Eighteenth-Century Music 3/1, 141–170 © Cambridge University Press

REVIEWS

BOOKS

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606210546 Printed in the United Kingdom

LORRAINE BYRNE
SCHUBERT'S GOETHE SETTINGS
Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003
pp. xix + 512, ISBN 0 7546 0695 3

Few would disagree that Schubert's settings of Goethe, taken as a whole, represent a particularly successful marriage of words and music. This marriage has been a troublesome one, however, complicated not only by generational and circumstantial differences between the two men, but also by Goethe's apparent lack of appreciation of Schubert's art. The notion of indifference on Goethe's part is based primarily on his failure to respond to the composer's overtures on two separate occasions, in 1816 and 1825. These two events, along with Goethe's avowed preference for simple strophic settings less ambitious than most of Schubert's achievements, led to frequent charges (particularly among early twentieth-century musicologists) of a lack of musicality on Goethe's part, charges that somewhat parallel the traditional image of Schubert as a composer lacking literary discernment, prepared to set any poetry that came his way.

In *Schubert's Goethe Settings*, Lorraine Byrne sets out to demolish these myths by showing that these two men had much more in common, both in their personalities and in their creative endeavours, than has traditionally been supposed, and that the resulting 'synthesis of words and music in Schubert's Goethe settings is in every sense unparalleled' (xv). In truth, these myths have faded over the years, and Byrne's refutations often come across as outdated. Nevertheless, in an examination of both the lives and the work of the two men, the detail with which she puts forward the case for a fundamental affinity is unprecedented. The book consists of two parts, the first considering the lives and backgrounds of Goethe and Schubert, the second discussing the sixty-three Goethe poems that Schubert set to music and analysing his settings.

The first part is divided into two chapters. 'Goethe the Musician?' examines the considerable role that music played in the poet's life, documenting his close association with composers such as Zelter and Mendelssohn and his deep-rooted belief in the ability of music to enhance poetry. 'Schubert, Goethe and the Development of the 19th-Century Lied' deals in part with the more complicated issue of the similarities between Schubert and Goethe, although most of these, such as the 'need to compose' (34) or the recognition of 'the role of suffering for the creative soul' (35), seem a little too generic to be truly meaningful.

The second part of the book – the analysis of Schubert's Goethe settings – is by far the longer of the two, and constitutes the core of the study. Byrne chooses to give the poet 'pride of place', as she puts it (xviii), by arranging the analyses in chapters according to stylistic and chronological progression of the poetry rather than the songs themselves. Each chapter begins with a general discussion of a topic as it relates to Goethe and (sometimes) to Schubert and is followed by a more specific discussion of each relevant poem and of

Schubert's setting(s) of it. Unfortunately, such an organization gives little sense of the development of Schubert's response to Goethe over the years, and a more apt title for this book might have been *Goethe's Poetry that Schubert (Happened to) Set to Music* (indeed, if a review of a book entitled *Schubert's Goethe Settings* seems out of place in a journal about the eighteenth century, we should remember that the book's central emphasis is on poetry that mainly belongs in this time period). A desire to emphasize the poetry in a context in which it is usually given insufficient attention is, of course, laudable, but in a study concerned with the crucial point of contact between two artists this point of contact takes too much of a back seat, to the extent that even the anthologies of Goethe's poetry that served as Schubert's basic source are not discussed at all.

The strongest aspect of the study, however, is the discussion of the poetry, in both general and specific terms. Byrne gives much valuable information on the cultural and biographical background to the poems, shedding light on many features that might otherwise go unnoticed by modern-day readers. But in discussions that tend towards broad interpretation of poems as wholes, what is often noticeably lacking is substantial analysis of detail – for example, subtleties of metre and assonance, details that contribute towards Goethe's 'musical-poetic genius', as Schubert himself put it (112). Unfortunately, very few examples of the poetry are quoted, and then only in English translations and not in the original German.

Byrne's general reluctance to criticize any aspect of Goethe's poetry is especially pronounced in her often simplistic analyses of Schubert's music, which are characterized once again by a severe shortage of illustrations. In sharp contrast to the discussion of the poetry, however, discussion of the music proceeds very much on a line-by-line basis, designed to show how Schubert's setting 'portrays' or 'reflects' images or concepts in the poem, but without really considering how such a setting might function as a parallel construct to the large-scale sense of the poem. Such an approach unfortunately leaves no room for examination of how Schubert's songs do not simply 'portray' texts but actively interpret them. This element of 'subjectivity', as considered by Lawrence Kramer, for example, in *Schubert: Sexuality, Subjectivity, Song* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), is what truly sets Schubert apart from most of his contemporaries, and the present study could certainly have benefited from a closer engagement with this issue.

In considering Schubert's settings solely within the context of the poem concerned, Byrne also isolates these settings from their wider context when a broader outlook would have enriched understanding. Very rarely are Schubert's settings of other poets mentioned, when consideration of other poetry on similar themes might well have contributed towards a better appreciation of how the Goethe settings might indeed be 'unparalleled'. Similarly, the organization of the book prevents consideration of Schubert's tendency to set poems in groups, highlighting connections between them by means of subtle musical links that add a whole new dimension of meaning. Once again an important recent piece of literature – Richard Kramer's *Distant Cycles: Schubert and the Conceiving of Song* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) – examines some of Schubert's Goethe settings in this light, and Byrne's book would have been enhanced by a proper acknowledgement of the topic.

Unfortunately, the overall impression is not helped by the considerable number of typographic errors; combined with a sometimes grammatically clumsy writing style, these suggest a monograph rushed too quickly into print, with insufficient editing. Such carelessness becomes a serious problem where citations are concerned. In particular, surname-only citations are inadequate when more than one author in the bibliography have the same surname, or if an author is represented by more than one publication. Indeed, most of the notes are simple citations and are often unexplained, sometimes leaving the reader unable to distinguish the author's thoughts from those of others. Perhaps the most striking example of a general tendency to avoid engagement with recent secondary literature can be seen in the way that Byrne deals with a book on much the same subject as hers, published just a few years earlier: Kenneth Whitton's *Goethe and Schubert: The Unseen Bond* (Portland, OR: Amadeus Press, 1999). Byrne mentions this book briefly in passing, with the author's surname only (22), but provides no citation and does not include it in the bibliography. Whitton's book is certainly shorter and less ambitious than Byrne's, but a proper acknowledgement of it and engagement with it would have been appropriate.

This book, then, is problematic in some important respects. Most crucially, it fails to make a convincing case for the special nature that Byrne claims for Schubert's Goethe settings, either in relation to other composers' Goethe settings or in relation to Schubert's settings of other poets. It is equally unconvincing in suggesting that many of the similarities between the two men were more than the product of a shared culture. Yet Byrne's strategy of according Goethe 'pride of place' in a book aimed primarily at musicians undoubtedly helps to correct a general lack of awareness of the poet amongst those who love Schubert's songs. The book's main strength is clearly its wealth of information on the cultural, philosophical and biographical background to those of Goethe's poems that were set by Schubert; it also has the potential to serve as a springboard for more penetrating analyses of Schubert's responses to Goethe's poetry.

STERLING LAMBERT

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606220542 Printed in the United Kingdom

MARIANNE DANCKWARDT AND WOLF-DIETER SEIFFERT, EDS
BERICHT ÜBER DAS MOZART-SYMPOSION ZUM GEDENKEN AN WOLFGANG PLATH (1930–1995) AUGSBURG, 13. BIS 16. JUNI 2000 (PUBLISHED AS *MOZART-JAHRBUCH* 2001)
Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2003
pp. xiv + 501, ISBN 3 7618 1580 8

This collection is devoted to the legacy of Wolfgang Plath, whose premature death in 1995 robbed Mozart scholarship of a distinct and influential voice. It was his conviction that the best research is often the pursuit of little problems. Plath, clearly influenced by Karl Popper, believed attempts at their solution would lead to a kind of collective progress in the aggregate. He wasn't shy about his methodological premises: his controversial position paper 'Der gegenwärtige Stand der Mozartforschung' (1964; reprinted, with the rest of his works on Mozart, in *Mozart-Schriften: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. Marianne Danckwardt (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1991), 78–85), which he presented at a panel discussion at the 1964 meeting of the International Musicological Society in Salzburg, was remarkable both for the controversy it engendered and for its prescience. In German Mozart research the grand exercises in *Geistesgeschichte* at which his polemics were aimed are now more the exception than the rule, and the smaller problems whose solution he proposed as an alternative continue to set the agenda. Indeed, there is little doubt that the discipline has moved substantially forward in a series of small steps, and it would be no exaggeration to say that Plath had something to do with this. Plath's own interests, besides methodological reflection, included an extremely focused brand of critical source study, which he pursued in his capacity as one of the lead editors of the *Neue Mozart Ausgabe*, and an analytical fascination with compositional process. I found all three here, in five groupings organized mostly by genre; the final section of the volume is devoted to two 'Arbeitsgruppen' (working groups) consisting of longer essays and substantial transcriptions of plenary discussions.

In each grouping the essays that stand out are those that put attention to detail in wider contexts. In the first grouping, 'Forschungsansätze', Joachim Brügge's 'Perspektiven und Grenzen von "Typus und Modell" für die Mozartforschung' impresses with its broad agenda. Brügge reconsiders Plath's concepts of 'type' (smaller compositional building-blocks) and 'model' (models Mozart may have adapted from others, or from his own works) and their use for understanding Mozart's compositional process. In Brügge's hands these heuristic tools continue to show some promise – mostly, I think, because they stay so close to the 'surface' of Mozart's practice as a composer and thus allow for analytical flexibility in the face of this music's extreme complexity. It surprised me, though, that Brügge – in an essay otherwise firmly grounded in the secondary literature – sees no need to acknowledge the work of topical analysts like Leonard Ratner, Kofi Agawu, Elaine Sisman and especially Wye J. Allanbrook, who pursue a quite similar project. Brügge's

labyrinthine prose is a challenge for those outside of German-speaking Mozart research, yet there is much to be gleaned from his work, and it sets a high standard for the essays that follow. Joseph Mančal's 'Historische Quellen: Faktum und Interpretation' takes up the challenge of Plath's meta-thinking about writing history. Mančal's thesis – that Leopold Mozart's Jesuit intellectual background would have had an impact on how Wolfgang thought about the physical remains of his own work, as relics of progress in compositional history – is strikingly ingenious. The honour of the first essay, 'Autograph – Abschrift – Erstdruck: Eine kritische Bewertung', belongs to the late Marius Flothuis, who died while the volume was in preparation. It is an old problem that he surveys here, with a sense for detail and perspective that comes with profound experience. I found it disappointing, though, that he lays most of his criticism at the feet of the *NMA*'s editors. Decisions made decades ago cannot be unmade, however unfortunate a few of them may have been.

In the second group, 'Kammermusik für Streicher', Laurenz Lütteken's investigation of the historical concepts of *Spiel* and *Konversation* and their relation to the Divertimento K563 – 'Konversation als Spiel: Überlegungen zur Textur von Mozarts Divertimento KV 593' – stands out clearly over the other contributions. Lütteken knows the *Begriffsgeschichte* of the eighteenth century like few others; here historical definitions are the foundation upon which he builds a new and interesting reading of the work, with a fascinating biographical twist. I won't give it away completely, but I will say it has to do with Mozart, his somewhat mysterious patron Michael Puchberg, gambling and the opaque circumstances of K563's composition.

The next group of papers, 'Zuschreibungsfragen', reflects Plath's sometimes acerbic approach to sorting out the real Mozart from the false. Two of these, Martina Hochreiter's 'Die *Geistlichen Oden und Lieder* nach Texten von Christian Fürchtegott Gellert KV Anh. 270–283 (KV^6 Anh. C 8.32–46)' and Paul van Reijen's 'Zur Frage der Autorschaft der unechten "Mozart"-Messen KV Anh. 185 und Anh. 186', concern themselves with the complicated matter of compositions in which both Leopold and Wolfgang may have had a hand. Both are extreme in their detail; what I like about them – and Plath's many efforts in this vein – is their willingness to leave some questions open, in the pragmatic hope that small observations can serve as the foundation for future research. And at this point in my reading an 'aggregate' theme began to emerge. Plath, perhaps drawing more than he was willing to admit on the nineteenth-century philological tradition for which reading sources and describing them were two side of the same coin, seems to have seen source studies as being inseparable from what an English speaker would call analysis. Van Reijen, for instance, slips effortlessly between the two, shifting back and forth between descriptions of physical materials and musical structure. What emerges very often in these essays, then, is a kind of informal analysis – unburdened by too much music theory – that focuses on Mozart's *dispositio* of larger sections in his works, a process that is relatively easy to follow in the sources.

The fourth grouping is devoted to Mozart's symphonies. Peter Jost's contribution, 'Mozarts Instrumentation anhand autographer Quellen', raises interesting questions about Mozart's use of tone colour and its disposition in blocks throughout his works as a compositional tool. In the manner of Plath, he is able to follow some aspects of timbre to the level of sketch and draft. Jost frames his claims with Carl Dahlhaus's theories on the history – through Berlioz and beyond – of composers' use of tone colour. It is useful to see Mozart's place in this panorama, but I would have been interested to read more about general theories of timbre in the late eighteenth century. (For more on this topic I refer the reader to Emily Dolan, 'The Origins of the Orchestra Machine', *Current Musicology* 76 (2003), 7–24.) The section ends with Marianne Danckwardt's return to another case in the 'Leopold or Wolfgang?' dossier: 'Nochmals zu den beiden "Lambacher Sinfonien"'. It is a fitting tribute to Plath, since one of the more sharply worded responses to his 1964 plea for positivism was Anna Amalie Abert's attempt to prove Wolfgang's authorship of the 'Lambach' symphony manuscript with Leopold's name on it (which now goes by 'Eisen G16') using purely stylistic arguments – the methods of *Verstehen* that Plath was so quick to criticize. (See Abert, 'Methoden der Mozartforschung', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* 1964, 22–27.) Danckwardt's main tool is the examination of *dispositio*. Her conclusion is that the 'old Lambach Symphony' – that is, the one with Wolfgang's name on it – displays more *Stringenz* (cogency) in its construction. I find the unacknowledged and unexamined slippage between *Analyse* and *Stilkritik* interesting; writers like Abert would, I suspect, have

avoided the first because of its overly empirical connotations. But is there a real difference? This question aside, Danckwardt's rethinking of the issues here is well worth reading.

