings of sonata-form movements by Schubert and Liszt.

An evening concert brought fine performances of the three sonatas of Beethoven's Op. 31 by Sara Laimon (No. 1 in G major), Richard Raymond (No. 2 in D minor) and Kyoko Hashimoto (No. 3 in E flat major). Laimon, who had been present at some lively question-and-answer periods over the weekend, projected a confident performance while Raymond's faultless rendition of the 'Tempest' belied any sense of anxiety he might have felt in presenting a piece that had been so recently and so closely scrutinized. Hashimoto's



quicksilver interpretation of the third sonata underlined some of the quirky ambiguities she had pointed out earlier in round-table discussions.

Hatten moderated the final open forum on performance and analysis with the assistance of Beghin at the fortepiano and Raymond at the modern piano, with Bergé and Caplin as ‘analysts’. Discussion was satisfyingly rambling and discursive. Beghin brought many organological insights to the floor and both Hatten and Raymond explored interpretative options at the modern piano. Much discussion centred on the intra-opus affinities of all three sonatas and the many lingering conversations amongst participants afterwards underlined the palpable atmosphere of new discoveries.

ERIN HELYARD



## SOCIETY FOR MUSIC ANALYSIS STUDY DAY: HAYDN'S *CREATION*

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, 10 FEBRUARY 2007

More than a decade ago, Schenker's decidedly un-chaotic analysis of Haydn's ‘Representation of Chaos’ at the start of *The Creation* prompted Lawrence Kramer to ask whether hermeneutics and musical analysis can mix. The study day on *The Creation* in Oxford's Faculty of Music was troubled by similar questions. Granted, that the Society for Music Analysis should have devoted a day to *The Creation* is evidence that the discipline of musical analysis has changed since Kramer portrayed hermeneutics as its uncomfortable bedfellow: it seems that analysts would now regard the manifest muddle of musical, textual and cultural meanings in a piece like *The Creation* as an opportunity rather than a nuisance. And yet there is no question that the papers were almost entirely of a historicizing bent. Maybe analysis has reflected on the historical mediation of its own strategies to such a degree that it has become, to all intents and purposes, merely a mode of historical musicology that pays more than usual attention to technical and textual matters. Or perhaps, even after so many years of disciplinary soul-searching by analysts, *The Creation* and similar compositions remain inimical to analysis ‘proper’.

That said, when it comes to Haydn, there is not much analysis around at the moment. There was no one among this international group of scholars, up-and-coming as well as established, that Americans would call a Theorist. Half of the participants were products of Cornell University's graduate school, and their work shared a focus on aesthetic philosophy, reception history and cultural studies; although all speakers engaged to varying degrees with the kind of technical issues associated with analytical discourse, they often carried the discussion far beyond these concerns. Indeed, the discussion even wandered far from *The Creation* – into thickets of aesthetic philosophy, deconstructive Big Theory and other compositions by Haydn (the ‘Creation’ Mass, quintet transcriptions, the ‘Military’ Symphony and *L'anima del filosofo*).

The members of the opening panel were all either currently or formerly of Cornell. Emily Dolan (University of Pennsylvania) opened proceedings with ‘Against Philosophical Listening: Haydn's *Creation* and the Discourse of Effect’, a persuasive and entertaining discussion of eighteenth-century critical anxieties about orchestral effects and instrumental gimmickry. Her intention was to show that Haydn inaugurated modern orchestration by developing the idea, current in music criticism and aesthetics, that instrumental sonorities conveyed precise shades of meaning. After a brief analysis of the opening of the ‘Military’ Symphony and the ‘Representation of Chaos’, Dolan's argument culminated with a critique of the notion of ‘philosophical listening’, espoused in various forms by Leon Botstein and Mark Evan Bonds – that is, the idea that early nineteenth-century musical reception was shaped by idealist aesthetic philosophies that were to some extent indifferent to musical practice. Dolan suggested that Haydn's *Creation*, with its many characteristic effects, can be understood as a lexicon of orchestral meanings, revealing the musical and semiotic preconditions for the subsequent generation of supposedly more abstract instrumental music.



