

Abstracts

BELLA BROVER-LUBOVSKY: *Vivaldi, Tiepolo, Algarotti and the Venetian «bizzarrie»*

This article adopts an interdisciplinary approach to Vivaldi's musical style. The aim is to demonstrate the striking parallels between the artistic life and reception history of Vivaldi and that of his concittadino, painter Giambattista Tiepolo (1696-1770). The proposition is that examination of the parallels existing between the two figures may enable a deeper comprehension of the aesthetic aspects of their work. Furthermore, placing both artists within the wider historical, cultural and intellectual climate of mid-eighteenth-century Venice fosters a fuller understanding of their works. Particularly persuasive affinities emerge from the reassessment of the contemporary critical reception of both figures, within which the keywords *bizzarrie* and *stravaganze* were deployed to characterize their allegedly eccentric styles. The article explores the historical meaning of *bizzarrie*, conceived as an amalgam of historical, stylistic and generic trends within a single composition. This stylistic blend can be demonstrated through analysis of the opening Adagio of Vivaldi's Trio Sonata Op. 1 no. 3 (RV 61) that features syntactical irregularity, harmonic waywardness, vague tonal directionality, a lack of correspondence between bass and melody and a tendency towards irregular proportioning. The application of analytical apparatus associated with art history places the heterogeneity of Vivaldi's approach in bolder relief. Reassessment of the stylistic traits and compositional techniques inherent in Vivaldi's compositions lays bare the intricate combination of formal Baroque expression and pathos with fine touches of *galant* brushwork. The result is often a motivic-thematic density and a lack of melodic-accompanimental hierarchy, quite similar to Tiepolo's overcrowded frescoes and canvases, with their abundance of sundry figures and images. The *bizzarrie* aesthetics coupled with an inclination towards eccentric, quaint and extremely individualistic expression also mirror the ambience of contemporary Venetian culture and lifestyle. These traits inhere in the literature and poetry of the region (by figures like Francesco Loredano, Nicolò Fontei) and also penetrate instrumental music, being identifiable with the emerging culture of virtuosity, as practiced by Carlo Farina, Dario Castello, Marco Uccellini. Pursuing further the Vivaldi-Tiepolo parallel establishes its relevance as a useful means of delineating the attributes and scope of the stylistic discrepancy that presumably exists between their works and mainstream mid-century Venetian culture; this culture was itself undergoing profound transformation, stimulated by the paradigmatic changes of its aesthetic and artistic values.

JOÃO PEDRO D'ALVARENGA: *Carlos Seixas's Harpsichord Concerto in G Minor: An Essay in Style Analysis and Authorship Attribution*

Coimbra, Biblioteca Geral da Universidade, MM 59 is a mid-eighteenth-century manuscript, probably by the same scribe as Coimbra MM 57 (a collection of keyboard sonatas by Carlos Seixas also including pieces by Alessandro Scarlatti and Giovanni Giorgi, datable to the 1750s-1760s or earlier) and Venice Ms. 9769 (the first part of Domenico Scarlatti's 1721 serenata *Contesa delle stagioni*). It contains a lengthy Harpsichord Concerto in G minor entitled

ABSTRACTS

Concerto a 4 Con VV, e Cimbalo, with no authorship attribution. The piece has been known since at least since Santiago Kastner's *Carlos de Seixas* (Coimbra, 1947) but, following Kastner's judgement, has been generally disregarded as «the work of an incipient imitator of Seixas», due to its alleged «crudeness and faults in orthography», and its late *galant* style. In this article I will substantiate the attribution of the harpsichord concerto in G minor to Carlos Seixas that I hypothesised in the new edition in *MGG*. This will be achieved by discussing Seixas's concertos in the context of early-to-mid-eighteenth-century solo concerto composition, particularly the group of early Italian harpsichord concertos originating from the late 1730s and 1740s. The style-markers of Seixas and the parallels between this concerto, Seixas's keyboard sonatas and his well-known, earlier Harpsichord Concerto in A major will also be considered.