The next section is devoted to opera. Now that I had become sensitive to it, I found that I was reading more and more of the papers as revolving around the compositional challenge of *dispositio*. Petra Weber-Bockholdt, for instance, examines Mozart's disposition of F major arias in operas from *Lucio Silla* to *La clemenza di Tito*. She finds that the composer prefers this key in two distinct situations: to underscore a character's mental confusion (she calls this the *mens confusa* topic) and, starting with *Idomeneo*, in moments just before scenes of departure and loss (these she calls the 'penultimate' topic). Sergio Durante's 'Considerations of Mozart's Changing Approach to Recitatives and Other Choices of Dramaturgical Significance' surveys Mozart's practices of writing recitative throughout his career with an eye for evidence of changes to autographs and, in the case of *Lucio Silla*, of tonal planning. Durante is right to raise the question of the role of performers and librettists in such matters, which was of course profound. In the volume as a whole, external factors like these do not always get the attention they deserve, so I was glad to see them considered here.

The final grouping of the first part of the volume concerns works with and for keyboard. Glenn Stanley's 'Einzelwerk als Gattungskritik: Mozarts Klavierrondo in a-moll KV 511', like Lütteken's, is one of the few contributions to take up the challenge of theoretical writings contemporary to Mozart. His close reading of the A minor Rondo benefits from these contexts, and his essay fits well with the collection as a whole, since rondo of course offers a composer many opportunities to display ingenuity in *dispositio*. Hartmut Schick, in his paper 'Originalkomposition oder Bearbeitung? Zur Quellenlage und musikalischen Faktur von Mozarts Klaviertrio KV 564', turns to one of the Mozart corpus's odder challenges, a keyboard score for many years thought to be a stand-alone rondo for solo clavier, which is now held to be the just the piano part to a piano trio. Schick thinks it might be for a violin sonata instead, and his argument, based on proportions (*dispositio*!) and philological observations, is a fine example of the Plathian method in action.

The second large section of the volume consists of five longer essays organized into three 'working groups'. Wolf-Dieter Seiffert's target in 'Die Untersuchung autographer Korrekturen als Chance "authentischer" Werkinterpretation: Dargestellt anhand von Mozarts "Haydn-Quartetten"' is disposition in miniature: tiny corrections to autographs. There is a fascinating whiff of contrafactual history about this (what if the viola had gone down a step here and not up a third?), and Seiffert's final claim is as striking as it is debatable: that Mozart's *Ausführung*, his *dispositio,* was on the whole limited to smallest course corrections. Are we to assume, then, that large-scale planning was already complete before Mozart began work on the autographs, and that this kind of tinkering was the 'long and trying labour' to which he famously refers in his dedication of the quartets to Haydn? Although this could be taken to suggest that Mozart's works were already finished wholes 'in his head', now a rather discredited notion, Seiffert's contribution is nevertheless very well argued and never strays from a solid foundation in the autographs. Joachim Brügge's second contribution to the volume, 'Ausgesuchte Aspekte zu den Werkautographen, am Beispiel von KV 458 I, und den Skizzen und Fragmenten im Umfeld der "Haydn-Quartette" Mozarts', explores the qualitative differences between quartet fragments Mozart discarded while working on the 'Haydn' quartets and the completed works. Here again, Brügge argues, the difference is a more effective disposition of larger units. Like his first essay, this one is often marred by impossibly obscure language. Non-native readers of German, and possibly a few native ones, are bound to be left shaking their heads in despair as his convoluted sentences snake their way through seemingly endless chains of relative clauses.

The second 'working group' focuses on opera. Claudia Maurer-Zenck's 'Dramaturgie und Philologie in der *Zauberflöte*: Eine Hypothese und viele Fragen zur Chronologie', as its title suggests, attempts the radical combination of ink studies and interpretation of Mozart's dramatic choices. I am not entirely convinced about the ink, but Mauer-Zenck's speculations about last-minute changes to the opera's disposition are to be applauded for their daring. Finally, Helga Lühning's essay 'Mozarts Auseinandersetzung mit der Da capo-Arie in *Mitridate, re di Ponto*' offers the kind of depth I had come to expect in this collection, and thanks to the length allowed her as one of the 'working-group' authors, Lühning is in a position to go even further

in her exploration of the rich potential of the da capo aria as a field for compositional experimentation. I was particularly grateful for the extensive transcriptions of the discussions of the 'working groups': in Lühning's case, the discussion of the role of *Mitridate*'s original singers in the evolution of Mozart's concept of the opera is a valuable addition to an already impressive paper. (The lengthy excursus on ink recipes in response to Maurer-Zenck's paper offers light relief too.)

There is much that the reader will not find in this volume. Reductive analytical techniques beyond charts with bar numbers are missing entirely; although German-language musicology's relative lack of interest in Schenkerian analysis might explain this, it still seems to me that some judicious use of linear reduction would surely have illuminated many claims about the disposition of larger compositional units. With the exception of the essays by Lütteken and Stanley, the use of eighteenth-century texts as conceptual foils is hit-and-miss at best; Seiffert's arguments, for instance, would have benefited from more engagement with the writings of Heinrich Christoph Koch. Finally, some authors display an alarming lack of interest in English-language scholarship (in the contributions on opera, all more or less analytical, there is not a single reference to the work of James Webster). Sometimes, I had the feeling I was in another world, hermetically sealed and frighteningly self-referential.

Plath himself, I venture to guess, would not have approved. For him, to put it simply, the broader the base the better the result. Nevertheless, this collection has much to offer. The editors have put Plath's call for a musicology of small steps to the test: there are no grand narratives here, no hermeneutic overkill, just essay after essay of solid musical scholarship. And the whole that results is more than the sum of its parts. It is the foundation, perhaps, for an even larger-scale investigation of Mozart's compositional imagination, working with both the materials he left behind and our critical readings of them.

THOMAS IRVINE

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606230549 Printed in the United Kingdom

MARK DARLOW
NICOLAS-ETIENNE FRAMERY AND LYRIC THEATRE IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE
Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 11
Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2003
pp. xi + 400, ISBN 0 7294 0836 1

The name of the critic, librettist and 'parodist' Nicolas-Etienne Framery (Rouen 1745 – Paris 1810) will sound more familiar to literary scholars specializing in the *Siècle des Lumières* than to many eighteenth-century musicologists. The latter may know him as one of the three editors of the musical articles of the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, perhaps even as the librettist of his main theatrical success, *La colonie*, an opéra comique 'parodied' from Antonio Sacchini's *L'isola d'amore* and performed in 1775 at the Comédie-Italienne.

A preliminary clarification is needed about the title of Mark Darlow's book, *Nicolas-Etienne Framery and Lyric Theatre in Eighteenth-Century France*, since one of the author's main aims was to provide a study of opéra comique during the last third of the eighteenth century and into the first decade of the nineteenth. Eighteenth-century French 'lyric theatre' is a rather large umbrella, not to mention the 'French eighteenth century', a problematic construction encompassing Lullian and post-Lullian *tragédie lyrique* (and hence necessarily extended to the end of the seventeenth century) as well as opera ballet, opéra comique and other subgenres marked by Italian influence. Rather than offering a reappraisal of French lyric theatre in general during a broad time period, the book is centred on Framery and his involvement in Parisian theatrical life from the 1760s onwards in order to follow the evolution of opéra comique and the development of French

musical aesthetics during the last third of the eighteenth century, the revolutionary period being included up to the first decade of the nineteenth.

With this first ever monograph on Framery's literary and musical careers – the two careers were inextricably intertwined – Mark Darlow reconsiders his often underrated output and reassesses his involvement in Parisian musical life from the 1770s onwards, notably his role in introducing Italian lyric forms in France and his involvement as a librettist at the Comédie-Italienne. In other words, this book also offers new and valuable insights into Parisian musical life during and after the *Querelle des Gluckistes et des Piccinnistes*, following Framery's activities among the partisans of the anti-Gluckist Antonio Sacchini and his ambition to bring to life a new model of Gluckist reform, specifically conceived for and directed at French audiences.

With backdrops such as the *Querelle* and the reciprocal influence between spoken theatre and opéra comique and their complex generic developments, as well as the peculiar musical and theatrical aspects of the Revolutionary period, Framery deserves to be accorded more than just a walk-on part. Darlow reverses the common view: rather than proposing a general survey of Framery's multi-oriented activities that would emphasize his somewhat unflattering reputation as an *amateur*, he details his privileged position as a witness of his time, and more precisely as a sharp observer of the French lyric stage.

Framery's journalistic duties from 1770 to the end of the Revolution certainly provided him with an excellent observation post, as shown in the efficient selection of his most important articles (published in the *Journal encyclopédique*, the *Journal de Paris* and the *Mercure de France*) provided in the appendices. Framery has been best known until now as a journalist, and Darlow gives his subject more depth by devoting one of his chapters (chapter 7) to Framery's 'engaged' journalism – a facet of his work that was already evident during his editorship of the *Journal de musique* (1770–1773) – and his inclination towards musical didacticism, a rather common late eighteenth-century attitude that was widely debated during the *Querelle des Gluckistes et des Piccinnistes*, but which is reinforced here with a reformist zeal for educating the readers and improving their musical and theatrical tastes. Framery's position as a journalist also explains his progressivism in cultural administration and the views he exposed in several texts on musical and theatrical institutions (such as *De l'organisation des spectacles* (1790), and the article 'Conservatoire' in the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, volume 1 (1791)), as well as the role he played in the recently resurrected 'Société des auteurs dramatiques' (see chapter 8).

An engaged attitude is also characteristic of Framery's output as a librettist, the consideration of which is certainly the most noteworthy part of Darlow's work. Framery's librettos can be divided into two categories. The first concerns his adaptations of French stage works (an activity he maintained from 1767 to 1802). The order given to the Comédie-Italienne in 1768 to revive the *opéra-comiques en vaudevilles* allowed Framery to exercise his talents on such works, substituting new *ariettes* for the old-fashioned *vaudevilles*. Darlow has paid special attention to a hitherto unknown published libretto (with *ariettes* composed by Felicio Bambini) of Framery's revised version (premiered in 1767) of Jean-Joseph Vadé's *Nicaise*, a *comédie poissarde* with *vaudevilles* parodied from André-Cardinal Destouches's *Le carnaval et la folie*. Through this example, Darlow efficiently discusses Framery's acute perception of the evolution of opéra comique towards drama, as well as his constant care for re-adapting the rustic quality of early opéra comique (based on Favart's model of the *paysannerie*) towards a more elevated humour better suited for contemporary audiences – one that would eventually lead to the new aesthetic of *sensibilité* and the *théâtre larmoyant*.

The second category of Framery's librettos involves his 'parodies' of pre-existing Italian theatrical works, parody to be taken here not in its satirical sense but in its strict musical meaning, of writing new words to old music. Several of his parodies are carefully explained in light of a consideration of a wide array of primary sources, some previously unpublished: Paisiello's *Le due contesse* (as *Les deux comtesses*, Versailles, 1778), *La Frascatana* (as *L'infante de Zamora*, Strasbourg, 1779; Versailles, 1781; Théâtre de Monsieur, 1789) and *Il barbiere di Siviglia* (as *Le barbier de Séville*, Trianon, 1784) and three of his parodies on Sacchini's works (*La colonie, l'Olympiade ou le triomphe de l'amitié*, Comédie-Italienne, 1777; parody of *L'Olimpiade* and *Renaud ou la suite d'Armide*, Académie Royale de Musique, 1783; parody of Sacchini's own pasticcio of his *Armida*).

Darlow's welcome focus on Framery as parodist sheds new light on the links between opéra comique and the cultural function of parody, a subject still frequently underrated among eighteenth-century scholars (notably overlooked in Downing A. Thomas's *Aesthetics of Opera in the Ancien Régime: 1647–1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)). Furthermore, the practice of parody raises issues about national characteristics proper to any language and the question of its musicality. Ultimately parody helped Framery to overcome the Rousseauan credo of the impossibility of French music, the most pressing issue in the wake of Gluck's and Piccinni's impact on French musical life.

As Darlow puts it, it is not excessive to speak of 'Framery's musical doctrine' (chapter 9) in view of his late writings on music theory. The milestone is the corpus of musical articles he wrote and coedited (with Ginguené) for the first volume on music of the *Encyclopédie méthodique* (1791; the second volume was edited by Momigny and published in 1818, after the death of Framery and Ginguené). By republishing almost in full Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Dictionnaire de musique* (1767) and adding commentaries from the editors, the *Encyclopédie méthodique* is the most prominent source for the reception of Rousseau's *Dictionnaire* at the dawn of the nineteenth century. It would have considerably exceeded the dimensions of Darlow's book to provide a detailed discussion of this major case study of Rousseauan reception (and how Framery readapted Rousseau's core concept of *unité de mélodie* with the Piccinnian musical period), but at least Darlow helps to lay the foundation for forthcoming research on post-Rousseauan musical aesthetics from the late eighteenth century onwards and its implications for eighteenth-century French musical terminology, still a poorly researched subject.