Instrumentation remained to some extent the focus of the next paper by Wiebke Thormählen (Cornell University), ‘*La Creation* à cinq instruments: Towards an Aesthetics of Arrangements in Late Eighteenth-Century Vienna’. Thormählen looked at the quintet version of Haydn’s *Creation* and its musical and cultural function in turn-of-the-century Vienna – a line of inquiry that took her into contemporary philosophies of *Bildung*, Baron van Swieten’s writings on the formation of taste among them. Thormählen emerged as an advocate for this relatively unknown version of Haydn’s *Creation*, viewing the quintet as a sort of musical reading or chamber exegesis, which carried the improving message of Haydn’s oratorio into the otherwise unreachable spaces of the Viennese domestic sphere.

The Hungarian scholar Balázs Mikusi (Cornell University) ended the panel with a talk on Haydn’s well known self-quotation of ‘The Dew-Dropping Morn’ in the ‘*Creation*’ Mass, ‘Haydn’s Worst Joke Reconsidered’. Mikusi offered several readings of this intertextual moment from the point of view of analysis, genre criticism, Haydn biography and cultural history. He also assessed the history of critical responses to Haydn’s self-quotation, from Griesinger to Landon.

The opening panel thus presented the audience with a good deal of historical context and rather less analysis. It consequently fell to the first keynote speaker, Ludwig Holtmeier (Freiburg Hochschule für Musik), to bring analysis and history into productive dialogue. His talk ‘Analyzing Haydn; or, How Historical Should Music Theory Be?’ was an examination of the limits and purposes of analytical discourse now that so many of its most cherished concepts and methods have been historicized and relativized. The core of Holtmeier’s presentation was a virtuosic display of ‘historically informed’ analytical technique – a demonstration of methods of melodic construction and part-writing derived from *partimento* (the practice, associated primarily with seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Neapolitan and Milanese musical culture, of deriving music from a bass line with reference to a vocabulary and syntax of harmonic and contrapuntal segments). Holtmeier began with a simple bass line of the sort that lends itself to improvised elaboration at the keyboard and proceeded to generate, according to the principles of *partimento*, a series of melodic and contrapuntal formulas from it; the surprising end result was Gabriel’s aria ‘Nun beut die Flur’ from *The Creation*.

Holtmeier accepted that the status of this mode of ‘analysis’ – what one took the techniques of *partimento* to be describing in this case – was a matter for further discussion. He also acknowledged the dangers of using historical sources as a way of arguing for the authority and exclusivity of an analytical approach. Nevertheless, Holtmeier maintained that his ‘historically informed’ approach opened up a space for a richer and more eclectic understanding of how eighteenth-century music works – a vision of ‘analysis’ that might advance beyond the rigid conceptual categories bequeathed by nineteenth- and early twentieth-century music theory.

The afternoon panel, although still featuring one former Cornell graduate, offered a greater diversity of viewpoints than the morning session. Michael Spitzer (University of Durham) brought together analysis and history in a way that the audience had not seen thus far. His ‘Three Acts of Haydn’s *Creation*: Lateness, Parataxis and the English Enlightenment’ linked the findings of a more traditional kind of analysis with a rather broad-brush conception of the special historical moment of *The Creation*. Using a conceptual framework derived in part from Adorno, Spitzer maintained that what he characterized as the anti-narrative, list-like structure of *The Creation* is characteristic of a ‘late-style’ work, and elucidated paratactic and cyclical tendencies in Haydn’s thematic ideas, modulations and long-range tonal planning.

Felix Diergarten (Dresden Hochschule für Musik) followed with ‘“Paintings for the English”: Haydn’s *Creation* and the Mimetic Taboo in Eighteenth-Century Music Aesthetics’. This paper focused on contemporary critical resistance to Haydn’s tone-paintings in *The Creation* and showed how some German writers had explained away these supposed lapses in taste as moments that catered to the English, with their admiration for Handel’s oratorios. While Diergarten presented a diverting summary of certain late eighteenth-century critical trends, he was reluctant to do more than retread the well known scholarly and aesthetic paths staked out by the idea of musical imitation and its critics.



