

Trinity College

Trinity College Digital Repository

Faculty Scholarship

2008

Review of Mozart's Viennese Instrumental Music: A Study of Stylistic Re- Invention, by Simon P. Keefe (Woodbridge, UK, and Rochester, NY, 2007) and Mozart's Piano Music, by William Kinderman (Oxford and New York, 2006)

John Platoff

Trinity College, john.platoff@trincoll.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/facpub>

 Part of the [Musicology Commons](#)

Trinity College
HARTFORD CONNECTICUT

dis-encharmed, he dies. Cervantes testifies to the potential of reading, that mad act of turning black marks on paper into words and sounds and images and ideas, to bring a pleasure that, in negating dogmatism and broadening our sympathies, helps make life worth living.

EDMUND J. GOEHRING

Mozart's Viennese Instrumental Music: A Study of Stylistic Re-Invention, by Simon P. Keefe. Woodbridge, UK, and Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2007. viii, 217 pp.

Mozart's Piano Music, by William Kinderman. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. 236 pp., 6 plates.

If the considerable scholarly literature on Mozart's instrumental music is constantly being enriched by the addition of important new studies, there's a reason for that. Mozart's symphonies, concertos, chamber music, and solo keyboard music are an inexhaustible source of interest and pleasure to nearly everyone who cares about what we call "classical music"; they are anchored as firmly in the repertory of performing groups and classical radio stations as any music has ever been. Moreover, Mozart's music lends itself very well to a wide range of theoretical, analytic, historical, and contextual investigations. It is hardly a surprise that scholars continue to add to our knowledge and understanding of this music. What may be surprising, however, is that the two books under review, which from their titles might appear to be quite similar, offer sharply divergent approaches to the music they discuss.

Simon P. Keefe's ambitious volume on Mozart's Viennese instrumental music begins by drawing our attention to the fact that the chronological development of the composer's style—his advances from one work to another—has been very little addressed by recent scholarship. As he says in his introductory chapter, "[a] crucial element in the stylistic analysis of Mozart's music, yet to receive the systematic attention it deserves . . . is the extent to which certain movements represent an original stylistic approach in relation to Mozart's own earlier practices" (p. 4). He goes on to offer a theory of stylistic change in Mozart's music that depends on the identification of particular works as turning points in the process.

The theory of stylistic development that Keefe proposes for Mozart's Viennese instrumental works, which he calls "stylistic re-invention," has two phases. "First, Mozart contemplates his pre-existent stylistic procedures in a genre, manipulating them to climactic effect. . . . Next, as the second stage in the re-invention process, Mozart fundamentally reshapes stylistic features of

[the works in a given genre], reacting in various ways to innovative stylistic qualities of the climactic works” (p. 167).

Keefe addresses three principal genres of Mozart’s instrumental music: piano concertos (in part 1, chaps. 1–3); string quartets (part 2, chaps. 4–5); and symphonies (part 3, chap. 6). And the “climactic works” in these genres are the Piano Concertos in E flat, K. 449, and C Minor, K. 491; the “Dissonant” Quartet in C, K. 465; and the “Jupiter” Symphony, K. 551 (though obviously the latter does not give rise to a later stage of stylistic development, since it is his final symphonic work). These choices arise only partly from purely musical considerations; Keefe acknowledges that he has “deliberately prioritized biographical, contextual and reception factors—motivated as I am by historical considerations—in determining initial points of re-invention” (p. 15).

The concerto K. 449, which Keefe views as a crucial turning point in the series of Mozart’s mature piano concertos, can serve here as an example of how the process of re-invention works and how a “climactic work” is chosen. Mozart began K. 449 in 1782 (as Alan Tyson’s work on the paper types of Mozart’s autographs has shown) but he finished it only in early 1784. Thus it was conceived alongside the earliest Viennese concertos, K. 413–415, but completed alongside K. 450, 451, and 453, the first of the “grand” concertos (the designation is Mozart’s own). But while K. 449 was contemporary with these three works, Mozart specified in a letter that, like the earlier K. 413–415, it could be performed “*a quattro* without wind instruments,” while the later works beginning with K. 450 all required the woodwinds. He further described K. 449 as a work in “an entirely special manner.”¹