Darlow's re-evaluation of Framery also aims to re-evaluate French lyric theatre of his time, by no means an overcrowded field of research in eighteenth-century musicology. Since the publication of David Charlton's *Grétry and the Growth of Opéra-Comique* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986) few substantial monographs have been published in this area. In the wake of recent publications on late eighteenth-century French lyric theatre – for example, Andrea Fabiano's *I 'buffoni' alla conquista di Parigi. Storia dell'opera tra 'Ancien Régime' e Restaurazione (1752–1815): un itinerario goldoniano* (Turin: Paravia, 1998), Alessandro Di Profio's *La révolution des Bouffons: L'opéra italien au Théâtre de Monsieur 1789–1892* (Paris: CNRS, 2003) and the late Elizabeth C. Bartlet's impressive collection of primary sources in *Etienne Nicolas Méhul and Opera: Source and Archival Studies of Lyric Theatre during the French Revolution, Consulate and Empire* (Heilbronn: Musik-Edition Lucie Galland, 1999) – Mark Darlow's monograph confirms that a new appraisal of eighteenth-century opéra comique is underway. The reader is also offered five well-stocked appendices of primary sources, including unpublished and little known texts by or concerning Framery and a critical catalogue of his works. A minor regret (expressed by Darlow himself at the end of his book) concerns the absence of discussion of Framery's French translation of Francesco Azopardi's *Il musico prattico* (1762, translated in 1786 as *Le musicien pratique*). Nevertheless, this book will contribute to renewed interest in all aspects of lyric theatre in eighteenth-century France.

JACQUELINE WAEBER

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606240545 Printed in the United Kingdom

DANIEL HEARTZ
MUSIC IN EUROPEAN CAPITALS: THE GALANT STYLE 1720–1780
New York and London: Norton, 2003
pp. xxiv + 1078, ISBN 0 393 05080 7

This book is a brilliant achievement and will remain a permanent inspiration to those who follow. For the first time, the musical eighteenth century is shown from within, being revealed as an integrated picture of

human activity, affinity, travel, influence and stylistic evolutions. Revelations occur on every page of its text, but it also emphasizes a dual structural alignment that was much needed. The first alignment is a consequence of the book's complementary role to Heartz's *Haydn, Mozart and the Viennese School 1740–1780* (New York: Norton, 1995). Released from the need to include Vienna, the new narrative swings up from Italy, through Germany and across to Paris, ending in London and Saint Petersburg, with Madrid as a codetta. A magnificent three-hundred-odd pages create our first comprehensive account of Paris and its composers, in which chamber, concert and stage music receive equal prominence, due weight and evaluation in the light of contemporary Europe. Gluck's late works form the climax. The second alignment flows simply from the internal logic and external ambitus, 1720 to 1780: if the whole project generates questions and ideas for starting a hundred new studies of all kinds, it is controlled by the single conviction that this is a periodization that respects both today's perceptions and those of its own century. As Heartz says, 'let us at least attempt to understand the *settecento* on its own terms' (xxi).

> Around 1780 there was a massive changing of the guard . . . Leaving the stage forever were Farinelli and Metastasio, Hasse and Gluck, Emanuel Bach, Jommelli and Holzbauer, Galuppi, Traetta, and Christian Bach. An era had clearly ended, one that was perceived at the time as a great musical moment, and one that could not justly be relegated to the status of a mere prelude to what followed. [1005]

While Heartz would clearly agree with a good deal of what James Webster wrote in issue 1/1 of this journal ('The Eighteenth Century as a Music-Historical Period?'), especially on page 54, the label 'galant' (unadorned) was Heartz's final choice, where Webster offered 'Enlightenment–galant'. I will return to this theme in due course.'On its own terms' is Heartz's coded rejection of theoretical speculation. In its stead there is a nexus of methodological constants, including much use of eighteenth-century writings, but these are always subsumed within the narrative itself. The language has an extraordinary transparency, unity and simplicity of shading; it conceals an exceedingly skilful control of detail and pacing, and a factual economy. More than once the suspicion arises that the style itself must reflect the very qualities of galant art. Certainly the love of poetry and painting are foregrounded. Watteau, in fact, forms the portal, as 'galant cynosure', in a steady ushering-in of themes linking taste, technique, periodization and (in a typically consummate piece of detective work) musical function in Watteau's painting *Fêtes vénitiennes*. In more than one sense the book's twelve beautiful colour plates form a central grouping, from which musical observations are reflected back at various junctures, but will also develop independently in the reader:

> The delicacy of the modeling and the airy lightness with which Gainsborough depicts the fabrics make a wonderful match with [Christian] Bach's supreme command of everything that is light and graceful in the modern music of his time. [927]

In poetry, it is Metastasio whose lines are offered as a thread along the whole length of the book: this too is because they existed inside the fabric of musical life, were interiorized by music lovers, reset, reheard, appreciated; above all because

> he was distinctive for being 'the most galant poet of all' – 'galantissimo' as Beretti Baretti put it. . . . The most salient feature of opera seria, which is virtually synonymous with Metastasian opera, was not that it epitomized courts, but that it was galant. [1003]

Music in European Capitals puts opera at the centre of musical development, opéra comique equally as central as opera seria; instrumental music is fully discussed alongside it. Only sacred music could not be covered in an equivalent way, and this was perhaps why the book could not be entitled 'History of Music in. . .': the discursive style of music history that Heartz has exploited simply made no space available.

A further word is therefore in order concerning scope and aim. It is not just Vienna that is absent, but also Rome, Leipzig and Hamburg. The presence of a significant operatic stage has determined the sequence: Naples, Venice (100 pages each), Dresden and Berlin (145 pages), Stuttgart and Mannheim (150 pages), Paris

(290 pages), London (50 pages), Saint Petersburg and Madrid (60 pages). Absolutely basic to this history is the idea of an integrated surface (*il filo*, a spun melody) within which attention to material circumstances is used to explain the promotion (or otherwise) of music. At the outset of city descriptions much emphasis is laid on the dynastic forces in play: ruling family connections across Europe and the effect of wars on specific regions. Nowhere are the levels more vividly balanced than when the story of Württemburg is told, for Carl Eugen had misused French cash to fund opera; many untrained subjects were henceforth dragged into war service in 1757 and slaughtered. 'Thus were the operatic triumphs in Stuttgart paid for in blood' (449).

Social structures become immediate reality under Heartz's pen because they are tied to people who made music and are brought to life via constant cross-referencing of detail across time and space, plus much careful use of documentary memoirs, letters and so on. He has actually developed what might be called a 'networked narrative': instead of 'thick description' we have a forward-moving account fluid enough to contain just the proper amount of such evidence. In this, two further vital factors contribute to Heartz's success: his command of detail and his deployment of four main European languages. With a bibliography of 634 books and articles (not counting his own thirty-two entries), the pool is vast. But nearly every reference prompts one to think anew, because of the acuity with which the author interprets even those documents one might have thought familiar. His eye for spotting unfamiliar witnesses is exemplary (Montesquieu, James Boswell) and equally so his eye for the passing reference. A good one, borrowed and developed from Barry S. Brook's *La symphonie française dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Université de Paris, 1962), concerns Saint-Georges's lost symphony 'that incorporated and reiterated the cadence formula of the forlana' (682), a reference lurking in the second volume of Grétry's *Mémoires*.

In a project whose origins, we are told, date back to 1975, it is noteworthy how up-to-date Heartz's secondary references are, most of them being fully integrated into the critical assessment. (Unfortunately, Bruce Gustafson's 1999 article on Mme Brillon in *Revue française de musicologie*, present on page 972, was omitted on pages 690 and 698.) In several places, Heartz's text casts him in the role of a facilitator, passing on the considered opinion of this or that expert, tacitly agreeing. When he disagrees with another authority, the topic will be confined to fact, not opinion. This nevertheless has the effect of recreating the occasional atmosphere of a Republic of Letters and promotes the subtle totality of endeavour that is not the least pleasurable aspect of a deeply pleasurable book.

Integrated with all the above levels of organization is that of musical and operatic discussions of individual pieces, assisted by musical excerpts or, on a few occasions, by complete examples. Here, too, the method is inspired by eighteenth-century approaches. A few examples are reproduced from important early sources, and consequently tell the story of Europe-wide distribution and resulting familiarity, as in the case of Hasse's aria 'Per questo dolce amplesso' (315–316). Sometimes a whole opera is recreated in descriptive terms: twelve pages are devoted to Holzbauer's *Günther von Schwarzenburg* (580), fifteen to Gluck's *Iphigénie en Aulide*. Mostly, however, accounts are shorter, allowing for representative, and long overdue, appreciations of many works by all the main stage composers. Structural and stylistic aspects (for example Heartz's own discoveries concerning the origins of the chain-finale in the collaborations of Galuppi and Goldoni) do not take an overly prominent place, but rather sit within a 'guided listening' approach. The trick was to make the detail fit within the evolving account of a musical language while also covering all the important works of a given composer at one time. This process is profoundly self-conscious, yet designed to hide all difficulties. Only once does Heartz reveal this: after translating Abbé François Arnaud's letter on *Iphigénie en Aulide*, he notes that 'it is remarkable how he succeeds with mere words in conveying a series of musical events with no text to help him – a difficult feat then and no less so today' (814).

Using, then, a mixture of descriptive tactics, Heartz plots the nature and course of European music and the galant style itself, the term being located initially in Mattheson in 1721 (18). Neither 'preclassical' nor 'rococo' plays any basic part in the discourse. Mattheson's 'galant composers' 'were all living practitioners of Italian opera around 1720', and the stylistic elements are discussed as such: in a 'simpler language' (18) than hitherto. Greater difficulties perhaps arise in codifying the subsequent stages of the style. Neither 'neoclassicism' nor 'sensibility' (subcategories of the period proposed by Webster in 'The Eighteenth

Century as a Music-Historical Period?') would fit the way the pioneering Jommelli composed new layers of complexity back into opera, a gestural, mimetic quality going together with fidgety orchestral lines and an avoidance of simple repetition. As this figurative and dramatic approach carried into the symphony, so the discussion leads into the essential work of Mannheim's first phase. But the real surprises come in Paris, where the discoveries of Barry Brook in the 1962 text already mentioned are now brought to fruition. Two masters of instrumental music are singled out for exceptional treatment. The first is Gossec, whose enormous advances (following the symphonies of François Martin and others) in the 1750s and 'full brilliance' in 1761–1762 are placed in European proportion. Indeed, it no longer seems tenable for Heartz that 'it took Stamitz and others from across the Rhine to plant the symphony in France' (649). The second is Simon Leduc: the discovery and evaluation of his music provoke some of Heartz's highest terms of praise, tempered only by a final prophecy that hints at general cultural pessimism:

> Leduc's output as a composer was modest in size, about a collection a year in the decade between his Op. 1 of 1767 and his early death. For this reason alone he will never be accorded major status, nor perhaps even the status of many prolific but mediocre composers who came before and after him. [671]

Leduc and Gossec, in their expressive organization, including command of structural forms of chromaticism which are duly expounded, 'moved . . . beyond the limits of the earlier galant style, to what is best called its second phase. Mozart would do so only later, and Leduc was perhaps one of the sympathetic spirits who was inspired enough to show him the way' (670).

There is also a second sense in which French composers help define this new 'phase'. It is in the exploitation of 'richer harmonies' (755), latterly seen in *Le sorcier* (1764) by Philidor. The quoted observer of these harmonies was J. A. Hiller in *Wöchentliche Nachrichten*. Philidor also benefited from knowledge of Gluck's *Orfeo*, as is well known, but not in order to change his own already formed language. In summing up, Heartz addresses this 'second phase' again (1003–1004), quoting Marpurg in support of opinions of the time raised in favour of 'some traits borrowed from counterpoint' to be added to 'the so-called galant way of writing'. Sacchini, Piccinni and Traetta, 'in enriching the harmonic language of Italian opera', created 'enhancements', says Heartz, that 'can be regarded as a second phase of the galant style'. But at the same time there were solid opponents to such changes. Regarding Paris, a string of powerful minor-mode instrumental works was established prior to those better known from Vienna (658). For my money, these new aspects of such a 'second phase' can be seen as a fresh impulse imported from the world of dance and ballet-pantomime; as is well known, the craze for dance, waxing in the 1740s, reached enormous proportions by the 1760s. Dancers criss-crossed Europe; dance was viewed alongside opera and helped determine reactions to it; Noverre was at his first peak of eminence. Instrumental music had sung, danced, drawn pictures and characters (22); now it 'gestured' in direct metaphorical strokes.

A rebalancing of our thinking about musical style must surely flow from Heartz's new book, even though he is hesitant about 'nam[ing] the constructions in his world', as Webster urges musicologists to do ('The Eighteenth Century as a Music-Historical Period?', 55). One reason that Webster's offering of '*c*1740/1750 to *c*1815/1830' (57) clashes with Heartz's rebalancing lies basically in a contrast between which genre groups are privileged. Heartz's periodization, which (incidentally) follows not only that of William S. Newman (*The Sonata in the Classic Era* (New York: Norton, 1972), 119–123) but also that of Homer Ulrich and Paul A. Pisk (*A History of Music and Musical Style* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1963)), is justified in his book by the centrality of opera seria and the Metastasian sensibility and its outgrowth of comic opera, including mature opéra comique. But at the same time the implied impossibility of imposing a single view of style upon a modern period is built into the dialectical opposition offered by the notion of the city – that is, local conditions – creating musical/stylistic variances. There is an attractive tension in this. Its solution points towards more adequate naming and other constructions than those afforded by privileging one single city (for example 'Vienna'), especially in connection with one category or label (even 'modernism', which carries a useful quality of reaction to whatever precedes it). Other great cities, such as Paris, will produce other

crucial styles of 'modernism' or innovation, which are sometimes exported. Even Newman opted for structural plurality, in proposing that *Empfindsam* (as he defines it) was 'a special case', namely a geographically focused special case, within the galant fold. Dahlhaus did something similar when he accepted French Revolutionary opera into the romantic fold, and when he asserted that 'Viennese classical music is not representative of European music of the time' (*Nineteenth-Century Music*, trans. J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 19–20).