The Haydn scholar and former Cornellian Caryl Clark (University of Toronto) presented the last paper on the panel, 'Revolution, Rebirth and the Sublime in Haydn's *L'anima del filosofo* and *The Creation*' – a talk that plunged the meeting back into rich historical contexts. It also incorporated several interesting examples from Haydn's London opera, unperformed in the composer's lifetime. Clark argued that the sublime terror of the opera and the sublime divinity of *The Creation* complement each other, presenting two sides of an aesthetic that was as unruly and destructive as it was elevating and ennobling. Haydn's sublime, maintained Clark, reflects Revolution-era preoccupations with historical upheaval and the promise of utopia, thus shaping an emerging post-Revolutionary musical and political discourse.

By the time of the second keynote paper – the last talk of the day – history and analysis remained largely unmixed: the papers had been either historical or analytical, but rarely both. Was Lawrence Kramer (Fordham University) – he who had explored the (in)commensurability of analysis and hermeneutics with reference to *The Creation* – about to bring history and analysis into alignment? Not entirely. Kramer's talk, 'Recalling the Sublime: The Logic of the Creation and *The Creation*', presented a characteristic mix of close readings that passed, almost imperceptibly, between musical and aesthetic texts. His overall aim was a deconstructive one: to show how *The Creation*'s sublime depends for its aesthetic viability on a rhetorical manoeuvre in which the sublime itself is negated – 'withdrawn' or 'recalled'. Kramer argued that this manoeuvre, which is also traceable through contemporary theoretical explorations of the sublime, provides an intellectual context for Haydn's critically problematic tone-paintings. Sublime moments of creation are either transiently performed or statically commemorated and 'recalled' in the oratorio. The products of creation itself – the depiction of which makes up much the larger part of the work – 'withdraws' the sublime. Kramer ultimately argued that the paradoxical rhetorical structure of *The Creation* seeks to 'remain true' to mystical, imponderable events, and is thus comparable to what the philosopher Alan Badiou has called a 'truth process'.

Given that the uncomfortable pairing of historical and analytical approaches more or less defined the study day, it is worth noting the polarized reception of Kramer's paper. Some of the more historically minded musicologists in the audience – among them Matthew Riley (University of Birmingham) – were unhappy with what appeared to them as an unreflective and unjustified coupling of *The Creation* with canonical contemporary philosophy. Other historically inclined critics – Emanuele Senici (University of Oxford), for example – encouraged Kramer to speculate about the concrete historical contexts and preconditions of the rhetorical manoeuvres in *The Creation*. This group wanted more history. By contrast, another group of musicologists – mostly comprising those who had come to see Kramer himself rather than the study day on *The Creation* as a whole – were keener to hear more about Badiou or to introduce other aestheticians and thinkers, such as Walter Benjamin, into the discussion. This group wanted more Big Theory.

Both sections of the audience had much to contribute, and elicited interesting and valuable comment from Kramer. It struck me, however, that those who desired more in the way of Big Theory succeeded only in drawing out one of the potential shortcomings of Kramer's otherwise absorbing critical approach: they risked using Haydn's *Creation* merely as an occasion to explore Badiou, Benjamin and others – a sterile mode of criticism, to say the least, which potentially subordinates a rich and multivalent work of art to various familiar philosophical ideas. Indeed, after so many papers concerned with historical context, Kramer's criticism, as superbly executed as it always is, sometimes appeared to be as historically indifferent as the Bad Old Analysis that he himself has often decried: in Kramer's hands, Haydn's *Creation* was at times reduced to an apparently schematic series of critical tropes. No longer inevitably reducible to the Schenkerian *Urfinie*, say, the musical work was instead reducible to a predictable set of deconstructive aporias.

