Eighteenth-Century Music 4/1 © 2007 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570607000826 Printed in the United Kingdom

FRANZ LACHNER, TWO WOODWIND QUINTETS

ED. L. JONATHAN SAYLOR

Recent Researches in the Music of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries 39
Middleton, WI: A-R Editions, 2004
pp. xix + 146, ISBN 0895795469

There are good reasons besides chronology for the wind quintet (a term preferable to 'woodwind quintet', implying that the horn is not made of brass) to sit oddly in a periodical devoted to eighteenth-century music. Some late eighteenth-century composers, pre-eminently Mozart and the young Beethoven, made expert use of wind instruments in ensembles also involving strings or a piano. On page xiii (note 4) the editor writes 'What seems inconceivable is that nobody pursued the piano quintet' with wind. But Danzi did, in Op. 41 (1810), published long ago by Musica Rara with the dubious claim that its quality matches Mozart's and Beethoven's. Spohr's quintet Op. 52 (1820), in a minor modification of the genre, has flute rather than oboe. Mozart's clarinet quintet and Beethoven's septet launched whole flotillas of imitations.

Nevertheless, the editor rightly remarks that despite Cambini, the wind quintet first flowered early in the nineteenth century and acquired new life in the twentieth, which it retains in amateur still more than in professional circles. The best 'classical' ensemble music for wind was *Harmonie*, distinguished from the wind quintet by using two instruments of a kind, omitting flutes and performance outdoors, or in the dining hall. Much of this music, by Mozart, Beethoven, Hummel and Krommer, is splendid; but it is not, as the wind quintet aspired to be, chamber music, or even an aerophonic rival to the string quartet. This aspiration may have driven Reicha to his unmatched productivity in the genre, and his cyclic forms, analogous to string chamber music, form a continuity with the eighteenth century. He had few heirs, other than Danzi, Brod and a distinguished classicistic quintet by Onslow (composer of over thirty string quintets). To these Lachner is a welcome addition, with similar length and musical density to Onslow, and his two quintets deserve as prominent a place in the repertory – a double-edged observation, for as the editor observes (xiii, note 14), the others are not often performed.

The wind quintet was never a feasible equivalent to the string quartet because of its fatal lack of the homogeneity whereby, in string groups, accompanying instruments can become unobtrusive. Paradoxically, the unavoidable variety of tone in a wind quintet can come to sound monotonous, and (though as a wind player I am loath to admit this) any bowed string instrument is capable of more variety of colour, articulation and nuance. A possible solution would be to write counterpoint, but formal fugues fall outside the relevant stylistic parameters, and also expose the different technical potential of the horn, as compared to the fully chromatic woodwind (in an obscure shed in Worcestershire, Elgar solved the problem, or had it solved for him, writing quintets with two flutes and no horn). And unlike strings, wind players must stop playing to breathe – out and in, and not merely gasp. Lachner is ungenerous with rests to allow for this. Occasional sets of bars' rest arise because one way of coping with so mixed an ensemble is to switch leading roles among the instruments, and it helps if at least one makes way during what are occasionally spectacular breaks. The clarinet solo in the first-movement exposition of the second quintet is virtuosic even by the standards of the time: presumably Lachner knew the concertos of Weber and Spohr, or their interpreters. There are, however, clear signs of Lachner learning, presumably from experience (though information on performers is lacking). The first quintet is ostensibly, perhaps ostentatiously, the more original; its first movement is over four hundred bars long, admittedly in a brisk triple time (following a slow introduction), its second is a scherzo in 9/8, its third a slow movement that turns into an Allegro. The second quintet's first movement is under three hundred bars of common time, but nevertheless feels more spacious, more varied in texture and theme.