What is not covered, then, in Heartz's book? I have mentioned the generally small space allotted to sacred music; even so, there are five pages on Pergolesi's *Stabat mater*. Holzbauer's masses are praised (552) but not analysed. Even Graun's *Der Tod Jesu* is cursorily included (366). The *grand motet* is defined very briefly (634) in the course of discussing Mondonville's fine series, but as there is no index of terms, the location may remain concealed to the casual reader. Definitions in general are indeed at risk for this reason. Pergolesi's 'Se cerca, se dice' (so memorably expounded by Heartz) 'thwarts da capo repetition'; thus Metastasio 'helped to free musicians from one of the "tyrannies" he had done so much to enforce' (117). But I do not think that the da capo principle has yet been discussed. On page 367, 'An explanation is in order. The full da capo aria is . . .'. Here it would also have been useful to have a more prosaic illustration of 'the full five-part da capo form'. On page 366 'Graun is at his most *empfindsam*' in the 'Gethsemane' recitative of *Der Tod Jesu*. However, this style category would be hard to trace across the book as a whole.

In a study pivoted on opera, the notion of the Italian opera 'season' rarely features. For stage management, production and visual elements of opera seria, readers should consult Bianconi and others, *History of Italian Opera*. For musical specifics, they should read Heartz. Some readers might object that certain aspects of practical music-making are hard to isolate. Musical instruments are discussed from time to time, for example the piano (and the pantaleon), but not in every case (the clavichord is never discussed as a vehicle of the galant). Readers would have been grateful for many more internal cross-references: to take two cases at random, between pages 117 and 461 (Caldara) and pages 602 and 653 (on Gossec). Rarely, though, is there a sense that anything is missing, as it can be found, conjecturally, in Heartz's companion volume, *Haydn, Mozart and the Viennese School*. Gluck's *Orfeo* is one such case. Another is 'Sporck's opera theatre' (510), never explained, and the man himself not indexed.

Instead, different topics are explored throughout: key associations; the poetry of Metastasio; the modernism of Vinci; the relation between bourgeois city life and the growth of ensemble music in Milan and Berlin (240, 413); the circulation of music and musicians, and also patrons; the connection between opera and statecraft. Most originally, we see (and hear) the many musical cells and nuclei that went into the formation of complete works by Holzbauer, Simon Leduc, Johann Stamitz, J. C. Bach, Mozart and so on. The 'networked narrative' continues over into networked music examples too. One such example is Mozart's probable tribute to his late friend, the 'London' Bach: K414/ii (see 928). This particular music epitomizes a 'wedge' design whose part-writing has been followed, as a galant trait, all through the book. Thus *Music in European Capitals* is also the history of a certain musical sensibility as manifest in the minute shadings of an apparently straightforward, but highly sophisticated style: 'I propose . . . to restore honor to the concept "artificial" ', Heartz explains (xxi). The use of Mozart at this point justifies the association of the style with the period as defined. When eruptions of a different sort of view of nature appeared in mid-century, they did not exactly displace the ethos of 'artifice as a substitute for nature': nature simply became less benign, and more individually human.

I have certainly not emphasized enough in this review the fineness of Heartz's observations of musical detail and of word-setting; nor have I sufficiently emphasized his enviable, encyclopedic knowledge of sometimes extensive scores, from which he has identified salient features. Furthermore, these observations are regularly supported by eighteenth-century criteria. And I have left mention until last of another of Heartz's guiding threads: the writings of Charles Burney, indeed 'the lodestar of this volume' (xxi), who helped solve this great unfathomed aspect of eighteenth-century music (not that there aren't more to fathom). Twenty-first century musicology is well advised to communicate with the whole network of

cultural landmarks bequeathed to us. The result here is a musicalization of music history that says: every fact of music history lies within the quality of language that creates it.

DAVID CHARLTON

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606250541 Printed in the United Kingdom

RAINER KLEINERTZ
GRUNDZÜGE DES SPANISCHEN MUSIKTHEATERS IM 18. JAHRHUNDERT. ÓPERA, COMEDIA UND ZARZUELA
Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 2003
2 vols, pp. viii + 339 and 328, ISBN 3 935004 74 5

In recent years there has been a remarkable increase in the amount of research into musical theatre in eighteenth-century Spain. The subject has inspired a number of different approaches from musicologists as well as from historians and philologists. Thus far, however, no study has taken a broad view of the evolution of musical theatre during this period in Spain. This gap in the secondary literature has been narrowed by the new two-volume study under review.

The work stems from a perceived need to update the state of knowledge concerning Spanish musical theatre in the eighteenth century, above all in reference to the fluctuating relationship between Italian and 'national' – or Spanish – styles. The antagonism between these styles assumed considerable importance in Spanish musicology under the influence of philologist Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, for whom Italian opera was categorically identified with the royal court and with foreigners. By contrast, the *zarzuela* has been celebrated as a 'national' genre ever since the work of Emilio Cotarelo y Mori in the early twentieth century (*Orígenes y establecimiento de la opera en España hasta 1800* (Madrid, 1917) and *Historia de la zarzuela o sea el drama lírico en España, desde su origen a fines del siglo XIX* (Madrid, 1934)). This dichotomy led some Spanish musicologists to propose a nationalist view, according to which the influence of the Italian style is contrary to the 'essence' of Spanish music. Only in the second half of the eighteenth century, so goes the argument, was this essence fully realized, with the advent of genres such as the *zarzuela costumbrista* and *tonadilla escénica*.

Although this point of view remained influential throughout the twentieth century, it became increasingly obvious that the perceived antagonism between Italian and Spanish styles was largely a product of nationalist prejudices. This has led in recent years to a realization that the modern understanding of eighteenth-century Spanish musical theatre is in need of serious revision. A number of more recent studies have sought to address this need, including William M. Bussey's *French and Italian Influence on the Zarzuela 1700–1770* (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1982), and a volume of essays edited by Malcolm Boyd and Juan José Carreras entitled *Music in Spain during the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). In addition, several interesting papers were presented at the 1994 *Simposio Internacional Salamanca*, the proceedings of which were published as *Teatro y música en España (siglo XVIII)*, ed. Rainer Kleinertz (Kassel and Berlin: Reichenberger, 1996).

The present work by Kleinertz, however, is the first monograph to attempt a global view of Spanish theatre according to the new, less reactionary, criteria. It does so from two complementary angles. On the one hand, the author aims to show that no genre can itself be exclusively associated with the royal court or with popular theatre, further dispelling the myth that the different genres developed independently of one another. On the other hand, he shows that the change of dynasty at the beginning of the eighteenth century and the corresponding loss of Italian territories did not initiate a cultural and musical decline in Spain, but rather a political and cultural process of increasing integration with the rest of continental Europe. In fact,

this second aim is completely in line with recent (and not so recent) studies of other aspects of eighteenth-century Spanish culture – including philosophy, science and literature – which demonstrate that the integration begins even before the start of the Bourbon dynasty. That Kleinertz is so determined in this aim demonstrates the urgency of bringing musicological studies into step with important developments in other fields.

It must be emphasized that this study is not intended to be comprehensive: rather it seeks to outline the *Grundzüge* or general trends of the period. To this end, Kleinertz focuses on the study of five selected works of the so-called *teatro mayor* (major theatre: opera, *comedia* and *zarzuela*). While the concentration on the *teatro mayor* provides a firm basis for comparison with similar works, the individual examples are chosen as being musically and ideologically representative, particularly with respect to their relationships with contemporary historical and political events.

The first chapter sets out to show that the new court of Phillip V encouraged the introduction of foreign elements within a traditional Spanish background very early in its history. Kleinertz does so through a study of *Los desagravios de Troya*, written in 1712 by Martínez de la Roca to a libretto by Juan Francisco Escuder. The work demonstrates a mixture of national styles, not only implicitly in the plot, the dramaturgy and the presence of operatic scenes, but also explicitly in the two interludes: one of them involves a competition between French, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish music in which the Spanish style ultimately prevails precisely because of its ability to relate to and integrate with other national idioms.

In the second chapter, 'Spanische Oper "...im italienischen Stil": *Amor es todo invención: Júpiter y Amphitrión*' (1721), the author examines the contexts of the first Spanish operas to be presented at the Madrid court, around 1720. These operas attempted a deliberate synthesis between Italian music supplied by Italian composers employed at court and Spanish texts written by Spanish poets. The work in the title is the first completely preserved opera from this time, the music written in 1721 by the Italian Giacomo Facco to a libretto by Spanish dramatist José de Cañizares. Kleinertz uses this example to explore what he sees as a reciprocal relationship between dramatic and musical forms. Nevertheless, as he notes, this sort of Spanish opera 'in Italian style' was not exclusive to the court: during the removal of the court to Seville from 1729 to 1733 Spanish opera became much more important for the aristocratic-bourgeois audiences of Madrilenian public theatres. Furthermore, there were other factors that contributed to the increasing Italian influence in Madrid, such as the opening of the Teatro de los Caños del Peral in 1735 and the arrival of Farinelli at the court in 1737. The negative corollary of this exposure, meanwhile, was the almost complete disappearance of the *zarzuela*, a genre that, with its archaic, mythological or religious subjects, had previously been a staple of the popular theatrical market.

One of the most interesting aspects of Kleinertz's study is his explanation, in chapter 3, of the gradual adaptation of Metastasian *dramma per musica* in 1730s Spain. Rejecting the traditional view that Italian opera was simply implanted, intact, into the Spanish theatre, he traces a gradual process of assimilation through a comparison of original Metastasian librettos and their Spanish versions. The earliest examples were not simply translations into Spanish; rather they were significant reworkings that attempted to conform to the tastes of the Spanish public (for example, the three acts of Metastasian librettos were transformed, according to the typical division of Spanish operas, into two-act works). Kleinertz shows that such changes disappeared gradually, so that the first Metastasian opera to be given in Italian (*Demetrio*, with music by Johann Adolf Hasse, in 1738) did not represent something strikingly new so much as the end product of a logical process of assimilation that started with traditional forms of Spanish opera.

Nevertheless, the ascendancy of Italian opera had at least one surprising consequence: because of the end of the competition between *zarzuela* and opera seria in the 1730s, the *zarzuela* underwent something of a renaissance, albeit heavily influenced by the ubiquitous Italian opera seria. This issue is explored in chapter 4, 'Zarzuela und Dramma per musica: *Donde hay violencia no hay culpa*' (1744), through a study of Nicolás González Martínez's *zarzuela* of that name, with music composed by José de Nebra. This work contains some Italian elements (including the plot itself and the use of the da capo aria), but just as important are Spanish characteristics such as the presence of comic characters (the *graciosos*) in a tragic plot.

After the *drammi per musica*, the next great Italian influence was the *dramma giocoso* with text by Carlo Goldoni, which first appeared after the death of Fernando VI in 1759. The most obvious consequence was the appearance of some *zarzuelas* mixing an Italian structure with a characteristically Spanish plot. These works, known as *zarzuelas costumbristas*, were understood as a form of nationalist retaliation against foreign influence. Nevertheless, Kleinertz points out Italian features in two of these new *zarzuelas*. In Chapter 5, 'Die Rückbesinnung auf Spanien, oder Arkadien und Aufklärung in Aranjuez*: Los jardineros de Aranjuez*', he explains how Pablo Esteve followed Piccini's example in his 1768 work, combining the formal structure of *dramma giocoso* with typical Spanish dramaturgy. Then in chapter 6 Kleinertz focuses on the famous *zarzuela burlesca* entitled *Las labradoras de Murcia* (1769), a 'Dramma giocoso in spanischem Gewand' written by Ramón de la Cruz with music by Antonio Rodríguez de Hita. This work has been defined as a model Spanish (and indeed anti-foreign) *zarzuela*, yet Kleinertz detects in it a strong Italian influence, namely the dramaturgical and formal features of the *dramma giocoso*. The only differences between the two genres are the spoken dialogue of the *zarzuela* and the differing situations and costumes.

Kleinertz's rigorous study of a fascinating subject thus represents a timely revision of attitudes towards eighteenth-century Spanish musical theatre. His *Grundzüge* provide valuable insights into this rather specialized field, and also serve as a useful introduction to the study of other closely related genres, such as the so-called *teatro menor* (minor theatre): the *sainete* and *tonadilla*. One criticism is that Kleinertz's approach is heavily focused on Madrid and the activity around the Bourbon court, in spite of wide recognition among scholars that opera was cultivated in other Spanish cities as well, including Cádiz, Barcelona and Valencia. While it is true that the lack of sources (above all scores) causes considerable problems in this respect, a more panoramic view of this subject would necessarily consider not only the relevance of musical theatre in other cities and provincial centres, but also the importance of the circulation of music and musicians among them.

Volume two of Kleinertz's book provides the first edited catalogue of musical works associated with the eighteenth-century Spanish theatre and will be an essential research tool for all scholars working in this area. While it contains no descriptions of the sources according to ISBD or RISM standards, it is still extremely useful: works are comprehensively identified according to title, genre, author of music and text, date of performance and location of sources (music and libretto). Bibliographical references are given, and many entries also provide textual incipits. One minor problem is incoherence with respect to genre: the catalogue seems to be focused on the *teatro mayor* but includes, without comment, isolated examples from the *teatro menor*. A more explicit explanation of the selection criteria would have been welcome.

In summary, this is an important contribution to the study and diffusion of eighteenth-century Spanish musical theatre and an ideal starting-point for future studies. The inclusion of an outline of the book's arguments in Spanish is most welcome, as it will increase its accessibility to scholars working on Spanish topics.

AURÈLIA PESARRODONA

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606260548 Printed in the United Kingdom

SIEGBERT RAMPE, ED.