Sophisticated and many-layered compositions like *The Creation* tend palpably to resist any kind of critical domestication, of course. In the event, however, *The Creation* accomplished a greater trick: as if performing one of Kramer's deconstructive tropes, it managed to be barely present at its own study day – an absent presence. The study day was dedicated to analysis, yet almost every speaker spoke around rather than about Haydn's oratorio: no sooner was the piece in focus than the contributors would talk of string quintets,



contemporary critical reception or Badiou. The discourse of musical analysis has changed a great deal. But if we still want to talk in detail about that disputed thing called The Music Itself, then it might just be that we need something more or less like Bad Old Analysis to help us.

NICHOLAS MATHEW



## DER JUNGE METASTASIO

DA PONTE INSTITUT, VIENNA, 21–22 FEBRUARY 2007

Interest in Metastasio and his dramas has grown considerably in recent decades, prompted by both a broader interest in music from the Age of Enlightenment and, more specifically, by the celebrations in 1998 of the third centenary of the poet's birth. An important contribution, both to Metastasio research and to an appreciation of the poet's works, is the critical edition of all the dramas, edited by Anna Laura Bellina (Venice: Marsilio, 2002–2004; online at <<http://www.progettometastasio.it/pietrometastasio>>). What is particularly valuable about this project – especially compared with what up until now had been the standard text, the Brunelli edition of 1943 – is the electronic version (both CD and online), with its comparison of the Hérisant collected dramas from the 1780s and all of the *principes* connected with the theatre premieres of each version of the plays. It is now possible, for instance, to compare Vinci's Venice and Hasse's Rome *Artaserse*, staged within a week of each other in 1730, or to consider nine different editions of *Didone abbandonata* and *Semiramide riconosciuta*. The configuration of the programme (by a team also including Luigi Tessarolo, Enrica Bojan, Luciana Grappeggia, Sandra Marin and Anna Vencato) permits a user to read two librettos side by side, with textual variants between them highlighted in different colours.

The present Metastasio renaissance has been nourished by a wealth of studies sometimes published by individual researchers but more often prompted by international conferences, as was recently the case with the Viennese Symposium 'Der junge Metastasio', organized by the Da Ponte Institut für Librettologie, Don Juan Forschung und Sammlungsgeschichte together with the Institut für Analyse, Theorie und Geschichte der Musik of the Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien, with the support of the Wissenschaftsabteilung des Kulturamts der Stadt Wien. The conference took place at the Da Ponte Institut headquarters in Vienna, just opposite the Burggarten, on the occasion of a rare performance of Vinci's *Artaserse*. This, the very first setting of Metastasio's most popular drama, was staged by director Nicola Raab in the innovative performing space of the Semperdepot-Ausstellungsraum; the Musica Poetica Wien Barockorchester was conducted by Huw Rhys James. Given that *Artaserse* was the last drama written by the poet for Italy before leaving for his lifelong appointment at the Imperial Court in Vienna, the topic chosen for the conference was the young Metastasio, a perspective as yet mostly unexplored in Metastasio studies. Accordingly, the focus was on the 1720s, when the poet started his operatic career and achieved major results with his early dramas written for opera houses in Naples, Rome and Venice (among them *Didone abbandonata*, *Catone in Utica* and *Siroe*).

This topic was the subject of nearly twenty papers by literature, theatre and music scholars from Italy, Austria and Germany, who collaborated in an atmosphere that prompted lively discussions following the presentations, a sure sign of genuine interest in topics such as the relationship between Metastasio and the theatre world, or Handel's interest in the poet's dramas. The first paper, by veteran libretto scholar Daniela Goldin Folena (Università di Padova), boldly asked 'Does a 'First' Metastasio Exist?' Goldin questioned the possibility of periodizing the poet's career, given his great awareness and technical ability from the very beginning of his career, an awareness and ability that had developed as a reaction to his experiences in Italian opera houses and that marked his concern for practical problems of staging while in the service of Charles VI and Maria Theresia. It soon became clear that the aim of the conference was not to point out specific features separating 'young' from 'older' Metastasio, but rather to take an opportunity to concentrate on



