Review

The Symphonic Repertoire, Volume 1: The Eighteenth-Century Symphony, edited by Mary Sue Morrow and Bathia Churgin. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2012

The five heavyweight tomes that now comprise *The Symphonic Repertoire* represent a signal accomplishment by any measure. Conceived as a love of labor and scholarly ambition by the late A. Peter Brown (1943–2003), the multivolume series was designed to offer a meticulous, style-analytical account of the symphony in its salient manifestations from the early eighteenth century through the twentieth. Reasonably enough, Brown's work on the plan focused at the outset on the later, more readily manageable phases of the genre's history. The first volume to appear in print was *The First Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert* (designated as Volume 2, published in 2002, not long before the author's death). Subsequent volumes appeared during the next several years: Volume 4, *The Second Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony: Brahms, Bruckner, Dvorák, Mahler, and Selected Contemporaries,* in 2003; and then Volume 3, in two parts: *The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930, Part A: Germany and the Nordic Countries*, and *Part B: Great Britain, Russia, and France*, both in 2007.

It was almost certainly Brown's intention to follow the two-part Volume 3 with the book that was to have completed the series, Volume 5, *The Symphony in Europe and the Americas in the Twentieth Century* (such a text has not appeared, although numerous library catalogs include the title in their general listing for the series; it is not currently mentioned on the publisher's website). This would have left Volume 1, *The Eighteenth-Century Symphony*, an exploration of the varied, astonishingly voluminous, and relatively little-known repertoire prior to, and contemporaneous with, the symphonic accomplishments of Haydn and Mozart. Certainly, there was good reason to leave this exceptionally difficult and time-consuming part of the enterprise for last. Indeed, this phase of the project posed challenges of an altogether different order of magnitude from the others. Rather than providing an explanatory analytical guide through a canon of symphonic masterworks, this study would involve the hard work of uncovering and sorting out the very foundations and early history of the genre, before there was such a thing as a symphonic canon. The raw numbers are staggering. Jan LaRue's *Catalogue of 18th-Century Symphonies, Volume 1: Thematic Identifier*, indexes more than 1,500 composers and lists 16,558 incipits (the actual number of symphonies composed during the period is doubtless much larger than this figure suggests).[1] Problems of dating and authenticity are legion and sometimes all but impossible to unravel, and many of the works to be identified and examined exist only in the form of manuscript parts widely scattered in a multitude of libraries, monasteries, and private collections.

Brown had devised an outline for the contents of *The Eighteenth-Century Symphony* but evidently had not begun writing by the time of his death. This was a tragic loss, but from that loss sprang an opportunity, namely the possibility of sustaining *The Symphonic Repertoire*'s

[1] Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988. As duly acknowledged by the editors, *The Eighteenth-Century Symphony* is indebted to LaRue's heroic effort in compiling the massive "Union Thematic Catalogue of 18th-Century Symphonies," which resides in the Fales Collection, Bobst Library, New York University.

momentum through a collective endeavor that would exceed what a single-author effort could reasonably hope to achieve. It was with this purpose that a resourceful team of specialists, twenty-two in all, was assembled under the editorial guidance of Mary Sue Morrow and Bathia Churgin, two of the field's most seasoned and accomplished experts. (Morrow's contribution merits special mention. In addition to serving as co-editor, she may be acknowledged as the book's principal author, having supplied the four introductory chapters encompassed in "Part 1: Overview," the first chapter of "Part 5: The Austrian Monarchy," and the summarizing "Part 9: Reflections."[2])

In keeping with the spirit of Brown's overall conception for *The Symphonic Repertoire*, there was no intention to forge a grand historical narrative with its attendant trajectories of progress and stylistic evolution. The intention, rather, was to create something inherently less problematic: a detailed survey of an extant body of works, examining the various manifestations of the genre at the hands of different composers whose careers are encompassed within the designated time-frame. The result is an admirably cohesive volume of nearly 900 pages, densely yet readably packed with information and musical insight, which covers the genre's first century. The book provides a solid foundation for the compendium as a whole, but it also stands very much on its own in method and substance. A definitive, superbly documented reference for research in eighteenth-century instrumental music, it will be required reading for specialists, and it will be of enduring interest to students as well as classical-music enthusiasts. (As an added benefit, the volume comes with a compact disc that offers recordings of unpublished symphonies by Joseph Camerloher, Louis-Gabriel Guillemain, Johan Helmich Roman, Johann Gottlob Harrer, Niccolò Jommelli, Johan Agrell, Karl von Ordonez, and Gaetano Brunetti.)