BACH: DAS WOHLTEMPERIERTE KLAVIER I: TRADITION, ENTSTEHUNG, FUNKTION, ANALYSE. ULRICH SIEGELE ZUM 70. GEBURTSTAG

Munich and Salzburg: Katzbichler, 2002
pp. 520, ISBN 3 87397 145 3

In 2000, as we commemorated the two-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the death of J. S. Bach, a host of symposia and conferences were organized around the world that focused on the composer's life and works. While I participated in four of these, there were at least another five that I was unable to attend. The book

under review arose from one of the latter group – a symposium on the *Well-Tempered Clavier* (*WTC*), Book I – held in October 2000 in Cöthen, the town where the work was conceived. It contains eleven articles – nine from the symposium (out of thirteen given) plus two articles that were not presented there.

As the subtitle 'Tradition, Origin, Function and Analysis' suggests, it attempts to cover a wide range of topics with one curious omission: issues relating to performance practice. The omission of this popular and often controversial area of discussion was deliberate, as the editor explains in the preface, given the explicit focus of the symposium. Performers will still find this volume of interest, as there are papers that deal with performance-related issues. Dominik Sackmann, for example, explores issues of style in the preludes, viewed in historical perspective, while Don Franklin examines aspects of pulse in the time signatures Bach employed.

The book opens with two contrasting source studies which show noticeable advances in research since Alfred Dürr published the critical report for the *WTC* in the *Neue Bach-Ausgabe* (1989). The first article, by Kirsten Beißwenger, paints a fascinating picture of Bach, his students and the *WTC* by concentrating on the background of the surviving manuscript copies that were produced during Bach's lifetime. She offers some interesting answers to puzzles such as why the *WTC* was not published, why Altnickol copied *WTC*, Book 2, twice, and why his later version (1755) was not copied from his earlier one (1744). An important focus for her paper is identifying one of the anonymous scribes (usually labelled 'Vr' or '12') as Elisabeth Juliana Friederica, one of Bach's daughters, who later married Altnickol. The circumstantial evidence she assembles is strong and convincing (though in light of more recent research by Peter Wollny, Beißwenger told me in a private communication that she now thinks the identity of the scribe is again open to question.)

The next article, by Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen, surveys a wide range of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century editions of the *WTC*. As an overview of the reception history of the work this is a fascinating paper, as this issue has been frequently over-simplified by concentrating on the widespread impact of a single edition by Carl Czerny (1837). By considering and classifying a broad selection of editions – as analytical or performance oriented, or as arrangements or paraphrases – Hinrichsen creates a more holistic view of how Bach's *WTC* was received during that time. I agree, for example, that Chopin, in his arrangement of keys in the Op. 28 Preludes, did not intend to deviate from Bach's order, as is often claimed, but simply followed a trend established by Imbault in Paris *c*1801. But Hinrichsen ignores the textual issues that are also important to any discussion of the reception history of the work. The question of Neefe's possible role in introducing the so-called 'Schwencke's bar' (that is, an extra C minor 6/4 chord inserted between bars 22 and 23 of the opening prelude of *WTC*, Book I) is a case in point: as this extra bar appears in many nineteenth-century editions, there is little excuse for not investigating it properly. A more in-depth, systematic study of nineteenth-century editions than is attempted here will surely reveal many more interesting details about the role that each of them played in the activities of professional and amateur musicians at a time when the reputation of Bach and his works was spreading quickly around the world.

Among the remaining articles, I found Rampe's on the social history and function of *WTC*, Book I to be most enlightening. Even allowing for overlaps with Beißwenger's and Thomas Synofzik's papers, Rampe's argument is both powerful and refreshing. The enigmatic title that Bach chose for this work has often been debated with respect to tuning systems, the establishment of tonality, the reaction by Bach's contemporaries, instruments, keyboard lessons and so on. But Rampe revisits all these possibilities with fresh insight as a result of more comprehensive knowledge of the historical context in which Bach worked than hitherto witnessed.

The volume concludes with a massive 150-page contribution by Ulrich Siegele, who received this volume as a festschrift commemorating his seventieth birthday. In this paper he attempts to categorize the formal construction of the fugues of *WTC* in ways that reveal new information about Bach's compositional plan and techniques. Siegele's longstanding engagement in this research area is well known; to my knowledge, this is the most comprehensive piece he has produced. Siegele's technical inspections of Bach's contrapuntal art are impressively thorough. While I was not surprised to read that Bach most likely conceived both parts of the

WTC as a 'work', I was struck by Siegele's observation that Bach left some unresolved problems of fugal technique in *WTC*, Book I which prompted him to write *WTC*, Book II.

YO TOMITA

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606270544 Printed in the United Kingdom

MATTHEW RILEY
MUSICAL LISTENING IN THE GERMAN ENLIGHTENMENT: ATTENTION, WONDER AND ASTONISHMENT
Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004
pp. ix + 188, ISBN 0 7546 3267 9

In *Musical Listening in the German Enlightenment* Matthew Riley has taken on the task of investigating eighteenth-century ideas about appropriate ways of listening to music by focusing on the recurring notion of 'attention' (*Aufmerksamkeit*) in the writings of a handful of German philosophers and theorists. This is not a book about audience behaviour, as is James H. Johnson's *Listening in Paris* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), for example, with its orientation towards reception history. Rather it takes what might at first be viewed as a more traditional approach: disregarding the recorded or inferred responses of lay listeners, it explores the ideas of writers who are experts in music, as well as those we might call philosophers of art, to discover a set of late eighteenth-century assumptions about musical experience that prepared the way for nineteenth-century attitudes. As Riley points out in his Introduction, it has often been assumed that the aesthetic importance of 'serious' musical listening emerged only in the nineteenth century and that eighteenth-century thinkers, like the presumably rather frivolous concert-going public, regarded the music they heard as 'mere entertainment'. One of the solid achievements of his work is to demonstrate the falsity of this generalization: however an individual listener may have approached the music in a concert performance, a significant number of critics and theorists – and, one might infer, many musicians as well – stressed the importance of 'attentive' listening to music. As he also shows, their ideas are not simple adumbrations of later ones, but occupy a territory distinct from both the mechanistic model of the previous century and the intense self-absorption of the following one.

In a search for the roots of the nineteenth-century ideal of musical experience, historians have tended to focus primarily on one of two identifiable groups, early and mid-eighteenth-century British writers mostly affiliated with the so-called Scottish Enlightenment, and the German Romantics who wrote in the years around 1800. The work of earlier German writers has been mined for a rather different purpose, primarily to gain insight into instrumental music of the classical period by studying contemporaneous views of the craft of musical composition. Johann Georg Sulzer, for instance, to whom Riley dedicates an entire chapter, is best known for the article in his comprehensive dictionary of the arts describing the ideal attributes of the symphony. This book follows quite a different path. Taking Johann Nikolaus Forkel's writings from the last two decades of the eighteenth century as his end point, Riley looks at the German philosophical tradition that undergirds and leads to Forkel's sometimes puzzling statements relating both to composition and to listening. In the process of elucidating the relevant ideas, especially those of Christian Wolff, Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten, Georg Friedrich Meier, Sulzer and finally Forkel himself, he paints a largely coherent picture of the development of a few concepts basic to a shared ideal of good listening. At the same time, however, he sometimes weakens the thrust of his narrative by introducing tangential issues that diffuse his central argument about attention.

At least for a reader (like this reviewer) possessed of only a passing familiarity with German philosophy in the first half of the eighteenth century, the first of the five chapters is the most illuminating as well as the most successfully realized. After pointing out the evident importance of the concept of attention to musical

composition, first in Forkel's 1788 comments about the diversity of 'the figures for the attention' and then in Sulzer's (and Kirnberger's) discussion of the *Hauptsatz* (1771 and 1778), the chapter sets out to trace the significance of attention in philosophical writings beginning with Descartes's foundational *Discours de la Méthode* (1637). For Descartes, certain knowledge can be achieved only in an 'attentive' state of mind that eliminates all prior prejudice in order to focus clearly on the question at hand. Wolff, whose ideas were closely allied with those of his predecessor Leibniz, continued to stress the essential role (first articulated by Descartes) of 'clear' ideas (ones that present themselves directly to the mind), and he put particular emphasis on the importance of making those ideas 'distinct' (clearly distinguishing their component parts, a process that requires a sustained use of the faculty of attention). While Baumgarten, who initiated the philosophical inquiry into what he called 'aesthetics', worked within Wolff's larger framework, his concern with the sensory perception of artworks led him to place a new value on ideas (or representations) that are clear but indistinct, or 'confused', which we grasp as a whole all at once without distinguishing the component parts. It was Baumgarten's student Meier who gave attention an essential role in the perception of the 'clear but confused' representations of artworks: 'The attention is the single faculty through which ideas become clear, and the degree of clarity is always proportional to the degree of attention' (Meier, quoted on page 15).

Building on the concept of attention thus established, and almost as a postscript, Riley dissects important late eighteenth-century modifications of the mimetic principle of unified sentiment within a piece. He follows this analysis with a discussion of the controversy surrounding the role in musical composition of rhetoric – which is certainly prominent in Forkel's work – and finally of the ambiguous attitudes towards 'wonder' and 'astonishment' that run through the century. Both these sentiments present difficulties: they represent extreme instances of attention, but of an involuntary rather than a voluntary sort, and thus deprive the mind of the very freedom of thought exercised by the (voluntary) attention.

Each of the next three chapters is devoted to a single music critic, beginning with a brief discussion of Rousseau (entitled 'Interlude') and going on to more extended treatments of Sulzer and Forkel. Rousseau's ideas present seemingly insurmountable obstacles to easy summary, and Riley has not succeeded much better than might be expected. This famously nonconformist French writer often seems to have contradicted himself, or at best simply to have ignored his own earlier pronouncements on a given issue, so that a clear and logical exposition of his ideas is necessarily selective. In this case, Riley seems chiefly concerned with the dictum requiring 'unity of melody', which he convincingly represents – despite his relatively superficial understanding of Rousseau's work – as an essential means of focusing the listener's attention. Rousseau seems far outside the German framing of the issue of attention, however, and it is not ultimately clear why he is injected into the discussion. Sulzer, on the other hand, is very much part of that tradition; yet any analysis of his ideas faces imposing challenges. Because his most important work, *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*, is in dictionary form, it is necessarily somewhat diffuse in its discussions of fundamental concepts, a problem only made worse by the uncertain role played by Kirnberger (and later Johann Abraham Peter Schulz) in shaping the music entries. Sulzer's aim, furthermore, seems to have been less to put forth striking new ideas and more to reconcile and codify those that were then current. Riley meets the challenges remarkably well, and his discussion is consistently interesting, but much of it seems relevant to the idea of attention only in its deepest underpinnings. The chapter on Forkel that follows further diffuses the narrative: as is explained this time at the outset, much of the material here does not pertain directly to the issue of attention, but merely to Forkel's ideas about the listeners of his day; and the final section on attention concedes that his approach is very different from the earlier ones of Meier and Sulzer.

Rather than consolidating the various strands of this account, the final chapter seems virtually to change the subject. Entitled 'Elements of a Rhetoric of Attention', it begins with a discussion of musical periodicity that indicates some points of correspondence between ideas about period structure and attention, but starts with the surprising assertion that 'the means for arousing the attention will be identified with the rules for ensuring a comprehensible period structure' (121). The remainder of the chapter is devoted to a summary and discussion of Forkel's musical rhetoric, including some of his analyses of music by Georg Benda and C. P. E. Bach, in which again attention plays an almost incidental role. Like a number of earlier shorter

discussions, this one is both useful and interesting, but seems not to belong to this particular book. Riley's larger project, to trace ideas about listening to music in the eighteenth century, was surely too ambitious for a book of relatively modest size; but he has fallen short of his announced aim of constructing a focused account of the role of attention in that larger history. The account he has written remains somewhat diffuse, with an often troublesome lack of integration among its various parts. Yet nearly all these parts expose ideas of interest to any student of eighteenth-century musical thought, ideas that have not been so clearly discussed before; and the very multiplicity of references that often blurs the focus of this argument offers a wealth of possibilities for further investigation. Riley has not written the definitive work on listening in the eighteenth century, but he has provided new insights into many of the questions that we continue to ask.

JANE R. STEVENS

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606280540 Printed in the United Kingdom

DAVID TUNLEY
FRANÇOIS COUPERIN AND 'THE PERFECTION OF MUSIC'
Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004
pp. 172, ISBN 0 7546 0928 6

In the Introduction to his new book David Tunley explains that it 'is both a second edition and a new publication' (vii), being a reworking and an expansion of his well known BBC Music Guide to Couperin. He has taken the title from the composer's own words: 'the bringing together of French and Italian styles must create musical perfection' (in *L'Apothéose composé à la mémoire de l'incomparable Monsieur de Lully*, 1725). The author views Couperin's complete output from this point of view. That this output is very small is clear from the list of works given in an Appendix at the end of the book. The book itself is short, the text being only a hundred and twenty pages, including many music examples, but, like Couperin, David Tunley does not waste space. The remaining pages include valuable appendices. Couperin's music is perhaps the most concentrated of any ever written; as Tunley puts it, 'how much he suggests by a single, penetrating glance' (19). Again like Couperin, the author's writing is a model of clarity. Like Wilfrid Mellers before him in his classic *François Couperin and the French Classical Tradition* (London: Dobson, 1950; revised edition London: Faber, 1987), the author's great love of the music rings from every page and is inspiring. This book will surely stimulate interest in a composer whose music Tunley justifiably feels is not widely enough known.

With his knowledge of the French *air de cour* David Tunley is in an ideal position to give an illuminating explanation of the roots of the French style, with all its rhythmic implications, implications that apply to French composers well beyond the eighteenth century. This section of the book should help to allay the fears of those performers who are afraid of tackling French music, particularly Couperin's. Unlike so many admirably scholarly books written today, this one is an invaluable guide to performers, including those of us who have lived with this music for many years. Knowledge of the effect of Italian music and Couperin's subtle adaptation of it enhances a performer's understanding; it is unfortunate, though, that one of the examples from Corelli has been shorn of some top notes (45).