It is thus K. 449’s historical position in addition to its stylistic features that is the reason for Keefe’s focus on the work, particularly its first movement. In a closely argued discussion typical of the book, he explores two passages in the development of the first movement—the part of the concerto to which Mozart presumably returned first in 1784, since the orchestral ritornello and solo exposition had been written in 1782. One of these passages (mm. 188–204), features a sharp confrontation between orchestra and soloist, played out in two-measure segments of fierce unisons (by the orchestra) and arpeggiated writing (by the piano). Using comparisons to specific passages of several other concertos, Keefe shows how this passage from K. 449 “combines a confrontational intensity new to Mozart’s piano concertos with a fusion of techniques from corresponding passages of earlier and later works” (p. 30). And he goes on to argue that “the terseness of [these] confrontations [lies] at the heart of stylistic re-invention manifest in the work [and that they] resonate not only beyond the confines of Mozart’s concertos from 1784, but also beyond his concerto repertory in general” (p. 34).

1. The phrase is Keefe’s rendering of “ganz besonderer Art” in Mozart’s letter. *Mozart: Briefe und Aufzeichnungen, Gesamtausgabe*, ed. Wilhelm A. Bauer and Otto Erich Deutsch, vol. 3, 1780–86 (Kassel and London: Bärenreiter, 1963), 315. Quoted in Keefe, p. 20.

In short, a particular passage in K. 449 is seen to bring together stylistic elements already present in earlier works into a new and original synthesis, one that in turn is further explored and reconfigured in subsequent works. It is this process, which Keefe views as quite deliberate on Mozart's part, that he refers to as "re-invention." In the later concertos, according to Keefe, Mozart built on the possibilities of dialogue between orchestra and piano that reached a first climactic point in K. 449. Speaking of the "grand" concertos beginning with K. 450, Keefe stresses the interaction of "grandeur" (the power associated with orchestral statements), "brilliance" (piano figuration), and what he calls "intimate grandeur." The latter seems to me an unnecessary and unhelpful neologism, derived in a strained manner from Heinrich Christoph Koch's discussion of the concerto in his *Introductory Essay on Composition*.² By "intimate grandeur" Keefe appears to mean "orchestra-piano dialogue," or perhaps, more narrowly, brief imitative dialogue between piano and orchestra that occurs during solo sections.

The second climactic work among the piano concertos is K. 491, which for Keefe represents a high point "in terms of stylistic equilibrium" (p. 55).³ As technical virtuosity in the solo portions of concertos ("brilliance") has steadily increased since K. 450, so has the power and forcefulness of the orchestral contributions ("grandeur"). K. 491 illustrates the culmination of those processes, also bringing them together in an apotheosis of dialogue: its first movement "contains both the most powerful confrontation between piano and orchestra in Mozart's concerto repertory (bars 330–45) and the most protracted sequence of piano/orchestra dialogue in his first movements (bars 362–463)" (p. 55).

After K. 491, Keefe argues, the remaining three piano concertos move in somewhat different stylistic directions (though it is not quite clear how K. 503 differs from K. 491, or why it is less of a climactic work). The final pair of concertos, K. 537 and K. 595, diverge from K. 491 in ways that are difficult to summarize while doing justice to Keefe's complex and multifaceted analysis.

2. Heinrich Christoph Koch, *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*, 3 vols. (Rudolstadt and Leipzig: A. F. Böhme, 1782–93); trans. Nancy Kovaleff Baker as *Introductory Essay on Composition: The Mechanical Rules of Melody, Sections 3 and 4* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1983), 209. Keefe's discussion is on pp. 46–47.

3. Keefe's argument for the "climactic" status of K. 491 also rests on its being the last "in an uninterrupted two-year stream of eleven masterpieces (K. 449–491, spring 1784–spring 1786)" (p. 23; see also pp. 10 and 12). Yet just under nine months separate the completion date of K. 491 from that of K. 503 (24 March and 4 December 1786); this gap is slightly smaller than that between K. 467 and K. 482 (9 March and 16 December 1785), two of the concertos in the middle of the "uninterrupted two-year stream." Moreover, as Keefe briefly acknowledges and as Kinderman stresses in his discussion of the reworking of K. 503's first piano entry, Alan Tyson has shown that the first three bifolia of K. 503's autograph date back to the winter of 1784–85, making the start of this work contemporary with Mozart's composition of K. 466 and 467. So the claim for K. 491 as the final concerto in a series, with K. 503 as some sort of later afterthought, is unconvincing, though the importance of the former for stylistic reasons remains.

