



out and pleasant to play from, and the edition a welcome expansion of available music for this eminently social medium.

JULIAN RUSHTON



Eighteenth-Century Music 4/1 © 2007 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570607000838 Printed in the United Kingdom

WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART, KLAVIERKONZERT A-DUR KV488: FAKSIMILE
NACH DEM AUTOGRAPH MS. 226 IM BESITZ DER MUSIKABTEILUNG DER
BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DE FRANCE, PARIS

INTRODUCTION ERNST-GÜNTHER HEINEMANN

Munich: Henle, 2006

xvi + 100pp, ISMN M 2018 3216 6

The publication of a facsimile of a Mozart autograph score is always a welcome event, especially when the quality is high. This facsimile is a credit to its publishers, Henle – the full-size, high-definition colour reproduction is superb, revealing ink colours and (often highly significant) manuscript blemishes in splendid detail. Looking through this facsimile gives almost as much pleasure as looking at the real thing.

The autograph score of Mozart's Piano Concerto No. 23 in A major, K488, has been held at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris since 1964. In possession of the publisher André after Mozart's death, it subsequently found its way into the hands of private collectors in Manchester and Paris. This is the first facsimile reproduction of K488 and consequently the first view for most of the autograph score of this much-loved work. The score is preceded by a brief preface (András Schiff) and an introduction (Ernst-Günther Heinemann); both are provided in English as well as in German. Schiff trades in hyperbole: Mozart's piano concertos 'are truly complete, mighty and consummate . . . masterpieces that form a perfect synthesis of opera, symphony, and chamber music'; and K488 is a 'resplendent jewel' with an 'extraordinary' middle movement and an 'incomparable' finale in which we 'hardly know what to admire most' (vii). His uncritical reverence can be forgiven, though, appearing naively enthusiastic to scholars perhaps but not to the wider world of Mozart lovers, for whom the manuscript will offer considerable interest.

Heinemann's introduction is rightly more sober. He follows Alan Tyson's work on the paper types of Mozart's autograph scores in proposing that Mozart began the concerto between early 1784 and early 1785 before completing it in spring 1786 (Tyson, *Studies of the Autograph Scores* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), 19, 152–153). Mozart's own page numbering on the bifolia – 1–26 for the first and second movements, restarting at 1 for the finale – 'also suggests that the third movement arose at a separate stage in the compositional process'. Heinemann continues: 'Nor can the first two movements, being notated on early and late paper, have been written in a single spell of activity' (xiv).

Mozart's autograph reveals that he intended (in 1784–1785) to set K488 for oboes rather than clarinets, changing his mind when the latter became available upon completing the work in early 1786 (xiv–xv, following Tyson, *Autograph Scores*, 152). The main theme and the concluding statement of the opening ritornello of the first movement are presented at pitch (that is, untransposed) on the fifth and sixth staves of the autograph (bars 9–18, 62–66), subsequently marked by Mozart with Xs and enclosed in squares; the transposed clarinet lines are then given on folio 26r between the end of the second movement and the beginning of the finale. Although Heinemann resists the temptation, it is interesting to speculate why Mozart wrote the first movement of K488 (at least in skeletal, particella form) only as far as bar 137. He may have intended it for an event between early 1784 and early 1785 that failed to materialize, of course, setting the work aside until a suitable performing opportunity arose. But the exact moment at which he broke off, the first bar of the middle ritornello immediately following the piano's cadential trill at the end of the solo exposition, is



perhaps revealing as it is identical to the moment that he stopped one of his preceding Viennese piano concertos in late 1782, No. 14 in E flat, K449. Like K488, K449 remained a fragment for approximately a year. Mozart wrote (probably in *particella*) up to the second bar of the middle ritornello, bar 170, then set the work aside, completing it only in early 1784 for one of his subscription concerts at the Trattnerhof. It is plausible that Mozart considered this juncture of a concerto first movement a good place to put it to sleep – the expository sections were complete and the immediate musical continuation at least temporarily secure on account of the middle ritornello's duplication of material from the opening ritornello. But passages of striking stylistic originality (judged in relation to Mozart's earlier concertos) appear so soon after the compositional breaks in K449 and K488 that one wonders whether the anticipated musical direction of Mozart's movements played a role in the compositional interruptions. Eighteen bars after resuming work on K449, Mozart included his starkest piano-orchestra confrontation to date – strongly contrasting two-bar units in the piano and the full orchestra (bars 188–203) – which represents a distinctly new type of interaction, with important stylistic ramifications for his concertos and operas. (See my ‘“An Entirely Special Manner”: Mozart's Piano Concerto No. 14 in E flat, K. 449, and the Stylistic Implications of Confrontation’, *Music & Letters* 82/4 (2001), 559–581.) Equally, stylistic innovation occurs six bars after the resumption of K488 where, for the first time in the middle ritornello of the opening movement of a piano concerto, Mozart writes a new theme (bars 143ff) that straddles the ritornello/development divide. This theme, elaborated by the piano at its re-entry, comes to dominate the development section and features in the recapitulation too, thus profoundly affecting the subsequent course of the movement. Perhaps Mozart had the new theme (K488) and the piano-orchestra confrontation (K449) in mind when he put his concertos aside. But we cannot discount the possibility that stylistic musings led to the hiatuses, irrespective of whether the innovative ideas themselves came to Mozart before he stopped writing, between stopping and restarting, or immediately upon resumption.