RUDOLF RASCH: *How Does Mozart Start His Development Sections?*

Mozart's sonata forms have been studied extensively. Nonetheless, relatively little attention has been devoted to one of the central moments in such a form: the beginning of the development section. Surveying Mozart's sonata forms in his keyboard music, chamber music with and without piano and symphonies composed from 1772 to 1791, two basic procedures can be observed: borrowing thematic material from the preceding exposition and employing new musical material. With the first procedure, the borrowed thematic material may be derived from the main theme, the transition, the subsidiary theme zone or the closing section. Borrowings from the main theme may take the head motive or a later phrase; they may be either literal or almost literal, or very free. Traditionally a development starts in the dominant key (in the case of a major-mode movement) or the mediant key (in the case of a minor-mode movement). However, Mozart's developments may start in many keys other than those prescribed by this schematic model. If 'deviating' keys are used to open the development, often the exposition is followed by a 'connection', a short passage that belongs neither to the exposition nor to the development, but is needed to bridge the gap between final chord of the exposition and the beginning of the development. (The connection may also provide the material with which to begin the development.) Mozart's procedures can also be studied from a chronological point of view. If we divide the compositions investigated into four five-year groups, we notice affiliations between particular procedures with particular periods of time. Introducing new material to start the development, for example, is predominant in the first and second periods, from 1772 to 1781, borrowing material from the main theme in the third and fourth periods, from 1782 to 1791. Furthermore, the range of initial keys for the section broadens over time. Taking all of these observations together, one is inevitably astonished by the endless variety in which Mozart opens the developments of his sonata-form movements.

MURL SICKBERT. *Mozart's 'Jupiter': A Memorial for Leopold?*

Mozart's C-major Symphony KV 551, nicknamed the 'Jupiter', embodies great breadth, richness, and variety. Its dazzling polyphony outshines that of previous symphonies. Composition of the 'Jupiter' Symphony began sometime during the year following the death of Mozart's father Leopold. Its possibly valedictory quotations and reminiscences of works by Leopold may seem a little too poetically neat, but the allusions and connections to Wolfgang's father seem to be sufficiently numerous to generate the inescapable conclusion that they were

strategically intended to create a musical memorial. The plausibility of this is indicated by two musical memorials Mozart had already created by the time he began composition of the C-major Symphony. These memorials — containing brief, somewhat inexact, quotations, respectively in a piano concerto and a sonata for violin and piano — followed within a few months the news of the deaths of two other father-figures and mentors: Johann Christian Bach in 1782 and Carl Friedrich Abel in 1787, also the year of Leopold's death. Beginning with analyses of both of these musical memorials — the slow movement of the A-major Piano Concerto KV 414 (385p) and the finale of the A-major Violin Sonata KV 526, both of which allude by quotation to two early mentors of Mozart in a genre in which each excelled as composer-performer (Christian Bach in the piano concerto and Carl Abel in string chamber music) — this article provides analyses of quotations and allusions to Leopold in three of the four movements of the 'Jupiter' Symphony. Wolfgang again seems to have selected an appropriate genre for a musical memorial for Leopold, this time the symphony. There is no proof that Wolfgang consciously intended the 'Jupiter' to be an *homage* to his father. If he did, however, the 'Jupiter's' testimony of Mozart's to Leopold appears to be positive indeed. When Johann Peter Salomon coined the sobriquet 'Jupiter' — father of the gods — for this magnificent symphony, he christened the work more aptly than he realised.

ELIZABETH KRAMER: «*Lebewohl*», «*Abwesenheit*», and «*Wiedersehen*»: *Cyclic Integration in Beethoven's «Grand Characteristic Sonata» in E flat, Op. 81a*

Commentators have said little about the finale to Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 81a in their otherwise elaborate discussions of the work. Even the most extensive analyses of the finale pale in comparison with those of the sonata's first movement and of the first and last movements of earlier and later sonatas by Beethoven. Although the third movement to Op. 81a is not as lengthy, complex, or cumulative as others of Beethoven's finales, it is far from being a generic piece that could be casually exchanged with another. It is an important aspect of the work's identity as a characteristic sonata, and it exhibits many components typical to cyclically-integrated compositions. After a brief discussion of characteristic music around 1800, this article traces under-explored elements of the first and second movements of Op. 81a that play out in its finale; the discussion highlights, in particular, submediant relationships as they appear in the sonata and its broader musical context, from *Fidelio* and the 'Emperor' Concerto to the Incidental Music to *Egmont*. The subsequent analysis of the Op. 81a finale centers on the movement's melodic and rhythmic integration of the three-note 'fare thee well' grouping and harmonic emphasis on the submediant as they echo through the finale's sonata form, culminating in a multifaceted coda. The expressive weight of this final coda evokes previous movements as it concludes what Beethoven called his «grand characteristic sonata». This close analysis supports an interpretation of Beethoven's Op. 81a as enacting more complicated interactions of farewell, absence, and reunion than previously thought: the sonata ends with the three as *primus inter pares*. The composition's use of the submediant as emblematic of farewell suggests cross-generic influences in the characteristic sonata. Furthermore, the motivic integration of all three movements and their resonances with characteristic referents may be heard as one example of «connotations of unity» important to characteristic music of the period.