But at least a part of their “new direction” is the appearance of harmonic and textural disjunctions in the first movements of both works—passages with startling chromaticism or audacious tonal shifts at places where such features have not occurred in Mozart’s previous concertos. At the same time, Keefe argues that these works, in the wake of “the formal and dialogic complexity of the first movement of K. 491,” continue to “[experiment] with his standard paradigm of . . . dialogic co-operation in the solo exposition and recapitulation sections and less intimate, often confrontational exchange in the development” (p. 83).

There is much to admire and much to think about in Keefe’s densely argued chapters, with their thorough examination of thematic, harmonic, textural, and formal elements. Especially in his chapters on the piano concertos, which were the subject of his earlier monograph,⁴ he is able to cite the details of particular passages with the authority of a Biblical scholar. On the other hand, the constant references to many different works in a single paragraph present real challenges for a reader, as this excerpt from the discussion of K. 449 reveals.

The openings of the development sections of K. 413, 415, 450 and 451 either foreshadow or recall the corresponding segment of K. 449, but without possessing its confrontational intensity. The brief *tutti* interjection in bars 183–85 of K. 413 contrasts thematically, texturally and dynamically with the preceding material in the piano; however, it also endorses the piano’s confirmation of G minor, and prepares for the unison texture and dotted rhythm of the piano’s subsequent phrase (bars 185ff.). The development of K. 415, like K. 449, begins with a six-bar solo statement in the piano which cadences in the dominant (bars 160–66, albeit not repeating the preceding orchestral theme). The orchestra’s subsequent modulation to C (bars 166–68), employing staccato quavers and a crescendo that contrast with the piano’s preceding material, and the piano’s sequential repeat of its thematic material from bar 160 in bars 168ff., suggest that an alternating sequential pattern of contrasting material will be established, although one does not in fact materialize. In K. 450 and K. 451, too, elements of the developmental passage from K. 449 resurface. The piano at the beginning of the development of K. 450 telescopes two procedures from K. 449—the modulation from the dominant to the dominant minor and the repetition of immediately preceding orchestral material—into two bars: the piano elaborates the strings and winds’ consequent from the previous phrase, while moving to F minor (see bars 152–56). In K. 451 (Ex. 1.6), on the other hand, the piano takes up the antecedent from the orchestra’s previous phrase at the opening of the development (bars 187–89), passing it back to the winds (189–91) before B9 harmony sets up a confirmation of E minor (bars 191–93). Arpeggios contrasting with the antecedent figure are introduced into the piano in bars 191–92 and 199–200 (F#9), thus invoking the opposition of the trill figure and the piano arpeggios from K. 449. (pp. 30–31)

4. Keefe, *Mozart’s Piano Concertos: Dramatic Dialogue in the Age of Enlightenment* (Woodbridge, UK, and Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2001).

Keefe's book is obviously intended for experienced musicians, but even so the many discussions like this one create a dilemma for the reader. One alternative is to consult the scores of no fewer than five piano concertos while reading a single paragraph, thus making one's progress through the book slow indeed. (That may in fact be what the author hopes for from his readers, though my guess is that few will take him up on it.) But the other is to read without referring to scores and take Keefe's word for the truth of what he is saying. In this case, the many paragraphs like this are simply far too detailed. The book's forty musical examples are enormously helpful, but they illustrate no more than a fraction of the passages Keefe discusses in detail. And while at times the analytical specifics (or references to comparable passages) are relegated to footnotes, often the main text reads much like the passage just quoted.