Heinemann explains the main deletions in Mozart's autograph (six and seven bars of first-movement piano passagework between bars 113–114 and 125–126 respectively) in a clear, sensible fashion. He explains that the second, for example, must have occurred before the subsequent material was written, as the orchestral parts align with the first note of the final version of bar 126, rather than the last note of the excised passage. Again we can only speculate why Mozart deleted the original version. Since its last five beats – a cadential trill in the right hand and semiquaver figuration in the left – are repeated exactly in the last five beats of the final version of the solo exposition (bars 136–137), we might reasonably infer that Mozart deemed the original seven bars between 125 and the end of the section too short, subsequently writing eleven bars that are also slightly showier than the original passage on account of a greater sweep from upper to lower registers.

It is a little surprising that Mozart's inclusion of a first-movement cadenza as an integral part of his autograph score (rather than as a loose leaf) merits only a passing mention from Heinemann, as it is the only occasion that a Mozart piano cadenza appears in this way. The cadenza is unusual in other respects too: it begins with ‘non-thematic’ material; and it contains the only passage ‘that can be regarded as an analysis of material from the concerto . . . [Bars] 21–3 of the cadenza telescope the motif at bars 5ff. to a two-note linear descent and extend this sequentially over the space of almost three octaves’ (William Drabkin, ‘An Interpretation of Musical Dreams: Towards a Theory of the Mozart Piano Concerto Cadenza’, in *Wolfgang Amadè Mozart: Essays on His Life and Music*, ed. Stanley Sadie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 164). Whether the unusual features of the cadenza are related to Mozart's decision to include it in the autograph is difficult to say. In any case, writing a single bar at the bottom of folio 18v, Mozart continues on to the next page, using all of 19r for the cadenza and giving the concluding, post-cadenza ritornello on the reverse side (19v). The perils of incorporating both virtuosic flourishes and registral extremes on this particular manuscript paper are obvious – the stems on the demisemiquavers in the first pause bar go well into the staff directly above, and Mozart has to extend another of the staves by a couple of centimetres to accommodate the bar of semiquaver sextuplets towards the end.



My reservations about this facsimile are minor. Readers unfamiliar with Mozart's autographs would have benefited from a brief introduction to standard features such as abbreviations, shorthand and the composer's smearing out of mistakes before the ink had dried. It is a pity too that tiny bits of material are lost on the left-hand side of recto folia (most notably the instrumental designations on the first page) and the right-hand side of verso folia, but entirely understandable given the decision not to disturb the high-quality binding during the reproduction process. All in all, this volume is a splendid addition to the ever-increasing number of Mozart's works now available in facsimile form. It is to be hoped that it is not a one-off Henle publication and is followed in due course by high-quality facsimiles of other Mozart piano concertos.

SIMON P. KEEFE



Eighteenth-Century Music 4/1 © 2007 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S147857060700084X Printed in the United Kingdom

JEAN-PHILIPPE RAMEAU, *PLATÉE*. Opera Omnia: Series 4, volume 10

ED. M. ELIZABETH C. BARTLET

Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2005

pp. 435, ISMN M 006 52787 8

JEAN PHILIPPE RAMEAU, *ANACRÉON*. Opera Omnia: Series 4, volume 25

ED. JONATHAN HUW WILLIAMS (WITH SYLVIE BOUISSOU AND CÉCILE DAVY-RIGAUX)

Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2004

pp. vii + 107, ISMN M 006 52591 1

The latest two volumes in the new Rameau critical edition bring to ten the total number since the series began publication in 1996 – an average of one per year. This admirable rate of production for an enterprise as challenging as editing Rameau may largely be attributed to the energetic leadership of its general editor, Sylvie Bouissou, who has not only overseen the whole operation, but has edited five of the volumes published to date: the 1757 and 1758 version of *Les Surprises de l'amour* (in two volumes, 1996 and 2000), the 1733 version of *Hippolyte et Aricie* (2002), the editorial guidelines (1997) and, with Denis Herlin, the catalogue of librettos and other textual sources for Rameau's stage works (2003). The other five volumes consist of the *Pièces de clavecin en concerts* (1996), *Zoroastre* (1999), *Acanthe et Céphise* (1998) and the two under review here, *Anacréon* and *Platée*. Ultimately the edition will comprise forty-four volumes in its six series. Bouissou is aided by Cécile Davy-Rigaux (whose title has evolved over the years from 'editorial co-ordinator' to 'adjunct general editor') and an editorial board comprising M. Elizabeth C. Bartlet, Denis Herlin, Davitt Moroney, Yvon Repérant and Herbert Schneider. The last two volumes initiated a change in publisher from Gérard Billaudot in Paris to Bärenreiter. The switch is barely visible from the volumes themselves, which maintain the red cloth covers, high-quality paper and sumptuous layout of the original series. Each volume continues to be published along with a separate keyboard-vocal score in paperback. Performing parts for the orchestral musicians are available for hire, both at written pitch and transposed for modern orchestras. Each volume in the series includes an introduction in both French and English, a transcription of the libretto (in French only, with eighteenth-century spelling conventions retained), a substantial critical apparatus (in these two volumes in English only, since both editors are Anglophones), appendices, and facsimiles of sample pages from the major sources for the edition.

The celebrations warranted by the continued publication of this important new edition have unfortunately to be muted on account of the untimely death of Elizabeth Bartlet in September 2005, only days after her edition of *Platée* was released. Her death represents an enormous loss to the community of scholars who