Apart from the substantial introductory and closing material (i.e. Morrow's Parts 1 and 9, mentioned above), the volume is arranged geographically, with major sections devoted to Italy, north Germany, south Germany, the Austrian Monarchy, France, Britain, and the periphery (a designation that not only encompasses such outer European regions as the Scandinavian countries, Russia, the Iberian peninsula, Scotland/Ireland, and Malta, but that also includes the reach of the genre into the New World). Within each of the regions surveyed, we encounter a parade of composers and an account of their symphonic achievements against a richly textured backdrop of relevant information on politics, patronage, and economic circumstances. Sacred and secular institutions in which the genre was cultivated are discussed, along with such musically pertinent issues as stylistic preferences and idiosyncrasies, orchestral resources, and aspects of change from one generation to the next. (For each region, a preliminary essay provides an overview and calls attention to significant contributors; the focus then narrows to a selection of the most notable figures in question, each of whom gets an individual chapter.)

The regional surveys are clearly written, filled with factual content, and thoughtful in presentation. Inevitably, some of the composers mentioned remain little more than names; and yet readers will find an astonishing number of composers coming to life with at least a passing account of their professional lives and symphonic contribution. The text is usually a pleasure to

[2] Contributing authors, in addition to Bathia Churgin and Mary Sue Morrow, include Peter M. Alexander, Allan Badley, Joanna Cobb Biermann, Paul Robey Bryan, Suzanne Forsberg, Robert O. Gjerdingen, Sarah Mandel-Yehuda, Marita Petzoldt McClymonds, Simon McVeigh, Jeannette Morgenroth, Sterling E. Murray, Timothy Noonan, Adena Portowitz, René Ramos, R. Todd Rober, Michael Ruhling, Judith L. Schwartz, Bertil van Boer, Richard Will, and Jean K. Wolf.

read, owing to the authors' enthusiasm and their skill in balancing details and particulars with the connective tissue of overview and generalization. The passage of trenchant observations quoted below (from the chapter on the symphony in south Germany) stands for many in this regard:

> The south German *Hofkapelle* network fostered an exceptional opportunity for cross-pollination of musical taste and style. This exchange is of special significance to our study, as it lends added credence to the perception of the eighteenth-century south German symphony as a unified musical repertory, drawing upon commonly established procedures and techniques while still subject to the personal taste of individual patrons. Typically, traveling musicians carried with them compositions to perform on tour, including their own works or those of composers from their home courts. Thus knowledge of "local" music passed effectively to other centers. Manuscript copies in one archive that were unmistakably prepared at another make the most compelling evidence for the inter-association of the south German courts. (p. 303)

The authors' ability to address complex historical and stylistic issues with a deft, imaginative touch is exemplified in a chapter on the symphony in France, where an intriguing question is raised: "What was French in a French symphony?" (p. 557). The search for an answer points our attention to such novel items as an eighteenth-century song that makes fun of French music, and the caricatures of national manners featured in Dittersdorf's *Sinfonia nazionale nel gusto di cinque nazioni.* Time and again, the authors' inclusion of peculiar biographical details, pertinent anecdotes, and quotations from contemporary writings adds color and substance to the discourse. In a survey of composers associated with the Mannheim court, for example, we read of the prodigious early accomplishment of the once highly regarded Anton Fils (1733–60). He managed to compose no fewer than 47 symphonies before his tragically early death, and was eulogized by C.F.D. Schubart as "the best composer of symphonies that ever lived" (p. 312). A look into the courts of Wallerstein and Regensburg includes mention of the exceedingly prolific Franz Xaver Pokorný (1729–94), who wrote more than 135 symphonies. A tale is told of professional envy of the sort that can send chills down the spine of the archive researcher. Our villain is the Thurn und Taxis intendant Baron Theodor von Schacht (1748–1823), who took it upon himself to obliterate Pokorný's name from more than 100 symphony manuscripts in the Regensburg collection in order to substitute the names of other composers: a veritable patron saint of forgers and falsifiers. And then there was poor John Marsh (1752–1828), an enterprising British writer and composer so frustrated by his compatriots' disdain for home-grown musical talent that at one point he tried to attract the interest of publishers by replacing his own name on symphony manuscripts with the vaguely German-sounding anagram "Sharm": a clever ruse, but would anyone have been deceived?