the poet's early output, considering in detail some important titles, starting with the very first, *Didone abbandonata*. Alberto Beniscelli (Università di Genova, and author of a comprehensive study on the poet's theatre, *Felicità sognate* (Genoa: Il Melangolo, 2000)), demonstrated how distant the baroque Dido staged by Busenello for Cavalli is from Metastasio's drama, whose Aeneas, modelled on the French dramaturgical and philosophical tradition of the *grand siècle*, can be traced to Descartes and Racine. Aeneas's character impedes all the other characters, who traditionally had been given much prominence throughout the seventeenth century. *Didone abbandonata's* 'primo uomo' attracted the interest of veteran scholar Elena Sala Di Felice (Università di Cagliari) as well; she analysed the cumulative tension of Aeneas's arias, which makes him nearly incapable of uttering a word. Francesco Cotticelli (Università di Cagliari), on the other hand, discussed the character of Dido, to whom Metastasio imparted a risky characterization, not depicting her completely positively, but, rather, stressing the guilty isolation that forces her into a harsh conflict with three heads of state; this is a topic that the poet later developed in *Semiramide riconosciuta*, whose main character bases her power on dissimulation. This session devoted to *Didone* came to a close with Anna Laura Bellina (Università di Padova), who followed the drama's path from the Naples 1724 premiere through the nine editions Metastasio was involved with, including the Madrid revision (1752), which requires, in addition to real tigers and lions, horses, a personal passion of Farinelli, who had commissioned and staged it.

The symposium then moved on to other early Metastasian librettos. I (Università di Genova and Università Cattolica) spoke about settings of the poet's second drama, *Siroe*, by two leading German composers of Italian opera, both known in Italy as 'Sassoni', Handel and Hasse. It is an interesting case, since Handel's 1728 setting and Hasse's two settings from 1733 and 1763 (the latter being the composer's last opera staged in Dresden) were written for some of the most important eighteenth-century singers; they not only use different versions of the play but also diverge strongly in their musical characterizations as well. My paper stressed the late baroque and galant style features that characterize each score, and showed how both composers' musical choices determined their original interpretations of the drama, interpretations quite distant from Metastasio's original intentions. Claudio Toscani (Università degli Studi di Milano) discussed the 1724 intermezzo *L'impresario delle Canarie*, attributed to Metastasio. The attribution to Metastasio of this comic text – the only one said to be by him – is problematic (the play was never explicitly acknowledged by the poet). Toscani compared the two surviving scores, by Domenico Sarro and Giovanni Battista Martini (this out of five known settings), stressing the national scope of the text, which goes far beyond local generic traditions, and the similarities of the settings. Predictably, *Artaserse* was the most frequently discussed drama in the conference. Herbert Seiffert (Universität Wien) described the *Artaserse* tradition prior to Metastasio, starting with the 1669 Aureli libretto set by Cesti (and only recently discovered). Marina Mayrhofer (Università di Napoli) discussed the implications of the poet's literary and philosophical background for *Artaserse's* political vision, a sort of preparation to his appointment as imperial poet in Vienna. Dörte Schmidt (Universität der Künste Berlin) undertook a comparison between repertory and text functions in the Italian and French traditions, detecting two different strands in the librettos and their settings, the second giving rise to a tradition exemplified by the settings of Vinci, Hasse and Galuppi. Reinhard Eisendle (Da Ponte Institut, Vienna) together with Johannes Weidinger (Don Juan Archiv, Vienna) pushed this even further, to the point where they detected Metastasian strategies in the writings of Lorenzo Da Ponte.