The editor includes analytical notes which seem accurate, although hardly a requirement of a scholarly edition; they and especially the somewhat colourful critical gloss are tautological for anyone who can read a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478570607000826 Published online by Cambridge University Press

score. His admiration for the first movement of the second quintet leads him into the trap of withholding from the opening idea – a grand unison gesture – the title of 'first theme', preferring to label it 'Ur-motive', and later 'the potentially ambiguous Ur-motive'. The potential ambiguity resides in its shift from the tonic to D flat, the gesture reiterated to fall from D♭ to C, where the music pauses. But the sequel shows that this is no introduction (as an undergraduate analyst would probably call it). The gesture is treated in counterpoint by four instruments (but not the horn), and what the editor calls the 'first theme proper' is the harmonically unambiguous, but not yet entirely homophonic, response.

This passage shows up one of the few textual questions, few because there is only one source, the autograph manuscript. The horn D♭ at the opening of the second quintet is 'omitted in the autograph manuscript': the note on page 63 directs us to the explanation of editorial method, under 'Erasures'. We might quibble at the semantic conflict between 'omitted' and 'erasure': the D♭ was not omitted, but composed by Lachner, then scratched out. The editor notes that an earlier edition (Musica Rara) included these horn notes without comment, which was certainly wrong. The editor's care here marks this (along with signs such as the numerous dotted slurs, even over scales passages that are slurred in other instruments and too rapid to tongue), from which we rightly infer that he aims at, and as far as I can see achieves, scholarly precision.

But for the horn D♭, the editor suggests that performers can decide for themselves whether to play it. This is evasive. With valves, these notes are easy, but then so is the rest of the four-bar unison, using D♭ and C – still *forte*, so the tone is markedly weakened by the absence of the horn. The quintets date from 1824 and 1827 (dates on the manuscripts, illustrated in the edition, revise the dates allocated by *The New Grove*). I assume, therefore, that Lachner did not expect the horn to play one of the new-fangled chromatic instruments, if indeed they had, by that date, been fangled. In the second movement of the first quintet Lachner requires the player to recrook from F into D to maximize the use of open notes in the trio section. Among the generous provision of introductory and methodological material, one might expect some comment on the reason for these details. Lachner's change of mind in the second quintet surely derives from the fact that D♭ and C (written for E flat horn as B♭ and A below middle C) would have to be stopped, and this in *forte* might sound unacceptably coarse. Experience, again, probably decided him not to risk it. There is some difference in handling the horn between the two quintets. In the first, a striding arpeggio in the finale (pages 49–50; written g^2-d^2-b^1-g^1) is feasible until repeated an octave lower, where the tone would be dangerously uneven, with no time to prepare the d' that Lachner's contemporary, Berlioz, calls 'stopped – bad' (*Berlioz's Orchestration Treatise*, ed. Hugh Macdonald (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 168). In mitigation, however, it is doubled in octaves by the bassoon. The second quintet avoids such problems, while making ample and effective use of higher stopped notes. The editor praises Lachner's handling of the instruments, and the writing is indeed grateful, though not easy; but he offers no comment on the nature of the mechanisms available in Vienna in the 1820s. How many keys had the woodwind? Could the bassoon execute the trill on its bottom note at the raucous end to the second quintet's minuet (page 110) – a trill Berlioz declared 'impossible'?

Another kind of problem arises in connection with the first-time and second-time bars at the repeated exposition of the first quintet. I suspect this is a mistake, even, perhaps, in the autograph. The exposition (first-time bars) wittily reprises the main theme, *forte* and tutti, and the repeat is to the third bar rather than the first, where the theme is given only to the oboe. I doubt very much whether this should be replaced, in the second-time bars, by five beats of silence, rather than a tonic chord and a still entertaining four-beat silence. This repeat, moreover, requires an impossible page-turn for flute and clarinet. There are other difficult or near-impossible turns, for which I can hardly blame the editor or the publisher, as they are symptoms of Lachner's unrelenting demands on the players' stamina. The second quintet, where the first movement exposition is not repeated, is marginally kinder, but turns would delay the Minuet da capo in both works. In the second quintet, the last page-turns for oboe and bassoon require a third hand. Or, of course, they require a photocopy of the final page. One wonders whether the common and sensible practice of copying pages to obviate impossible turns is actually legal; if it isn't, the law is indeed an ass. Otherwise the parts are clearly laid

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478570607000826 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478570607000826 Published online by Cambridge University Press