In the chapters devoted to selected individual symphonists, the authors provide well-documented accounts of their subjects' careers, with due consideration to relevant local customs, economic factors, and the various limitations and opportunities that informed their conditions of employment. Where practical considerations permit, chronologically ordered lists of relevant works are provided, with information on key, meter, scoring, and the like, so that we can grasp some sense of a composer's symphonic oeuvre at a glance. (Several of these composers, driven by engines of unstoppable productivity, wrote so many symphonies that to list them all would consume a prohibitive amount of space.) Technical and critical discussions of the music typically involve the choice of one or more representative works for close inspection, with music

examples to accompany the descriptive commentary. Two dozen composers are given this treatment, including such familiar names as the brothers C.P.E. Bach and J.C. Bach, Luigi Boccherini, and Johann Stamitz, but also a host of less well recognized figures, including the brothers Joseph Anton Camerloher and Placidus von Camerloher, Gaetano Brunetti, and Helmich Roman. Revelations abound as new material is brought to light, and there are unexpected insights into fundamental issues of symphonic style and structure. To cite one example, there appears to have been a more widespread concern for the mechanisms of cyclic cohesion than one might have thought. For example: Michael Haydn's predilection for distinctive motives and sonorities that recur from one movement of a symphony to the next (pp. 507-509); whole passages from first movements of certain symphonies by Boccherini that return in subsequent parts of the cycle (pp. 174-78); and opening pronouncements in symphonies by Wanhal to which explicit allusions are made in later movements (p. 532).

Also surprising is the extent to which a number of mid-eighteenth-century composers digressed from prevailing customs of instrumentation. Notable in this regard are the insufficiently recognized contributions of Johann Samuel Endler (1694–1762), who was active for most of his professional life at the court of Hessen-Darmstadt. Composing for the well-endowed orchestra of the Darmstadt *Hofkapelle*, evidently one of the largest standing ensembles of this time, he made rich and varied use of the wind and brass instruments at his disposal. He also saw unusual possibilities for the court's large array of kettledrums. For example, in the brilliant opening theme of his symphony F1, where the penetrating sonority of high trumpets doubles the first- and second-violins parts, the impact is amplified by a formidable battery of five timpani, tuned to the pitches F, G, A, Bb, and C respectively (Example 14.2a, p. 271). In the course of the opening phrase, the multiplicity of available pitches enables the timpani to at least partially double the animated, beat-marking leaps of the bass line; and when the opening primary-theme statement concludes in measure 8, those timpani contribute a surge of energy and propulsion into the next phrase, as they join the basses in a marvelously percussive, sixteenth-note melodic descent through the lower half of the F-major scale (C Bb A G F).

Enlightening from several perspectives is the chapter on Giovanni Battista Sammartini, which argues a persuasive case for regarding this composer as one of the most inspired and influential symphonists of the time. The chapter focuses sharply on aspects of Sammartini's stylistic development through detailed scrutiny of compositional processes: the early works' prodigious surface energy, rhythmic variety and tension, and innovative solutions to basic problems of movement structure (p. 149); the middle-period command of melodic expression and instrumental interplay, as witnessed in the haunting chromatic inflections and delicate melodic dialogue of first and second violins at the outset of the slow movement of J-C 62a (Example 8.4, p. 160); and the polished coordination of elements seen in the late symphonies, with their nuanced dynamics, textural variety, and vivid thematic contrasts (p. 163).