Another main focus of the conference was the young Metastasio's environment. Mario Armellini (Conservatorio di Verona) discussed the poet's activity at the Teatro di San Bartolomeo in Naples, where he collaborated with the prima donna Marianna Benti Bulgarelli. He suggested that some alterations to *L'Astarto* and *L'Ermelinda*, for performances in which she sang, might have derived from the poet. Paologiovanni Maione (Università di Napoli) discussed young Metastasio's liaisons in Neapolitan society, which account for most of the poet's professional contacts and artistic partners. Silvia Tatti (Università La Sapienza di Roma) drew attention to the allegorical feast *La contesa de' numi*, with music composed by Vinci for the birth of the French heir in Rome in Metastasio's last Italian year. The staging of this work anticipates the poet's Viennese dramas insofar as it deals with concepts of knowledge, virtue, tradition and innovation. Two scholars pursued further discussion on Metastasio and opera seria: Gernot Gruber (Universität Wien)



read a paper on “Clemenza und Costanza” in Mozart’s and Mazzolà’s *Clemenza di Tito* and, finally, Silke Leopold (Universität Heidelberg) discussed the convention of the *lieto fine*, a convention faithfully observed by Metastasio throughout his career. The *lieto fine* is, in fact, much more problematic than might be supposed: on the one hand, even tragic endings such as *Didone*’s are actually a sort of *lieto fine*; on the other, proper *lieti fini* were given strongly diverging interpretations in different musical settings, with composers often taking paths independent of the poet’s original intentions – a leitmotiv heard quite often in this Vienna conference. The conference proceedings will be published by Edizioni dei Turchini, Naples.

RAFFAELE MELLACE



## PERFORMANCE PRACTICE: ISSUES AND APPROACHES

RHODES COLLEGE, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE, 4–6 MARCH 2007

This conference, organized by Tim Watkins of Rhodes College, proved that the discipline of performance practice remains vibrant and wide-ranging: there were twenty-two papers dealing with performance issues from medieval monophony to nineteenth-century elocution, nearly half of which dealt with the eighteenth century. It was worth getting together for three days in the warmth of Memphis, even if nowadays we are aware that ‘authenticity’ is better regarded as a marketing concept than as an intellectually defensible goal, and that the notion of a stable musical work is perhaps best seen as an intermittently useful fiction. Christopher Hogwood’s virtuosic keynote address on the final evening of the conference did not take that tack, but then it was aimed more at the donors and concert-going public than at performance practice scholars per se. One hopes, none the less, that his large audience took away an enlightened view of the ‘homework’ that a performer must undertake in order to ‘get it right’, even in quite recently composed music. He gave many examples of the evidence one ought to consult beyond the score, from early (even if technologically challenged) recordings to out-takes that preserve Aaron Copland’s comments on *Appalachian Spring*, which have much to tell us about how the composer thought the music should go.

Margaret Butler (University of Alabama) opened the conference with a paper on the 1778 Bologna production of Gluck’s *Alceste*, based on extensive annotations in a printed libretto and correspondence between the Bolognese stage director and the librettist, Ranieri de’ Calzabigi. The detailed descriptions of stage action and timings in her sources reveal much about the director’s struggles to achieve his aesthetic goals. In his paper ‘How to be an Emperor’ in opera seria, Richard King (University of Maryland) argued that portraying Alexander the Great requires more than simply grafting standard baroque gestures onto the stock character of ‘emperor’. In order to act the part authentically, performers must immerse themselves in all available artistic representations and literary descriptions of the personality and demeanour of such historical characters.

Theatrical music was the focus of two other papers, both of which further removed the repertoires from their original contexts. I (University of Western Ontario) discussed the many adaptations of Handel’s *Rinaldo* issued by John Walsh. Arrangements ‘fitted to the harpsichord’ or adapted as sonatas for melodic instruments enjoyed a steady market in eighteenth-century England. Such publications bespeak an attitude towards the ontology of the work much more flexible than our own, in which arrangements are typically devalued, even though they provided ready access to the work in an era before recording. Timothy Crain (Indiana State University) examined the use of instrumental music in Charleston’s colonial theatre, emphasizing the degree to which the use of music seems parallel to practices common on the Restoration stage in England. Theatrical entertainments mounted in Charleston from 1735 to 1774 invariably included at least one work that featured music prominently. Contemporary advertisements and surviving arrangements allowed Crain to reconstruct typical orchestrations and to document the musicians’ concerts and teaching during their stays in Charleston.