A quite different problem, and for me the source of considerable skepticism, is the extent to which Keefe asserts the intentionality of Mozart's stylistic experimentations. If he never quite reaches the point of arguing for the composer's conscious intentions, he does not stop far short:

It is more remarkable . . . that the continuation of re-invention through stylistic experimentation was so carefully planned for complementary effect in the first movements of K. 537 and 595. [In both movements] he contravenes his standard approaches to harmonic and thematic succession at important formal junctures and his typical attitudes towards the placement of piano figuration. . . . [But whereas K. 537/i] is stylistically innovative . . . in the orchestral exposition, solo exposition and recapitulation sections, [K. 595/i] breaks new ground in the development and after the recapitulation's cadential trill. Mozart's experimentation at complementary locations covering all principal sections of the movement . . . points to a systematic re-assessment of his compositional *modus operandi* . . . carried out in organized, methodical fashion. (pp. 83–84)

That Mozart intentionally explored innovative stylistic approaches in certain sections of the first-movement form of K. 537 and reserved his innovations in K. 595 for the remaining sections of the form—that these two works were *planned* to be complementary in this way—seems quite unlikely.

The same difficulty arises in the first of Keefe's two chapters on string quartets. Few would disagree with his choice of K. 465, and in particular the notoriously chromatic slow introduction to its first movement, as a "climactic work" in this genre. He sees the six "Haydn" quartets as a tightly knit, very carefully planned set and characterizes the introduction of K. 465 as an "integration of musical procedures from the first five 'Haydn' quartets" (p. 104). Keefe demonstrates this by way of a specific passage from each of the other quartets that he ties to K. 465, stating that the composer quite intentionally "foreshadows the K. 465 Adagio in each of his preceding five quartets" (p. 100). This is a very different claim from showing that there are passages in the previous quartets that anticipate, or may be stylistically linked to, the opening of K. 465.

Keefe views the “collective invocations of [the first five ‘Haydn’ quartets] at the opening of K. 465” as a carefully planned strategy, one about whose motivations he is willing to speculate. “Mozart could conceivably have intended invocations of his own quartets in the K. 465 Adagio as a complement to his invocations of Haydn’s Op. 33 set in [some of the earlier works in Mozart’s ‘Haydn’ set]” (p. 103). But the stylistic connections that Keefe adduces, while for the most part convincing in themselves, do not persuade me that Mozart intended the introduction of K. 465 either to “invoke” the earlier quartets or to sum up the cycle.

The second string quartet chapter addresses the “Prussian” quartets (K. 575, 589, and 590), focusing on the central stylistic importance of “intense musical contrast” in these works (p. 123). It is less successful, though, in arguing that this “new intensity of contrast [developed] from the startling contrast between the Adagio and Allegro of K. 465/i” (p. 122), particularly since the contrasts in the “Prussian” quartets are quite different in kind from those of K. 465. Moreover, Keefe’s placing of the quartet K. 499 at a stylistic midpoint between K. 465 and the later works seems a little too neat, as though stylistic development proceeded chronologically in step-by-step fashion.

In the single chapter devoted to symphonies Keefe discusses the famous contrapuntal finale of the “Jupiter” Symphony, K. 551—a climactic work if there ever was one. Since Mozart’s Viennese symphonies comprise just a small number of works, and since no symphonies followed K. 551, Keefe’s overall argument for “stylistic re-invention” can be made here only in part. But his detailed account of the finale, while taking into consideration much of the vast previous literature, provides a new perspective by focusing on the concept of “dramatic dialogue” in eighteenth-century writings about the symphony, as well as on the ways this dialogue may be located in Mozart’s music.

A final chapter investigates stylistic re-invention outside the confines of the three genres considered earlier in the book. Keefe discusses the Quintet for Piano and Winds, K. 452, the piano quartets and trios, and in somewhat more cursory fashion some of Mozart’s piano and violin sonatas and solo piano sonatas. Here he brings together many earlier threads, showing how the quintet and quartets in particular can be understood as drawing upon the procedures of both piano concertos and string quartets. The chapter also provides the author the opportunity to discuss more fully a subject mentioned frequently earlier in the book: intergeneric connections and stylistic developments in Mozart’s music (including connections to Mozart’s operatic music, particularly with respect to processes of dialogue).