Among the changes witnessed in Sammartini's style over time, there are resonances with similar developments in works by his younger contemporaries. Notable in this regard is a growing fondness for increasingly large units of melodic construction, a tendency that goes hand in hand with increasing thematic diversity and functional differentiation. In this vein, the chapter on Johann Stamitz notes a progressive "broadening in the prevailing dimension of activity" (p. 354). Elsewhere we read of Wagenseil's change from favoring small melodic particles to his later preference for three- and four-measure phrases (pp. 475-78), and of Wanhal's expansion from one-measure motives in early symphonies to his later four-measure phrases with their characteristic "Italianate melodic curve" (p. 532).

A reasonable inference from such observations concerning small-scale growth is that a corresponding expansion takes place in the overall size of symphony movements. There are a number of discussions that do in fact deal with issues of movement length, and with related matters regarding the genre's changing functions and its capacity as a vehicle for expressive weight and rhetorical intensity. Yet there remains a pertinent question that seldom is confronted directly: Just how long are the movements of a typical symphony within a generation, a locale, or a particular phase of a composer's career? Among the book's many otherwise helpful lists and tables, it is only in one instance—in the chapter on J.C. Bach—that we actually find measure counts for each movement of each work. Here we can see, among other revealing peculiarities, the special cyclic profile bestowed on Bach's lone minor-key symphony (Op. 6 No. 6 in G minor), whose uniquely compact first movement (43 measures in 2/4 time, compared with 146 measures in common time for the first movement of Op. 6 No. 1, for example) is set off against an exceptionally long finale (82 measures in 12/8 time, compared with that of Op. 6 No.1, which extends for 144 measures in 3/8 (p. 666).

Given J.C. Bach's "historical position as a path breaker for future eighteenth-century composers" (p. 678), the substantial size of the chapter devoted to his symphonies seems amply justified (21 pages, roughly comparable in length to the Sammartini chapter, but more than twice as long as the chapter on Johann Stamitz). Why some of these chapters are longer than others is not always obvious, and, in some cases, there may be no other basis than the vagaries of a complex, multi-author enterprise in which contributors are to some extent left to their own devices. The longest composer chapter of all happens to be that exploring the symphonies of François-Joseph Gossec (1734–1829). Detailed discussion of form and style in his symphony movements is augmented by an array of informative tables that list the orchestras with which the composer was associated, the tempos and movement-forms for each work, and their instrumentation. The profusion of topical references in Gossec's symphonies is treated at length: the conventions of the Italian opera sinfonia, the rhythms of opera buffa, and the gestures of ballet and ballroom dances, as well as allusions to the pastoral, the hunt, military style, and church music. From here, the chapter leads us deep into the realm of the partimento tradition and to Gossec's inventive use of such colorfully named structural schemata as the Monte, Ponte, Prinner, Romanesca, and Quiescenza.

Such breadth is certainly instructive, and the many stylistic insights are fascinating; but one wonders about certain disparities when the length of this chapter is compared with others. Whereas the chapter on Gossec consumes some 40 pages, that devoted to a younger contemporary of Gossec's, Ignaz Pleyel (1757–1831), occupies a mere seven, two of which are taken up by music examples and tables. True, Gossec is justifiably identified as "the leading French symphonist of eighteenth-century France" (p. 585), based on his 46 extant symphonic works. But Pleyel, who can be credited with at least 42 symphonies, was scarcely a marginal figure, as the author of the Pleyel chapter clearly points out. Having "inherited from Haydn a mature and complex symphonic language on which to base his own developing voice as a composer," he came to enjoy "phenomenal popularity" through compositions that were so widely disseminated that they were "better known in some places than the works of Haydn and Mozart" (p. 543). What happened here? Perhaps at a critical stage in what must have been a daunting editorial process, some arbitrary trimming proved necessary owing to limitations of available space.

Limitations of available space were apparently not a matter of concern, however, when it came to the question of music examples, which this volume displays in startling abundance.