Montéclair's 'free graces' in the *doubles* to his suites published in the 1720s were the subject of Charles Gower Price's (West Chester University of Pennsylvania) paper. Such notated examples of how to vary a melodic line may have had as much influence on subsequent composition as on improvisation per se, although the latter is of course harder to judge. Price argued that Montéclair's repertory of melodic figuration – much enriched compared to ornaments indicated by means of signs – helped to shape the emerging international style of instrumental graces we see in works by Bach, Telemann and Leclair. In another paper bearing on two improvisatory practices, Evan Jones (Florida State University) applied Quantz's classification of chords from the 'Advice to the Continuo Player' to the figured bass supplied with his ornamented *Adagio*. And he concluded that the harpsichordist is to play fuller (louder) chords based upon the nature of the harmonies while the flautist ornaments primarily on the basis of melodic considerations. Jones's work confirms that such ornamentation tends to project structurally significant pitches, while the continuo player is likely to emphasize dissonant sonorities. Thus melodically and harmonically driven strategies may conflict, leaving performers to negotiate an acceptable collective reading. Those looking for a single clear and internally consistent set of rules to guide modern performers of eighteenth-century sonatas are once again out of luck.

We often bemoan the decline of improvisatory ability among classically trained musicians, and Kailan Rubinoff (Wilfred Laurier University) gave us at least one institution to blame for accelerating this decline. She trained her sights on the Paris Conservatoire's 'revolutionary model of music education', in which technical instruction and repertory were strictly regulated within an extremely hierarchical organization. This approach to music education privileged technical drills and even tone quality over extemporization, which gradually disappeared from the curriculum. Aside from playing ever higher, faster and louder, performers learned faithfulness to the minute details of the score and to the composer, while their previously valued performative freedoms began to evaporate.

Randall Goldberg (Indiana University) discussed C. P. E. Bach's practice of adapting the works of other composers, exemplified in a full score rediscovered in the Berlin Singakademie *Notenarchiv* of the *Lukaspassion* of 1775 (D-BSA 50). Here, and in Siegwart Reichwald's (Converse College) paper on Mendelssohn's parts for the premiere of *St Paul*, we see composers pragmatically adapting their ideas (or those of others) to the constraints of a performance situation. By studying annotations on the score, Goldberg showed the 1775 Passion to be derived from a work by Gottfried August Homilius. Bach's annotations provide instructions to a copyist, omitting pieces and reducing orchestration as well as transposing particular arias into ranges appropriate for soprano or bass, in order to cope with the departure of one tenor from his ensemble.

Eighteenth-century North America provided the context for Charles E. Brewer's (Florida State University) discussion of problems in scholarly editions of works by William Billings, which in his view privilege the original prints too strongly over the influence of memory and oral traditions. Using the example of Billings's *Jordan*, he argued that the literary text as transmitted in the printed sources is flawed and should be altered or supplemented in performance to reflect New England oral traditions of the period.

Cellists and cello playing were well represented. Guido Oliveri (University of Texas at Austin) explored a manuscript cello tutor from early eighteenth-century Naples in which the composer-cellist Francesco Paolo Supriani (sometimes spelled Scipriani) provided not only technical exercises but also twelve toccatas for unaccompanied cello, recast on subsequent pages as ornamented sonatas with figured bass (the original cello line is written out alongside a more complex version). Clearly Supriani had a pedagogical aim, but the details are not entirely clear: were the derived sonatas models of how to ornament, did the student gradually progress from the simpler to the more demanding version, or did the teacher play along on the bass line, to help the student with intonation? Christine Kyprianides (Indiana University) re-examined Bach's cello suites from the perspective of an experienced performer, concluding that one might best regard the works as more reflecting Bach's interest in counterpoint than as idiomatic and carefully notated suites comparable to those for unaccompanied violin. She suggested that in comparison with those for violin, the cello suites are much more varied technically and stylistically, with awkward and sometimes unplayable chords, even on



such peculiar instruments as the 'arm-held' cello. According to Kyprianides, regarding the works as similar in conception to the *Art of Fugue* and the *Musical Offering* may in fact allow us to approach them more successfully than would taking at face value Anna Magdalena Bach's manuscript copy.