Keefe has written a rewarding, challenging, and at times frustrating study. His theory about stylistic re-invention is carefully and densely argued, and the many detailed stylistic connections he makes between works both within a genre and across genres provide ample opportunity for future scholars to eval-

uate the persuasiveness of his claims. Keefe's argument is also enriched by numerous discussions of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century theoretical and aesthetic writings. If at times he pushes his argument—especially with respect to the intentionality of Mozart's stylistic development—further than my own reading of the evidence justifies, he has nonetheless insisted that scholars need to think about stylistic change in Mozart's music, and offered a promising way of doing just that.

William Kinderman's *Mozart's Piano Music* is a very different sort of book. A performing pianist himself, he limits his focus to Mozart's music for piano (both solo and with other instruments) and does not seek to make an overarching argument about these works. Rather, the book's main chapters "survey characteristic features of Mozart's style, illustrated by analytical discussion of selected works" (p. 15). Four of the seven chapters address particular genres of keyboard music: the piano sonatas; variations and miscellaneous other works for solo piano; four-hand and two-piano works; and, in the longest chapter of the book, the piano concertos.

Naturally, some works receive more attention than others. The C-minor Piano Concerto, K. 491, the subject of an earlier article by Kinderman, gets twenty pages, nearly all of it devoted to the first movement, while the Piano Concerto in E flat, K. 449, so central to the argument of Keefe's book (and which Kinderman calls "highly original" [p. 155]), is dealt with in three concise paragraphs.

Kinderman's lucid analytical discussions of particular works and movements are almost unfailingly insightful. He considers various characteristics of individual works: gestural and motivic relationships, harmonic and tonal issues, and formal structure. At times he also offers advice on how a passage should be performed. Explicitly rejecting an emphasis either on "fallible substance [or] determined, inexorable structure," he insists on a balance between these two elements.⁵ And he frequently directs the reader's attention to the way in which Mozart's musical gestures early in a movement raise implications that are fulfilled later on. A sentence about the first movement of the Sonata in G, K. 283, can also serve as an apt description of the author's analytic approach: "The gestural meaning of this music is closely bound up with the individuality of its motivic components, but also with the rich web of interrelationships as musical ideas are recalled, combined, transformed, and even placed in conflict with one another" (p. 27).

Among many felicitous examples of this approach is Kinderman's account of the opening ritornello of the C-major Concerto, K. 467. Citing the three

5. The quotation is from Richard Kramer, "Ambiguities in *La Malinconia*: What the Sketches Say," in *Beethoven Studies* 3, ed. Alan Tyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 29. It is quoted by Kinderman on p. 13.

distinct elements of the initial paragraph—the spare triadic theme played by unison strings, the tonally colorful fanfare response of the woodwinds, and the tutti which combines the triadic theme with a new counter-melody in the winds, reinforced by the brasses—he points out that “[t]he opening moments of the piece thus expose three distinctly different qualities of sonority, which are treated consistently and with far-reaching implications in the remainder of the work” (p. 176). And the following paragraph deftly shows how these implications are realized first at the end of the ritornello, and then with even greater effect at the climax of the development section. “Here, as elsewhere in Mozart, a conspicuous detail in the orchestral texture assumes a much broader significance in the work as a whole” (p. 176).

That last sentence suggests a thread which a reader might trace through Kinderman’s book: his interest in demonstrating how particular motives or gestures are transformed and reused as a movement progresses. It is, however, one of the few such threads that can be found. For the most part, Kinderman addresses one work at a time. As I have said his chapters are organized by genre; and within chapters he proceeds chronologically, but without attempting an overview of the characteristics of the works in that genre. Simply put, we do not learn here what Mozart’s piano sonatas are like (beyond a few very basic points). Rather, we are directed to particular features of, say, the opening movement of the Sonata in C, K. 279; then to features of the work’s Andante and its finale; and then on to the next work. Observations about groups of works, or about Mozart’s stylistic development over time (whether within a genre or across genres) are extremely rare. Even when Kinderman acknowledges the “rich stylistic evolution” that occurs in Mozart’s piano music, he addresses “the chronological tendencies” of this evolution in a single paragraph and makes only two stylistic observations: that the many piano works of 1781–86 show a “brilliance and diversity” that make this period the “climactic phase” of his output for piano; and that the solo piano works from 1789 “show contrapuntal and monothematic tendencies that are characteristic of Mozart’s last years” (p. 13).