Many extend for several pages and most are beautifully set in full score—a feast for the music historian's eye, all the more welcome in light of the fact that so many of the sources remain all but inaccessible. In some instances, seeing a full-score excerpt helps clarify important points about instrumental usage or contrapuntal intricacy. Yet there are many instances in which the orchestral passages in question are technically uncomplicated, and where the scoring is so light that we see nothing but rests in many of the instrumental lines. For this kind of example, compact alternatives to the full score would have freed up many pages for other uses—additional commentary on otherwise shortchanged composers such as Pleyel, to be sure, but also more structural diagrams and other graphic aids. A number of the book's authors do in fact make good use of a particular kind of diagram, the analytical timeline: a measured horizontal graph designed to give an approximation of a movement's temporal proportions and to display thematic events, changes of key, formal punctuations, and other salient features.[3] Being able to represent the defining features of a musical form in this easily graspable way is critically important to this book's enterprise, which among other things must address the symphony's key role in the exploration of large-scale musical architecture—in particular the hierarchically complex formal schemes that lent themselves to the genre's potentially exhilarating contests of exuberance and restraint, its capacity for strokes of surprise or thwarted expectation, and its ability to convey dramatic action as well as aesthetic equilibrium.

From this perspective, interest focuses on the nearly universal preference for a relatively long first movement whose design exemplifies what most of the relevant scholarly literature calls sonata form; and, as a survey of this volume's contents attests, to study the eighteenth-century symphony is to engage in animated dialogue with that literature and its recognition of the form's basic structural components—normally designated as exposition, development, and recapitulation—and two familiar variants: forms without a development section but with full recapitulation; and the so-called binary sonata, in which tonal resolution comes not with a tonic-key recapitulation of the primary theme but with the eventual return of secondary material.

So far, so good; yet readers may be justified in feeling perplexed by a statement in the book's opening chapter regarding the authors' "collective decision…to acknowledge the century's compositional flexibility by using the term *sonata practice* instead of *sonata form* whenever possible" (p. 11). Alas, just what distinctions are to be drawn between "sonata practice" and "sonata form" are never specified, and how the "sonata practice" directive plays out varies from one author to another, sometimes with baffling results. Several authors, perhaps wisely, have chosen to avoid the alternative label and to speak of "sonata form" unapologetically. Others have opted for a more-or-less wholesale adoption of "sonata practice"—an approach that leads to the kind of usage seen in the following description of a symphony by Carlos Baguer (1768–1808): "A sonata-practice first movement precedes a variation-form second…. Flutes replace the oboes in the minuet, and the finale is a rondo…. While structurally conventional, the work has some idiosyncratic rhythmic and melodic elements" (pp. 720-21). If the structures are conventional, and if we are at liberty to speak of standard formal stereotypes for the second, third, and fourth movements (i.e. variation form, minuet, and rondo), we can reasonably conclude that the first movement is recognizable as a sonata form.

Elsewhere, the inherently troublesome "sonata practice" formulation works mischief in ways that can leave the reader less certain as to what meaning was intended. Thus, we read that

[3] The techniques of timeline analysis are discussed in Jan LaRue, *Guidelines for Style Analysis*, expanded second edition (Sterling Heights, MI: Harmonie Park Press, 2011), 166-72.

"movements I and III [of a Galimberti symphony] contain double bars and the layout of sonata practice" (p. 107). Is such a layout different from that which readers will associate with sonata form? More opaque is the observation that "it is possible to detect embryonic sonata practice in many first movements" of early eighteenth-century opera sinfonias (p. 473). Utterly mystifying is the statement that "Jommelli rolls out a dignified repetition of (mostly) four-measure phrases in a variety of sonata practice" (p. 647). As for the observation made about a symphony finale by Reicha, that "the fugue does not stand alone but has grafted upon it thinly veiled sonata-practice gestures" (p. 322), what is actually meant by such gestures must be left to the reader's imagination.

Several of the book's authors have found the term "sonata practice" useful for distinguishing, say, between movements that readily encompass a semblance of exposition, development, and recapitulation (thus exemplifying sonata form), and those such as Jommelli's 1761 sinfonia for *Olimpiade*, where sonata ingredients are in fact only partially relevant as determinants of structure: in this work, an Andante falls between the exposition's primary and transition themes, and a closing Presto follows the recapitulation of those two themes (p. 124). There is also a large class of non-standard movements in which the multiple, form-defining recurrences of an opening theme may be recognized as ritornellos, related in principle to those of an early eighteenth-century Italian concerto movement. This happens in a number of works by Italian, north German, British, and French symphonists, and readers might have been helped by at least some measure of guidance or explanatory background on the phenomenon identified in the following sentence, which describes the opening movement of a symphony by Johann Adolph Scheibe:

> As the movement progresses, this [opening] theme expands into a two-subsection A statement before transitioning to another homophonic theme…that abruptly shifts to K in V…. This gives the exposition contrasting themes/textures of sonata practice, but with added episodic material derived from the older ritornello form. (p. 695)

At issue here evidently is a classifiable stereotype—ritornello form—and its influence on the design of certain symphony movements. Although the term crops up in this capacity more than 50 times, there is no consensus on exactly what it means. For example, there are references to a "tri-ritornello" form traceable to the concertos of Torelli (p. 105); but elsewhere we encounter references to movements with four or five ritornellos; and, in a diagram given for the movement by Scheibe cited above (p. 696), we find no fewer than eight discrete statements of a ritornello. On more than one occasion, the term "ritornello form" is identified with the concertos of Vivaldi, a composer whose concerto movements are notoriously varied in structure and resistant to generalization regarding key scheme, number of ritornellos, relationship between ritornello and solo material, and other factors of style and structure. Especially unsettling in this regard is the observation that "[Vivaldi's] widely imitated ritornello form not only influenced concerto form and style, but also provided a formal model, which, in more or less modified form, was used widely in early symphonic first movements" (p. 211). This is a reckless claim, unless what the author meant was actually something of the order of "ritornello procedure" or, indeed, "ritornello practice"; for arguably the term "ritornello form" is more unacceptably nebulous and more thoroughly undermined by "compositional flexibility" than "sonata form." In this view, the terms "form" and "practice" could plausibly be reversed (i.e. where we might consider speaking of "sonata form" and "ritornello practice") in sentences like the following: "We have noted this [i.e. the absence of a central double bar] already in a ritornello-form movement by Arne, but…it

remains the predominant British practice for sonata-practice movements…until the Haydn imitations of the later 1780s" (p. 641).

It was perhaps the common association of "sonata form" with terminological conventions of later generations that led authors to feel that the term was too suggestive of an anachronistic point of view. Yet few of the authors have any hesitation in using the patently problematic "development section"; and remarkably, all have steered clear of the term "X section," the maximally flexible alternative to "development section" proposed by Leonard Ratner.[4] Whatever the case, the intended flexibility of the "sonata practice" formulation often collides with a no less salient peculiarity, the tendency on the part of many of the book's authors to favor the theoretical mechanisms of James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's treatise on sonata theory.[5] If "sonata practice" promotes a fluid concept of formal processes, uncontaminated by late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century canon-based standards, the elaborate system of categories and labels proposed by Hepokoski and Darcy bespeaks the opposite, namely an allegiance to norms witnessed primarily in the music of Mozart, and thus to a canon-based yardstick. (The Mozartean bias of Hepokoski and Darcy's theory can readily be seen by a glance at their seven-page index of compositions cited. Of the list's 27 columns, no fewer than 10 are devoted to works by Mozart, 4½ to compositions by Haydn, 3½ to those by Beethoven, and a single column to Schubert's works. Of the some three dozen other composers whose works are listed, the vast majority come from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. References to eighteenth-century symphonies other than those by Mozart and Haydn are negligible.)

The Hepokoski and Darcy paraphernalia may have a certain nerdish appeal as they help impose systematic order on our descriptive analyses, but the Mozartean vantage point can be suffocating. A typical case involves the description of a symphony movement by Gyrowetz: "An even more dramatic instance of delayed cadential gratification occurs in D9/i, where a light and lyrical *S* reaches a somewhat unsatisfactory V:PAC relatively quickly (m. 57)" (p. 455). Is it possible that the V:PAC in question might not have been heard as unsatisfactory (technically or asthetically) by Gyrowetz and his listeners? Elsewhere we read that "in the two-part expositions [by certain Austrian symphonists], the types and ranges of the medial caesuras conform fairly well with those described in Hepokoski and Darcy, except that around half of the V:HC MCs here occur in the 50 to 60 percent range—somewhat beyond their normal limits" (p. 430). Here it is reasonable to wonder just whose "normal limits" are in question. The Hepokoski and Darcy apparatus seems still more burdensome in descriptions such as the following: "an apparent medial caesura [in a symphony movement by Boccherini]…gives way to material of unstable tonality, and while the V:PAC at m. 86 suggests the EEC, the ensuing melodic repetition delays it until five measures before the end of the exposition" (p. 173); and "here Gossec ambiguously combines the effect of a medial caesura declined with trimodular block strategy" (p. 623 n. 35). If we filter our comprehension of such passages through our experience with Mozart and the Hepokoski and Darcy treatise, we might well interpret the events in question in terms of EECs, TMBs, delaying tactics, deviations from norms, deformations, and the like; but it remains uncertain how well such interpretations align with the intentions of the composers and their listeners' expectations.