Three very strong and entertaining papers on nineteenth-century topics – elocution (Marion Kimber, University of Iowa), song accompaniment (Monica Henneman, Birmingham University) and the 'piano girl' (Candace Bailey, North Carolina Central University) – moved us further away from score study into the oral performance traditions and social contexts in which they were situated. In addition, there were five papers on pre-1700 topics. Virginia Lamothe concluded the first session with her study of Monteverdi's *Ballo delle ingrato* from the perspective of contemporary dance practice. Later, Timothy Watkins (Rhodes College) employed accounts of Franciscan and Dominican missionaries to discuss European sacred music performed by the indigenous population in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Mexico; Jann Cosart (Baylor University) examined issues of ornamentation and rhythm in the chants of W1; Joshua Veltman (Union University) focused on aspects of chant performance in the early seventeenth century; and Allen Scott (Oklahoma State University) discussed practices among meistersingers in Breslau in the late sixteenth century.

Interspersed among the formal papers were six concerts, ranging from Tallis to Liszt. To my mind the most significant was a stellar performance of serenatas by Alessandro Scarlatti, presented by mezzo-soprano Tasmin Simmill (Durham, NC) and harpsichordist Marie-Louise Catsalis (Santa Clara University). Contending that Scarlatti provided introductory *sinfonie* only when he employed obbligato instruments (absent here), Catsalis played *introduzioni* to prepare singer and audience for each serenata, drawing on Scarlatti's didactic collection (BL Add. MS 14244). Earlier, soprano Rebecca Crow Lister (Lebanon Valley College) had aptly contrasted Italian and French singing styles in Elisabeth-Claude Jacquet de La Guerre's *Susanne* (1708) and Barbara Strozzi's *L'Astratto*. We also heard a very fine lecture recital by pianist Kenneth Hamilton (Birmingham University) devoted to the *Hexameron*, presented in sections interspersed with insightful commentary on the sources and on Liszt's own practices when he performed the work.

Finally, two papers posed more abstract questions. John Mayhood (Brown University) put Peter Kivy's view of period performance in perspective by reminding us that Kivy is only concerned with a situation in which a performer's personal artistic judgement conflicts with the demands of a historically informed approach. If one's artistic desires happen to coincide with what HIP would suggest, the conflict evaporates. None the less, the idea of performing a C. P. E. Bach sonata on a clavichord in order to line up with the composer's preference will no doubt raise the conflict anew, since what worked in the eighteenth-century salon may not be effective in the modern concert hall. According to Mayhood, the composer's intentions, whether historically based or imaginatively reconstructed, as if the long-dead authors were alive today (the 'Bach would have preferred the piano' argument), are equally unavailable to HIPsters and players of modern instruments.

Stephen Meyer (Syracuse University) explored the parallels he sees between HIP and the rise of the compact disc. The new technology afforded cleaner, crisper recordings at a time when clean and crisp articulation was valued by HIP performers. Moreover, the clarity of recordings in which evidence of human participation has largely been erased in Meyer's view paralleled the historicist focus of early HIPsters. If the era of the CD is now drawing to a close, does the new approach of downloadable MP3 files parallel a postmodern stance with respect to performance practice, in which the work is no longer seen as an entity to be recreated but as a sketchy set of instructions to be played or heard in a variety of equally justifiable ways? *Pace* Hogwood, maybe 'getting it right' is no longer (if it ever was) a viable goal. 'Knowing what you are doing and why' has always seemed to me challenging enough.

SANDRA MANGSEN