Kinderman’s introductory chapter, “The Challenge of Mozart’s Keyboard Music,” diverges from the work-by-work discussion, as do two later chapters. The introduction treats briefly a number of general issues, among them the question of historic instruments (about which the author takes no position); the performance traditions of Mozart’s time and the relationship of musical scores to performance; notions of taste (“Geschmack”) and sensitivity (“Empfindung”), and what these terms meant to Mozart; other composers whose music influenced Mozart’s; and the sensitivity of the composer to the taste and expectations of his audiences. Each of these helpful and at times provocative discussions could have been much expanded; as it stands the issues are not explored in sufficient depth to satisfy a reader who already knows much of Mozart’s keyboard music and is eager to develop a broader conceptual framework in which to appreciate it.

Conversely, I found chapter 2, “The Musical Language: The Sonata in G Major, K. 283,” to be the most satisfying of the book, precisely because its allotment of twelve pages to a single movement (the opening movement of the sonata) provides sufficient space for Kinderman to unfold and develop his ideas. The chapter is intended to present the author’s analytic concerns and serve as a model of an “ideal” analysis, as preparation for the much more concise discussions that follow. It illuminates the musical workings of the movement clearly and powerfully and will change any reader’s sense of how it should be heard or performed.

Chapter 6 addresses Mozart’s creative process by considering the “Dürnitz” Sonata, K. 284, and the C-major Concerto, K. 503. The first movement of the former “survives in an original version that was later thoroughly reshaped” (p. 117), while the autograph of the latter contains a discernible “outline draft” of the first 127 measures that can be compared with the final version. Kinderman stresses here that Mozart, contrary to the popular view found in *Amadeus* and elsewhere, frequently sketched and reworked his music, determined to find the best way to express his ideas in a manner familiar to us from the later example of Beethoven. The chapter presents illuminating and rewarding discussions of how and why Mozart altered and improved his initial musical ideas.

For whom is this book intended, and how is it to be used? Clearly, Kinderman assumes that readers are already familiar with each work he discusses, or that they will have a score at hand—preferably both. This may be inferred from nearly every one of his discussions of individual works. These three sentences address the opening of the Piano Sonata in A Minor, K. 310:

Mozart expands his thematic structure at precisely that moment when the poignant piano gestures are heard; consequently, the tonic cadence, with its vigorous reassertion of the head of the opening theme, is delayed one measure, until bar 9. The continuous driving rhythm of eighth notes connects to this short expressive episode at m. 5, with the ostinato effect curtailed at the sigh-figures in mm. 5–7, as imitations in the left hand mimic the gestures in the right hand. It is as if an implacable external agency embodied in the first measures had yielded momentarily to a personal, subjective presence in the following measures, before collapsing into the irresistible forward momentum. (p. 45)

These words are not very enlightening to anyone not consulting a score,⁶ and they will be of only limited interest to anyone who cannot already bring to mind the passionate, driving intensity of this astonishing work. However, since very few readers will already be well acquainted with all the compositions Kinderman treats here, many of them may find the chapters that survey an entire genre tough going, however rewarding the discussions of particular pieces

6. The book contains seventy-two musical examples of various lengths; these are very helpful where they occur, but do not illustrate more than a fraction of the works discussed.

may be.⁷ In fact, it is likely that readers will find much to interest them in the introductory chapter and those on K. 283 and the “Dürnitz” Sonata and K. 503, while dipping into the genre chapters to see what Kinderman has to say about particular works.

The overlap in coverage between Keefe’s and Kinderman’s books is smaller than one might expect, given their titles. Since Keefe discusses Mozart’s piano sonatas only briefly, and since neither author devotes that much attention to his chamber music with piano, the only genre to which they both give considerable space is the piano concertos. And in light of the goal of each book, the concertos are discussed in quite different fashion, Kinderman examining one work at a time and Keefe concentrating on a small number of particular works (all the time drawing comparisons to others) which he uses to make his larger argument.