[4] *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1980), 225.
[5] *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

In truth, we cannot reasonably ignore the historically overbearing presence of the period's late eighteenth-century giants. The symphonies of Haydn, in particular, were emulated by his pupils and other contemporaries—to cite one example, our indomitable British self-promoter, John Marsh, who declared a 1788 symphony of his to be "in imitation of the style of Haydn & Pleyel" (p. 655)—but to acknowledge the shadow of Haydn's and Mozart's presence is not necessarily to capitulate by taking the century's enormous symphonic repertoire to be the work of predecessors, imitators, or also-rans who variously conformed to or deviated from the practices of Haydn or Mozart.

Yet even given the premise that we can fashion a coherent account of the eighteenth-century symphony while essentially taking Mozart and Haydn off the table, recognition of a larger context does seem desirable. It is perhaps in this spirit that the book's final chapter attempts to pull everything together in an all-encompassing portrayal of the era's accomplishments. However, such a bold thrust can be dangerous if it leads to valedictory comparisons with the late eighteenth-century masters from whom the book's authors have sought release. So it is that we now confront the difference between the work of a lesser light (in this instance a symphony by the theorist, teacher, critic, and composer Georg Joseph Vogler), and that of a true master. Vogler's G-major symphony of 1779 is described as "pleasing and solidly composed, with moments of striking sonic and harmonic invention." However, "those moments cannot overcome the relentlessly regular phrasing and progress of the mostly unmemorable motives and themes" (pp. 789-90). The chapter continues: "By way of contrast, W.A. Mozart's Symphony in Eb Major (K. 543) follows [the genre's] conventional practices almost religiously," but the commonplace techniques "seem quite fresh here," owing to "Mozart's masterful exploitation of conventional practices." From here, we proceed to the claim that "this…seems to be what the eighteenth century valued in its symphonies. From the vantage point of the eighteenth-century listener, the best composers were not the ones who produced startling and radical changes to the system, but those who best manipulated that system. Few did that better than Joseph Haydn, and review after review marveled at his inexhaustible genius. His near rock-star status…" (p. 790).

Wait! Haven't we just wandered into the judgmental, historical-narrative terrain whose pitfalls and confrontations we had been trying to finesse? If we reintegrate Mozart and Haydn into the roster of eighteenth-century symphonists and then proceed to assign rankings, it is not likely that many of those to whose legacy this book is devoted will come out on top. To seek out and celebrate the best composers while denigrating the work of their predecessors and lesser contemporaries was surely not the aim of our journey. Nor do we need to end up by pondering unanswerable questions about whose mastery of conventions the eighteenth century most valued. Instead, having relished in the construction of a panoramic view of the century's symphonic accomplishments (minus those whose works are treated in *The Symphonic Repertoire*'s second volume), we can, as our authors continually remind us, choose to appreciate the eighteenth-century symphony "on its own terms" (p. 33), viewing each composition as "a creative work that seeks its own place in the repertory" (p. 726), "released from the long-established expectations derived from the symphonies of Haydn and Mozart" (p. 181). Detaching ourselves from those expectations and trying to hear the music with the ears of those for whom it was written is an approach that "can enhance our appreciation and understanding of the contributions of all the eighteenth century's symphonic composers and guide us to a renewed enjoyment of their music" (p. 791). *The Eighteenth-Century Symphony*'s authors have amply prepared us to arrive at this

goal. Their industry, scholarly acumen, and musical sensitivity constitute the terra firma on which this this book's immense value resides.

FLOYD GRAVE