The opening chapter, on 'Couperin and his Times', gives an excellent introduction for the general reader to the composer's background and includes a good thumbnail sketch of Lully and his all-important position in France. In the short summary of Couperin's life and character Couperin comes more vividly alive than is usually the case – a man who took part in the 'vital life of Paris in its many guises' (3), but a man who was defensive and averse to criticism and who suffered from 'a degree of personal insecurity' (4).

With reference to the organ masses, issued by Ballard in 1690, one of the appendices is devoted to the relevant section of the Paris Ceremonial, 'when the organ is to be played, when the notes of the plainsong are to be played, when the organ is to be played expressively, seriously, smoothly, sweetly and harmoniously, in order to move clergy and people to greater devotion' (151; Martin Sonnet, *Priest* (Paris, 1662), 534–539). Tunley feels that this document has sometimes been misinterpreted, and therefore goes into detail on the all-important registrations and Couperin's use of plainchants. These early compositions are 'in the pure style of the French tradition he inherited as a boy' (57). This is not true of Couperin's vocal sacred music. In his comparisons of the French and Italian styles Tunley investigates differences between setting French words and Italian or Latin, the effect of the words on the melodic line and, by implication, the style. His vivid section on the motets makes the reader wonder why these works are so rarely performed. He provides complete texts and translations in an Appendix for the more widely known *Leçons de ténèbres* (1713–1717). His implication, moreover, that Le Cerf de la Viéville's diatribe against opera singers being engaged to perform at the Holy Week celebrations at 'a well-known convent' (66) applies to Couperin's *Leçons de ténèbres*, 'with their highly emotional texts', could help put an end to what one reviewer recently called the 'pallid' performances of these wonderful works.

The chapter on the chamber music once again makes us wonder why these works are so seldom performed. A clue is perhaps given in the section on the secular vocal music. When speaking of the earthy canons Tunley says that they 'help to round out Couperin's personality for us, giving us perhaps a more human quality than is suggested by his aristocratic art' (97). The 'aristocratic art' of the chamber music often disguises the 'human quality' of the movements to which an audience would respond.

With the final chapter we reach the harpsichord music and Tunley again laments the fact that, aside from a handful of pieces, this is not widely known. Other writers have, of course, introduced Couperin's predecessors and their harpsichord music, but Tunley provides more on French harpsichords than is usually given. Here he gets confused about the coupler and Couperin's instructions for uncoupling it. Regarding the titles of the pieces he says that 'much lies beneath the surface' but questions whether 'at our distance' they are 'truly significant' (109). This is somewhat contradictory, since the pieces are significant only if what is 'beneath the surface' is understood. His references to them are literal and pay no attention to their multi-layered implications, and thus miss the vital human element. He also muddles several of them, saying that 'La Milordine' refers to the Duchess of Berwick (who is 'La Nanète') (42), confusing Jacobines and Jacobites in 'Les Culbuttes Jxcxbxnxs' (111) and placing 'Le Gazouillement' in the First Ordre, when it belongs in the Sixth (109). (Incidentally, he also confuses Marguerite Louise Couperin with Marguerite Antoinette when speaking of the singers in the motets (60).) But these are minor quibbles. He writes of the various forms of the harpsichord pieces, and in an Appendix gives descriptions, albeit rather over-simplified ones, of the most common dances. The other Appendices contain all Couperin's Prefaces with original texts and translations and Titon du Tillet's entry on Couperin in *Le Parnasse françois* (1732), with an accompanying translation.

So many of Tunley's observations highlight the supreme problem Couperin presents for performers and consequently for listeners and underline the reasons why his music is not more widely known today. At the very beginning of the book he explains: 'there is perhaps a tendency to regard Couperin's music as over-refined and precious', but 'we should not imagine for a moment that Couperin's music is merely a mirror of what we tend, erroneously, to imagine was an artificially elegant – almost inhuman – society' (18). He goes on to say that 'Couperin must have felt as deeply as any man' (19). When writing of the *Leçons de ténèbres* he explains that Couperin 'finds an intensity of expression not usually associated with eighteenth-century French music' (70). And yet his final sentence – 'If his music is couched in a language of infinite refinement, we are so much the better for it' (118) – seems contradictory, and dangerously leads us back to the 'over-refined and precious' world he wisely urges us to avoid. Yet Couperin's technique *is* infinitely refined, as is Corelli's, the composer he worshipped. But with Corelli we are not searching for a hidden world, but a world inhabited by real people. In portraying these characters Couperin raises them to a universal plane. Even the dances in the chamber music are danced by real people and the intensity of the sacred motets is felt

by real people. Couperin is perhaps the most acute observer of human nature there has ever been, and if this were more widely recognized and communicated, his music would be more widely appreciated. David Tunley's eminently readable and easily comprehensible book should indeed contribute to that wider appreciation.

JANE CLARK

EDITIONS

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606290547 Printed in the United Kingdom

MUZIO CLEMENTI, SYMPHONY NO. 1 IN C MAJOR, WO32

ED. MANUEL DE COL AND MASSIMILIANO SALA

Bologna: Ut Orpheus Edizioni, 2003 (Muzio Clementi: *Opera Omnia*, Volume 56)
pp. xv+138, ISMN M 2153 0860 2

Clementi is not readily associated with orchestral composition. Most of his output consists of keyboard music, including sonatas, large-scale pedagogical works like the *Gradus ad Parnassum*, Op. 44, many miscellaneous compositions and some chamber music with piano. Nevertheless, orchestral composition was something Clementi took very seriously, especially in the second half of his career. Clive Bennett estimates that he composed 'probably more than twenty' symphonies 'over a period of almost thirty years' ('Clementi as Symphonist', *The Musical Times* 120 (March 1979), 207). The most obvious contribution of any new edition of any orchestral work by Clementi is that it leads to a more rounded, less 'keyboard-centric', vision of the composer.

Manuel De Col's and Massimiliano Sala's edition of Clementi's Symphony No. 1 in C major, WO32, belongs to a sixty-volume urtext edition of the composer's complete output, coinciding approximately with the two-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of his birth in 1752. The anniversary also provided the catalyst for two book-length studies of Clementi and his music, the multi-author, multi-lingual *Muzio Clementi: Studies and Prospects* (Bologna: Ut Orpheus Edizioni, 2002), edited by Roberto Illiano, Luca Sala and Massimiliano Sala, and Anselm Gerhard's *London und der Klassizismus in der Musik: die Idee der "absoluten Musik" und Muzio Clementis Klavierwerke* (Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler, 2002). Research into Clementi and the dissemination of his works are, moreover, advancing at unprecedented rates.

Clementi is not strongly associated with orchestral composition for the simple reason that very little of his orchestral music has survived. Two of his symphonies were published during his lifetime, as Op. 18 No. 1 in B flat and No. 2 in D in 1787, but Clementi went on to produce most of his important orchestral compositions during the first two decades of the nineteenth century. At this time performances of Clementi's symphonies were frequent, both in England and on the Continent, with critical reactions ranging from favourable to enthusiastic – something that did much to strengthen Clementi's international standing.

Apart from Op. 18, none of Clementi's orchestral works were published and none of the autographs have survived in a complete state. This was primarily owing to Clementi's reluctance to publish the symphonies, even after they had been successfully performed and intensively revised. In the early years of the twentieth century, furthermore, a large number of Clementi's symphonic manuscripts appear to have been thrown away accidentally by a servant whilst in the possession of a Dr Cummings, who auctioned the rest of his collection at Sotheby's in 1917. Clementi's original unwillingness to publish the symphonies has traditionally been ascribed to his sense of inferiority in the wake of the achievements of Mozart and Beethoven, leading to the rumour that he himself destroyed much of his work. Such rumours have been discredited by recent

scholarship, and in his contribution to *Studies and Prospects*, Sala attributes the dearth of published symphonies much more plausibly to practicalities such as the relatively restricted publishing market for orchestral works at that time. This is a convincing explanation, reflecting as it does Clementi's characteristically acute awareness of market conditions, particularly in the second half of his career, when business activities had taken the place of performing and were equal in importance to composition in his professional life. (See Sala, 'Muzio Clementi's Symphonies: Contributions Towards a New Edition', in *Studies and Prospects*, 229–245.)

Any new edition of Clementi's orchestral works involves complex processes of reconstruction and adds to a succession of previous editors' attempts. The first attempt was stimulated by the rediscovery of manuscripts early in the twentieth century. In 1921 Georges de Saint-Foix announced that fragments of symphonic material by Clementi were included in a collection of manuscripts acquired in 1917 by the Library of Congress. Connecting these with other manuscripts housed at the British Museum, Saint-Foix described four symphonies (of which WO32 is the first), a separate *Minuetto Pastorale* and an Overture. Alfredo Casella reconstructed two of the symphonies (WO32 in C major and WO33 in D major) in 1935, subsequently publishing them with Ricordi in 1938. (See Leon Plantinga, *Muzio Clementi: His Life and Music* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 251–252.) In the 1970s Pietro Spada revised and extended Casella's work, producing performing versions of four symphonies (WO32–35) and of the miscellaneous orchestral works, all of which were published by Edizioni Suvini Zerboni *c*1976. Casella's and Spada's efforts revealed that Clementi's later symphonies were ambitious works of high quality, fully deserving of the initial positive reception that they received. In all four symphonies Clementi uses large orchestral forces, including clarinets and trombones, and the works have many idiomatic features in common with the later piano sonatas and works like the *Gradus ad Parnassum*. In the symphonies, as in those other works, Clementi's motivic processing is intense, and strict counterpoint frequently makes its presence felt. The long two-part canonic passage in the slow movement of WO32 has direct equivalents in the Sonatas Opp. 40 and 50 and in the *Gradus*.

The composition, early performance and documentary history of WO32 is complicated by the substantial alterations Clementi made to the work between performances. WO32 existed originally in a version in B flat major with different inner movements (see Sala, 'Muzio Clementi's Symphonies', 235). The C major version has complete central movements, written to replace the originals in the B flat version. The first movement of the C major version, however, has an incomplete exposition, and both the finale in C and the one in B flat major are incomplete. The orchestration is missing from parts of the B flat finale and there is one substantial structural gap (bars 31–114). The C major version also has a large gap, from bar 278 to the end, and the orchestration of the existing portions is incomplete. Among the surviving manuscripts relating to the C major finale is an alternative draft for bars 13–43 and one for strings only for bars 169–173 and bars 176–210. Also extant is a sheet of string sketches inscribed 'Al fine del finale' by the composer.

De Col and Sala's approach to the task of reconstruction differs quite significantly from Spada's (and Casella's), leading to significant discrepancies in their respective end results. As part of their intention to adhere more closely to the originals than hitherto, De Col and Sala have undertaken much more detailed research into the autographs. Their interpretation of the finale draws quite heavily on the B flat version, which they use to complete the parts of the orchestration missing from the C major finale. Whereas they base their reconstruction of the ending that is missing from the C major finale on the B flat version, which is complete at this point, Spada's approach was much more invasive. He appropriated the twenty-six bars of string sketches inscribed 'Al fine del finale' and connected them to the point where the C major autograph breaks off by composing a passage based on the finale's main theme.

In aiming at greater authenticity than Spada and in criticizing Spada for overly liberal treatment of the sources, De Col and Sala echo Spada's criticisms of Casella. Spada censured Casella for trying to 'better Clementi here and there' and was himself 'inspired by the firm idea not to modify, where possible, the original material and to present the surviving works with the utmost textual authenticity, so as to recapture, to the greatest possible extent, the ideas of the composer' (Pietro Spada, *The Complete Symphonic Works of*

Muzio Clementi (Milan: Edizioni Suvini Zerboni, 1977), 7). At one level we could say that the appearance of each successive edition of Clementi's orchestral works entails a move closer to an ideal state of authenticity; and we could readily commend De Col and Sala for accelerating this process. At another level, the achievement of greater fidelity to the composer's intentions emerges as something of an illusion. Plantinga's remark, made just before the appearance of Spada's reconstruction, that 'Casella did his work well' and that 'these "arrangements" . . . are about as accurate an approximation of the original as we are likely to achieve' (*Muzio Clementi*, 252) seems surprising in the light of what has subsequently emerged; but it should be borne in mind that still further attempts at reconstruction may follow De Col and Sala's and, most importantly, that an 'authentic' version of Clementi's symphonies can never appear, by virtue of the non-existence of original editions and complete autographs. The symphonies will inevitably remain 'works in progress'.

There can be little doubt that De Col and Sala's reconstructions, particularly of the finale's ending, make better musical sense than Spada's: by comparison, Spada's reconstruction of the ending sounds disconcertingly like a series of partly composed, partly appropriated fragments. The higher level of scholarship is reflected elsewhere in the edition. In his preface Sala assembles much of the documentary evidence relating to the early performances of Clementi's symphonies between 1813 and 1822 and includes substantial quotations from several contemporary reviews. Much of this information is usefully assembled in tabular chronological format – information that previously had to be gleaned from a number of secondary sources (viii). Following the Preface are the notes on editorial method (xi–xiii). Although these contain details of the reconstructed parts (xii), they might profitably have been amplified with a more thorough description of the procedures used in the reconstruction process and of how these and the new version of the symphony to which they give rise differ from Spada's. As it is, Sala's contribution to *Studies and Prospects* remains essential as a source of backup information and, in spite of the fact that the book has – rather unusually – been included as the sixty-first volume of the complete edition, there may have been a case for transferring some of the details in it to the editorial introduction to the volume.

De Col and Sala also differ from Spada in adopting the original layout of Clementi's orchestral score, with the brass and percussion at the top, followed by the woodwind and then the strings. This arguably takes the quest for authenticity a step too far, working against ease of reading – particularly if the edition is used in a performing context. The text also contains some significant typographical errors: for example, bar 13 of the second movement, where the sharpened C in the violas is clearly extraneous, and bar 17, where the second violins have a B♭ that clashes with the violas' A♭.