Their treatments of the opening movement of the C-minor Concerto, K. 491, illustrate these divergent approaches, while also reminding us of the many angles from which one can usefully think about a masterpiece. Kinderman’s lengthy discussion concentrates on motivic ideas and their treatment, on harmonic relationships, on formal structure, and on the music’s character, with references to the *ombra* music of *Don Giovanni*. Despite Keefe’s view of K. 491 as a “climactic work” he actually discusses it only briefly, no doubt because he wrote about the work in great detail in his earlier book on the piano concertos.⁸ And his discussion in the present book focuses almost exclusively on the specifics of orchestra-piano dialogue, a subject that scarcely appears in Kinderman’s far longer treatment.

There are many ways to write about Mozart’s music, as these two very different books remind us, and nearly any approach will have much to offer if it is carried out as scrupulously and authoritatively as Keefe and Kinderman have done. While Keefe’s view of stylistic change makes the process seem more intentional, even teleological, than his evidence justifies, his careful analysis of specific musical features in Mozart’s instrumental music draws our attention to processes of stylistic change that deserve further scrutiny. Kinderman’s book provides the reader with illuminating insights into many of Mozart’s keyboard works, even if it is less successful in telling us about the composer’s piano music as a whole. Both books leave questions unanswered; but then, what work of scholarship does not? As the music theorist Leonard B. Meyer liked to say, “Just because I can’t explain everything doesn’t mean I

7. In this respect his approach offers less to readers than does that of Robert Levin’s chapters “Mozart’s Solo Keyboard Music” and “Mozart’s Keyboard Concertos” in *Eighteenth-Century Keyboard Music*, ed. Robert L. Marshall (New York: Schirmer, 1994), where Levin offers many broader connections between works, remarks about the wider musical context, and general observations about stylistic trends within a genre.

8. Keefe, *Mozart’s Piano Concertos*, esp. 80–100.

shouldn't explain something." In their quite divergent ways both Keefe and Kinderman have explained a lot of somethings.

JOHN PLATOFF

W. A. Mozart, by Hermann Abert. Translated by Stewart Spencer. Edited by Cliff Eisen. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007. xxvii, 1,515 pp.

Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart: A Biography, by Piero Melograni. Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2007. xv, 300 pp., 8 pp. color plates.

"Oh qual contrasto," exclaims Elettra in *Idomeneo*, recognizing Ilia's heroic self-sacrifice, and her own solipsism. Similar feelings are evoked by contrasting these two studies of Mozart. Hermann Abert transcended his original intention to revise Otto Jahn's Mozart biography, and he produced an essentially new book in two volumes, each of over 1,000 pages, dealing with life and music. They were published in 1919 and 1921 (called the 5th edition); a 6th edition, "essentially unchanged,"¹ appeared in 1923 and 1924, and it is this edition that is now translated for the first time into English, by Stewart Spencer, in a single volume with additional notes by Cliff Eisen. Piero Melograni in *La vita e il tempo di Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart* (2003) felt impelled by the interest of the subject to exceed his original intention, of which some traces remain: a short biography for young readers, hardly discussing the music.

Nevertheless, Melograni invites scholarly inspection by his copious reference to sources, and the translation by Lydia G. Cochrane is pleasantly readable. But the resulting portrait is neither markedly original nor entirely reliable, and is overdependent on the more seductive opinions of such predecessors as Wolfgang Hildesheimer and Maynard Solomon.² Occasionally Melograni breaks free, demolishing Hildesheimer's self-satisfied ruminations on Mozart's behavior at the time of his mother's death (pp. 99–101). In such circumstances Abert lays out what we know by copious quotation from the sources, mainly the family letters, occasionally rebuking his predecessors in footnotes. Any Mozart biography depends heavily on this correspondence, and the family relationships exposed or hinted at offer ample scope for interpretation. Melograni insists on Nannerl's jealousy of her brother, whereas

1. Translation of Abert's preface to the 6th ed. (p. xxvii in the translation reviewed here).

2. Wolfgang Hildesheimer, *Mozart*, trans. Marion Faber (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1982); and Maynard Solomon, *Mozart: A Life* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995).