The most significant consequence of this new edition is that it may rekindle interest in a problematic area of the composer's work, an area with considerable historical implications. Clementi's persistent dissatisfaction with his orchestral works and his desire to maintain them as 'works in progress' anticipate the well known nineteenth-century trend whereby, particularly in symphonic spheres, composers felt inspired yet inhibited by the increasingly canonical achievements of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven. The tortuous gestation of Clementi's later symphonies has immediate parallels with that of works such as Mendelssohn's Symphony No. 4 in A major, Op. 90 ('Italian'), which, existing as it now does in more than one version as a result of John Michael Cooper's work, also remains something of a 'work in progress' (see John Michael Cooper, *Mendelssohn's 'Italian' Symphony* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)). The eventual emergence of Clementi's other three symphonies in the same edition will call for a full-length study of all of the composer's orchestral works. This might contain comparisons not only with Continental models, but also perhaps with British orchestral productions of the time, including those of Samuel Wesley, Cipriani Potter and others, which are – albeit gradually – becoming available in modern scholarly editions.

Ultimately De Col and Sala's edition of Clementi's C major symphony is to be welcomed as a significant advance on previous work in this area, and as the beginning of the much needed dissemination of material relating to a centrally important, but hitherto obscure, area of Clementi's output. We can only wait in eager anticipation for the emergence of the Symphonies Nos 2, 3 and 4.

ROHAN STEWART-MACDONALD

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606300541 Printed in the United Kingdom

JEAN GILLES, *DILIGAM TE, DOMINE*

ED. JOHN HAJDU HEYER

Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era 135
Middleton, WI: A-R Editions, 2004
pp. xix + 96pp, ISBN 0 89579 554 X

Jean Gilles is remembered today primarily for his Requiem (*Messe des morts*) and the motet *Diligam te*. In addition to serving for the composer's own funeral and that of Rameau in 1764, Gilles's Requiem was used for the obsequies of Louis XIV in 1715 (in Bordeaux) and Louis XV in 1774. The stature of *Diligam te* nearly equalled that of the Requiem during the eighteenth century. Between 1731 and 1770 the motet received at least fifty-one performances at the Concert Spirituel in Paris, and in 1752 the *Mercure de France* described it as 'trop connu pour que nous en parlions' (too well known for us to speak of).

Ironically, Gilles's reputation as a composer was established several decades after his death. Born in 1668, Gilles was affiliated with the choir school of St Sauveur in Aix-en-Provence from 1679 to 1695 and later with the choir school at the Cathedral of St Etienne in Toulouse for the last eight years of his life. He died in 1705 at the age of only thirty-seven, after spending his entire life close to his birthplace near Avignon. His surviving works include two mass settings and thirteen motets (Psalm settings, Lamentations and a Te Deum) and several smaller sacred works. It is hard to say how much more extensive his output was: at least seventeen motets are known to have been lost, and many others are presumed to have perished in a fire that destroyed the old library of the choir school in Toulouse.

After the eighteenth century Gilles's music fell into obscurity until John Hajdu Heyer drew attention to it through both his performances and his scholarly research. *Diligam te* received its first modern performance at the Santa Cruz Baroque Festival in March 1978 with the University of Santa Cruz Choir and soloists conducted by Heyer. His scholarly work includes a doctoral dissertation ('The Life and Works of Jean Gilles' (University of Colorado, 1973)) and numerous other studies and editions in the field of French baroque music, especially on the music of Lully and Gilles. Michel Prada has also championed Gilles, with a scholarly monograph (*Jean Gilles: L'homme et l'oeuvre* (Béziers: Société de musicologie de Languedoc, 1986)), as have a few modern conductors such as Philippe Herreweghe, who recorded the Requiem and *Diligam te* with the Choeur et Orchestre de La Chapelle Royale in 1990 (Harmonia Mundi HMX 2981341).

The new A-R edition of *Diligam te* includes a detailed Introduction on the composer and his music and on performance practice issues. A full Critical Report is also included, with a description of the sources, an explanation of the editorial methods and critical notes for each movement. The challenge in editing Gilles's music stems from the lack of holograph sources or even copies associated with early performances of the works. There are seven surviving manuscript sources for *Diligam te,* all dating from the mid-eighteenth century. The edition is based on the earliest of them, a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Vm^{1} 1345) that was prepared and signed by the copyist Duprat in Toulouse and dated 17 May 1731. One can safely postulate that since this manuscript originates from Gilles's own base, it bears a close relationship to the composer's original score. Four other eighteenth-century manuscripts were also consulted and furnish emended readings in places where the 1731 score contains errors or omissions. A manuscript in the Library of Congress (M2020.M65.case), of unknown provenance and dating from the mid-eighteenth century, preserves a significant variant of the third movement, 'Dolores inferni', which the editor has supplied in an appendix. The instrumental forces are reduced here from four parts to three, with the *taille de violon* eliminated. It therefore furnishes an example of how flexible the instrumental forces were.

The section entitled 'Notes on Performance' draws on the editor's own considerable experience as a performer. Little is known about the differences between performance traditions in Paris (or Versailles) and in provincial centres such as Toulouse or Aix-en-Provence. The editor acknowledges that, if the treatise of Jean Millet (*L'art de bien chanter* (Lyon, 1666)) is any indication, Italian music and performance may have

held more influence in the provinces. Lacking specific evidence of how the music might have absorbed Italian influence, the editor confines his discussion to Parisian performance practices from the period in which Gilles's music earned its reputation at the Concert Spirituel during the mid-eighteenth century. Topics such as vocal ornamentation and the historically appropriate size of performing forces (both choral and instrumental) are treated in some depth. The discussion of vocal ornamentation is based on Montéclair's treatise *Principes de musique* (Paris, 1736), one of the few treatises that mentions music set to a Latin text. Heyer describes the role of ornamentation in both sacred and secular French music of this period as a requirement that will 'tastefully enhance the expression of the text' (xi), though he suggests that additional ornamentation beyond what was written in the score may have been introduced less frequently in motets than in secular pieces.

In the area of vocal and instrumental performing forces, the editor provides figures that allow us to compare the relatively small numbers available to Gilles with the much enhanced ensemble that performed his works at the Concert Spirituel. In Toulouse, we know that his vocal resources would have consisted of six to eight choirboys and about six professional soloists (with some additions for festive days). The choir and soloists were accompanied by organ with serpent, but other instruments were not necessarily available to him. In Paris the resources were much larger: four female and four male solo singers, a choir of thirty-eight voices (six female and six male sopranos, six male altos, seven tenors, five high basses and eight low basses) and an orchestra of about thirty-four musicians (sixteen violins, two violas, six violoncellos, two double basses, one flute, four oboes, three bassoons). These figures represent the performing forces at the Concert Spirituel in 1755.

The editor also discusses other issues that arise in performing Gilles's music, such as *notes inégales*, historically appropriate bowing and pitch. Performers would do well to supplement the information offered here by consulting the Introduction to Jean-Paul Montagnier's edition of *Super flumina Babilonis* by Charles-Hubert Gervais (1671–1744), especially for additional references about Latin pronunciation (A-R Editions, 1998). Montagnier's work also offers a useful comparison of the size of performing forces, since Gervais's work survives in a complete set of (autographed) manuscript parts. From the Gervais parts we can tell that vocal soloists sang in the *grand choeur* and that the total number of performers was about forty to fifty vocalists and twenty-six instrumentalists.

This new critical edition of *Diligam te* pairs well with an earlier volume (No. 47) in the same series containing Gilles's Requiem (*Messe des morts*), also edited by John Hajdu [Heyer] and published in 1984. A comparison of the two A-R editions confirms that both adhere to a high standard of editorial rigour. Each score was prepared from a single primary source, with variants logged against readings from that source and noted in the Critical Report. They differ slightly in appearance, because A-R moved several years ago to a glossy, more durable cover and computer-generated musical notation, which is smaller but certainly more economical for score layout.

There is at least one significant change in editorial procedure between the two editions of Gilles's music. Whereas there is a written-out continuo part in the full score for the Requiem, in *Diligam te* a continuo part is included only in the separate keyboard–vocal score. (The set of performing parts was not supplied with the review copy, so the continuo part could not be examined.) Editorial bass figures, missing in the original source, are also added to the bass line in *Diligam te,* but not in the Requiem. Although there are varying opinions on whether a written-out continuo realization should be included, I believe that the editor has chosen wisely to omit it, and editorial bass figures are certainly a plus. (For another point of view about a written-out continuo part, one that appears in a recent A-R edition of Girolamo Abos's *Stabat Mater* (Recent Researches in the Music of the Classical Era 68), see Michael Talbot's review in *Eighteenth-Century Music*, 1/2 (2004), 320–321.)

Another difference between the two A-R editions of Gilles's music is that the score for *Diligam te* follows the current trend for retaining eighteenth-century notational conventions such as the two-note slur usually found in sources from this period at the end of a vocal melisma, rather than long editorial slurs over all notes belonging to that syllable, as in modern notational convention. The earlier practice is easily understood by modern performers (and is fully explained by the editor in the Introduction), and the result is much tidier.

I would argue that we should also retain eighteenth-century notational conventions with regard to accidentals and key signatures. Modernizing key signatures and silently emending accidentals to conform to current conventions makes it difficult in some cases to reconstruct the accidentals that were present in the original sources and can lead to misinterpretations. While the removal of redundant accidentals sounds harmless enough, the consequent need to add other accidentals or to introduce natural signs can make it difficult in some cases to know which accidentals are original. A case in point is movement five of *Diligam te*, 'Commota est et contremuit terra', where the key signature has an added flat, and many lowered and raised accidentals are silently adjusted to accommodate the modern key signature. Variants in the other manuscripts are still logged against the edition, but reconstructing the information from the primary source is conjectural at best.

Heyer notes that a recently discovered early manuscript source for Gilles's *Messe des morts* offers important information about the sources for *Diligam te* as well. The new source (manuscript 628 in the Bibliothèque de Bordeaux) is the earliest known extant source for a work by Gilles. It dates from 1712, only seven years after the composer's death. Heyer's observations concerning this manuscript and what it reveals about Gilles's music are most welcome and point to the need for a complete edition of this neglected composer's works.

Vivid word-painting and textural simplicity are hallmarks of Gilles's style. He reveals himself everywhere as a melodist rather than a contrapuntist, and the individuality of his asymmetrical phrases and accents on weak beats adds a distinctive freshness to his music. This new edition of *Diligam te* makes an important work accessible to performers as well as scholars and adds significantly to our knowledge about French sacred music of the early eighteenth century.

MARY CYR

RECORDINGS

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606310548 Printed in the United Kingdom

JOHANN FRIEDRICH FASCH (1688–1758)

OUVERTURES IN G MINOR, D MINOR AND G MAJOR
Il Fondamento. Artistic direction: Paul Dombrecht
Fuga Libera 502, 2004; one disc, 71 minutes

This CD arrived while I had the music of the Zerbst Kapellmeister Johann Friedrich Fasch still ringing in my ears after the Ninth Biennial Fasch Festival (Zerbst, April 2005; see page 184 for my report of this occasion). Great esteem for the splendid music of this composer was immediately reinforced and I was reminded of the superb performances given at the opening concert of the Fasch Festival by the splendid Belgian ensemble Il Fondamento, directed by Paul Dombrecht. The Fasch Festivals and the associated symposia hosted by the city of Zerbst have over the past years provided many opportunities for performers, musicologists and audiences to assess the music of the composer whose name is so closely associated with the city. The recording under review adds to our appreciation of this musician who, in common with so many of his contemporaries, was overshadowed in music histories by the genius of Johann Sebastian Bach.

In 1900 Hugo Riemann observed that a striking range of composers stood before the 'major peaks' of instrumental music composed in Europe (by Bach, Handel, Haydn and Mozart) during the eighteenth century ('Johann Friedrich Fasch und der freie Instrumentalstil', *Blätter für Haus- und Kirchenmusick* 4 (1900), 102–106); it was among this group that Riemann placed Fasch. From 1722 until his death in 1758 Fasch spent his working life as Kapellmeister to the Orthodox Lutheran court of Zerbst in Anhalt-Zerbst. The musical

training that led him to this position included instruction from Johann Kuhnau at the Thomasschule in Leipzig (1701), composition lessons with Christoph Graupner at Darmstadt (1714), the position of violinist to the court of Bayreuth (1714), employment as court secretary and organist in Greiz (1719) and master of the much admired Kapelle of Count Morzin in Prague until 1722, when he accepted the position offered at Zerbst. The musical and cultural diversity experienced during Fasch's years of study, as well as several years of working in southern and central Germany, stimulated his fertile imagination as a composer. Today much of his music is kept in centres other than Zerbst, an indication of Fasch's reputation during his lifetime.

The three ouverture-suites presented on this recording are but a fraction of Fasch's contribution to the genre (he composed close to seventy in total). This type of suite was a particularly popular form of musical entertainment in Germany during the baroque era. The large-scale structure almost always comprised an introduction composed in the French overture manner followed by a string of dances and character pieces. Telemann, who claimed in his autobiography of 1739 to have written about two hundred such works in two years whilst attached to the court of Count Erdmann II of Promnitz at Sorau, Lower Lusatia (now Zary in Poland), described the form as 'ouvertures and their secondary pieces'. In a passage in *Der critische Musikus* (Leipzig, 1745) Johann Adolph Scheibe expressed the opinion that the German composers who excelled the most in this type of composition for solo instruments (including the French woodwind trio of two oboes and bassoon) were Telemann and Fasch.

The works chosen for this recording of Il Fondamento are scored for either two or three oboes, bassoon, strings and basso continuo. And how attractive and engaging this combination is! Fasch's use of a section of double reeds pitted against a body of strings and continuo gives rise to a great range of expression. Two of the ouverture-suites presented here (FWVK:g2; FWVK:G15) were among several instrumental works by Fasch that were heard at entertainments played by the celebrated musicians of the Dresden court under the leadership of concertmaster Johann Georg Pisendel, who had been a fellow student of Fasch's in Leipzig. (The influence of Pisendel was recently examined at a conference held in Dresden, 23–25 May 2005: 'Komponist, Violinist, Orchestererzieher und Musikaliensammler der Dresdner Hofkapelle – Johann Georg Pisendels Dresdner Amt und seine europäische Ausstrahlung'.) The ouvertures composed for Dresden (today kept in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek / Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek) are the first and last works presented on this CD. The rich and velvety resonance produced by a body of three oboes and bassoon was certainly part of the orchestral palette used by the composers of Dresden during the second half of the 1720s, and especially around the time that Fasch visited (late 1726–1727). In liturgical music composed for the Dresden Catholic court church, for example, three oboes were required by Heinichen (his *Magnificat* of 1726 (*D-Dl* Mus. 2398-D-23) and a *Regina Caeli* setting of 1727 (*D-Dl* Mus. 2398-E-3)) and by Zelenka also (*Missa charitatis* of *c*1727, ZWV10, and his *Missa circumcisionis* of 1728, ZWV11, as well as the *Litaniae de Venerabili Sacramento* of 1729, ZWV148). Between the opening and closing ouverture-suites written for Dresden is the Ouverture-Suite in D minor (FWVK:d4). The autograph score of which is now housed in the Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek of Darmstadt together with a set of parts in the hand of Fasch's friend and fellow composer Christoph Graupner. In addition to these three sources pointing to the popularity of Fasch's music during his lifetime, they indicate the networks established between German composers of the era. (From about 1728 until his death in 1755 Fasch organized an exchange of sheet music between Zerbst, Darmstadt and Dresden.)

The performances of these ouvertures by Il Fondamento are nothing short of brilliant, especially the performances of the double reed players. The flawless ensemble, the precision of articulation and the impeccable intonation of the three oboes are delightful. In addition, the broad array of articulations employed by the players adds an extra dimension to Fasch's music, which ranges in expression from great nobility (heard, for example, in the ouvertures proper) to immense tenderness (as evident in the Aria Andante (No. 2) from the Ouverture in G major). This variety of articulation also presents many opportunities for displays of good humour, charm and wit. The Aria Allegro (No. 5) from the Ouverture in G minor and the Menuet II from the Ouverture in G major provide excellent examples. With the frequent addition of a character movement named 'Jardiniers', Fasch added his own touch to the usual ouverture-suite. A paper given during the conference at this year's Fasch Festival in Zerbst paid particular attention to the musical features of this

type of movement. In the hands of Fasch a rustic simplicity associated with the down-to-earth folk character of the gardener is usual. Two examples of such movements are heard in the recording.

Because of some unease I have previously felt about the tempos taken by Dombrecht (especially in Zelenka's late *Miserere* setting, ZWV57, which the composer marked 'adag:[io]' in the score, an instruction which appears in all original surviving instrumental performance materials including the part prepared for the Dresden concertmaster Pisendel), I could have wished for the opportunity to check the sources used for these performances. But this is a minor quibble, and perhaps it is better to remain unaware of Fasch's instructions. After all, the final result of this recording is so exhilarating that in such pedantry there is the danger of spoiling the great pleasure and satisfaction experienced upon the first and subsequent hearings of these works.

JANICE B. STOCKIGT

Eighteenth-Century Music © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570606320544 Printed in the United Kingdom

ANTON REICHA (1770–1836)

WIND QUINTETS IN B FLAT MAJOR, OP. 88 NO. 5, AND C MAJOR, OP. 91 NO. 1

Michael Thompson Wind Quintet: Michael Thompson, horn; Jonathan Snowden, flute; Derek Wickens, oboe; Timothy Lines, clarinet; John Price, bassoon

Naxos 8.554227, 2004; one disc, 63 minutes

Anton Reicha is perhaps best known for his twenty-four wind quintets, written between 1810 and 1820, with a twenty-fifth dating from around 1826. Ranging from thirty to forty-five minutes in length, these are hefty works, often symphonic in scope. Although Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven had long since written their masterpieces for wind ensemble, and composers such as Antonio Rosetti and Leopold Kozeluch a host of partitas, divertimenti, serenades and octets, Reicha credited his wind quintets with establishing his reputation in Europe, surpassing even his highly regarded didactic treatises (*Notes sur Antoine Reicha* (*c*1824; published Brno: Opus Musicum, 1970), 30). During the early nineteenth century these works were promoted by the best publishing houses, including Boieldieu in Paris, Nikolaus Simrock in Bonn and Cologne (publishing the first eighteen quintets) and Schott in Mainz and Brussels, who began an edition of the complete quintets in 1818. Fortunately there has been a renewed interest in Reicha's music in recent years and this excellent recording makes a significant contribution to the revival of the works of this relatively unacknowledged master.

Also famous as a theorist, Reicha wrote extensively on melodic phraseology, harmony, counterpoint, form and thematic development. His major theoretical works wielded enormous influence in the first half of the nineteenth century and were translated into German by no less a figure than Czerny. Although most theorists of this period were composers of some merit, it is unusual to find a great theorist who is as distinguished in composition as Reicha. I will therefore draw attention to some of the salient features of his ideas about music in the context of the works on this recording, for here is an extraordinary composer attempting to put into words his deepest intuitions about music.

The early nineteenth century saw a dramatic rise in the lexicography of music analysis. Many theorists of the time were concerned with the emerging doctrine of the autonomous musical idea. Chief among them was Reicha, who in his *Traité de mélodie* (Paris, 1814) used the term *dessin* to depict musical ideas at the level of small melodic figures and *motif* or *thème* for larger thematic statements, to which he later added the term *idée mère* in his *Traité de haute composition* (Paris: A. Farrenc, 1824–1826). Unlike his great contemporary Alexandre Choron (1771–1834), who was of the opinion that opening ideas should be relatively benign so as to allow room for expansion, Reicha believed that a composition must begin with

powerful and memorable ideas in order to provide a firm foundation for development. The listener will observe that each movement of the quintets on this recording indeed exhibits highly distinctive opening ideas. The first movement of Opus 88 No. 5 is an excellent example, launching a finely cut theme that alternates between oboe and flute, interspersed with rhapsodic cadenzas on clarinet and horn (here executed with delicate restraint by the Gordon Thompson Quintet). The juxtaposition of thematic, textural and colouristic ideas creates an expansive compound introductory gesture that sets out the material for the entire movement. Another fine example is the unusual *idée mère* of the third movement of Opus 91 No. 1, which creates a *Klangfarbenmelodie* variation out of the *idée mère* of the first movement in a dramatic ascending gesture (foreshadowing the opening of Elliot Carter's Brass Quintet!).

The notion of a strong opening idea may today seem somewhat platitudinous, but it nevertheless has far-reaching implications for the compositional process, especially in an era that was coming to grips with the self-referentiality implied by intense thematic working. Reicha's stance not only challenges the composer to come up with a profusion of original ideas *ex ante*, but also requires a high degree of motivic-thematic development to do them justice. In the *Traité de mélodie* Reicha shows how a theme can be broken down into different figures (*dessins*) through a process of decomposition, the extracted figures then forming the basis for new material. In the *Traité de haute composition musicale* he describes how the composer selects thematic material and arranges it in a table, decides what new material can be combined with the original ideas and notates this in another table, and then determines the best order for the two types of material. For the latter step to be effective the composer should practise developing an idea to the maximum limit and learn how to make 'ingenious combinations' of two, three and four ideas, writing out a series of variants that become the basis for new motivic forms. The wind quintets are a testament to Reicha's mastery of these techniques. The stately opening theme of Opus 88 No. 5, for example, is transformed into the witty first *idée mère* of the sonata-form continuation of the movement, which in turn is cleverly transformed to become the second *idée mère*. In Opus 91 No. 1 the first *idée mère* is again transformed into the second *idée mère*, but Reicha goes further in this work, integrating all four movements with variants of the opening idea. Contrary to Choron's cautionary view, strong opening ideas do not necessarily stop music dead in its tracks, but in the hands of a skilful thematicist set the stage for transformations that on a deeper level become the real thought content of a piece. As any perceptive listener will attest, the thematic processes and logical progression of ideas manifest in these pieces are clearly palpable even when highly varied and transformed. Although the language Reicha uses to describe these thematic processes may today seem rather circuitous, the modern reader will no doubt detect an obvious affinity between a gripping *idée mère* and its transformation into new motive forms and the ideas of *Grundgestalt* and developing variation espoused by Schoenberg some one hundred years later.

While advanced thematic procedures are an indispensable feature of Reicha's thought, he is also fully cognizant of the manifold intricacies of melodic phraseology flowing from mainstream eighteenth-century music theory. Drawing on the rhetorically derived notion of *contre-sens* (a 'contrary-sense' was said to occur when the musical punctuation contradicted the grammatical punctuation of a text), Reicha recommends the persistent use of melodic interruption whereby the tonic is avoided in the melody except at structurally appropriate points. Reicha recognizes, however, that the appearance of a perfect cadence at what today would be called foreground to middleground structural levels is not necessarily an act of closure. In the *Traité de mélodie* he notes that on the rhetorical plane a perfect cadence is not expected at the beginning of a composition and its occurrence there will not be understood as a high-level resting point. An excellent example can be seen in Opus 91 No. 1, which begins with a period that is closed with a perfect cadence after only eight bars and then without preparation slips into the parallel minor with a variation on the theme before the opening *idée mère* resumes its course. Reicha is here toying with the expectations of the competent listener, who will be pleasantly surprised by these imaginative deviations (which in the hands of a lesser composer would be deemed simply incompetent). It is thus clear, from both Reicha's theoretical writings and his music, that local events cannot be considered apart from their rhetorical placement within the whole.

Reicha was deeply concerned with the proportional distribution and complex interrelationships between phrase rhythms. A unique feature of his theory of phrase rhythm is the 'supposition' (not to be confused with

Rameau's use of the same term). In Reicha's terminology the supposition is one or more bars that play a dual role, simultaneously forming the end of one phrase and the beginning of the next. The supposition is not, however, to be confused with the elision, which operates on the principle of the suppression of a bar; on the contrary, the supposition is actually counted twice. That is to say, having heard it as the end of a fore-phrase, the listener retrospectively reconstructs it also as the beginning of an after-phrase, even as the music is in motion. This process effectively doubles the durational value of the bar(s) of supposition in the imagination, thereby altering the strictly linear perception of musical time. As early as the unpublished *Practische Beispiele* (Vienna, 1803) Reicha declared that music teaches the mind to grasp things simultaneously. Although this may fly in the face of an uncompromising clarity of structure demanded by some modern theorists, it is precisely this ambiguity and process of mental recalibration that characterizes the ebb and flow of certain kinds of musical phrase rhythms. Not all suppositions, of course, are of equal strength. The first supposition in Opus 88 No. 5 is relatively straightforward, coming at the end of the opening eight-bar phrase, upon which the horn begins its cadenza. The next supposition comes at the end of the second statement of the theme, in what could be construed as a two-bar extension (by supposition) of the theme leading to the clarinet cadenza. Needless to say, the supposition is only one – albeit highly individual – aspect of Reicha's theory. His music demonstrates a total mastery of the techniques of melodic phraseology current in his time, from which he fashions a compositional palette of extraordinary subtlety and variety.

Unfolding with natural and spontaneous assurance, these quintets represent a remarkable fusion of erudition and inspiration. Reicha's unsurpassed use of counterpoint in these works is never gratuitous, but is inextricably bound to the developmental processes, resulting in a terse compositional aesthetic of economy blended with diversity. With complete interparametrical fluency Reicha combines elements of harmony, phrase rhythm, motive, form and rhetoric into a fabric of inexhaustible invention. Conceived in grandly sculpted gestures, the music is always interesting and highly finished, often brilliant, yet never resorts to showmanship.

These masterworks have been enthusiastically quarried by the Gordon Thompson Wind Quintet, with meticulous attention to detail and an excellent sense of pacing. Intellectually stringent yet emotionally intense, this reading unpacks these works in a disciplined and compelling manner, as if to mediate the paradox of simultaneous growth and stability so characteristic of Reicha's thought. At times, however, the crisply linear performance seems to sacrifice the momentum that comes from broad musical contrasts. The Allegro in the first movement of the Opus 88 No. 5, for example, alternates between being charming, melancholic and melodramatic. These rapid shifts in mood would be considerably enhanced by sharper variations of instrumental colour and dynamic shading. While Reicha demanded a rigorous clarity of form on the one hand, that he firmly believed in a highly charged emotional intensity on the other was evidenced by his admiration for composers who cultivated simultaneously what he called the two great qualities of the soul, *sentiment* and *esprit* (*Notes sur Antoine Reicha*, 20). In Opus 88 No. 5 the players seem to lean towards Reicha's Apollonian side, with a natural blend of impeccable virtuosity subservient to an unfaltering, if perhaps overly reserved, musical integrity. This restraint is considerably relaxed in the Opus 91 No. 1 quintet. The first movement is spontaneous and dynamic, and the ensemble seems much more willing to take risks, resulting in a sustained dramatic momentum. The Andante displays an admirable sense of line, but is somewhat ponderous, perhaps because of the tempo chosen and a lack of sharp dynamic and colouristic variety. The Menuetto and the rondo finale are performed with streamlined efficiency, the virtuosic triplet figures of the last movement being dispatched with effortless assurance. Somewhat disappointing is the final cadential gesture, which seems to lack preparation and the agogic flexibility needed for it to have full rhetorical effect. Overall, the high level of formal integration in these works is fully conveyed by the Gordon Thompson Quintet, whose sensitive and sophisticated feeling for their deeper processes results in a performance of exceptional clarity and reflectiveness. This well engineered and balanced recording is an outstanding achievement and will be an important vehicle in attracting the attention these works deserve.

PETER LANDEY