knowledge that directly influenced women’s (and men’s) intellectual activity. Clues might also lie in a study of the educational institutions of the period. Just as Lutheran contrafacts served an important role in the German Reformation schools, I suspect that the spiritual renditions of Lasso’s chansons might have found a ready audience among the educationally inclined in France. It is a risky venture to criticize the book that an author didn’t write, but Freedman does such a good job of teasing out the internal spiritual message in these transformed chansons that one longs for a broader-based study involving direct comparison to other texts that reflect Huguenot religious fervor. An even more extensive reconstruction of the intellectual and spiritual side of the Huguenot endeavor than that offered here would contribute much to our understanding of sixteenth-century thought.

Do contrafacts matter? Yes, profoundly so, as Freedman has amply demonstrated. The act of adaptation, as this study proves, offers insights into the original conception of “the work of art” as well as into the historical circumstances surrounding its editorial revision. This is a book about Lasso’s chansons, then, as well as one about the listeners who responded so tellingly to the song texts they heard and read. It is, at the same time, a book about piety and about habits of reading, as well as one about printing and its communities. But most of all, we should remember that this is a book about music, its details, and its meanings.

CYNTHIA J. CYRUS


Studies of Orientalism and exoticism in music have proliferated during the last decade. This is mostly due to Edward Said’s seminal book, Orientalism, which opened new paths in research not only on Orientalism but also on musical


5. I am thinking here of the kind of study undertaken by Kristine Forney in her article ‘Nymphes gayes en abry du Laurier: Music Instruction for the Bourgeois Woman,” Musica disciplina 49 (1995): 151-87. Forney’s study, based principally on information from the Low Countries, addresses a broad pool of educational resources and the kinds of decisions that guided their selection by sixteenth-century educators and middle-class families. A search for a similar range of materials for Huguenot France might be fruitful for the information it would provide on Calvinist educational practices.
exoticism. Indeed, through this book and other writings that have dealt with music, Said has to some extent had an impact on musicology itself. Similarly, studies by Mikhail Bakhtin from the late 1920s to the 1950s have become important for today’s musicological research, in particular that by European scholars. The main topics of these highly influential authors, Orientalism and masquerade, are reflected in the content of Matthew Head’s book, where they are applied to one of the most significant manifestations of musical exoticism, Mozart’s Turkish music.

Head’s study is the first monograph to focus exclusively on Mozart’s Orientalism. Not only does it disclose new ways of contextualizing the exotic output of the Viennese composer, but it embeds the argument into a post-colonial context, thereby provoking discussions on the issue of musical Orientalism in general. Since Head associates the phenomenon of Orientalism mainly with cultural reception, this book will undoubtedly play an active part in further research along those lines. Even if readers do not share the author’s views, his many insights into Mozart’s Turkish exoticism and particularly into the methodological problems of the subject deserve an attentive reading.

The introduction takes its departure from Mozart’s famous letter on Osmín’s rage in Die Entführung aus dem Serail, which reveals the composer as both dramatist and Orientalist. For Head, Osmín is a figure who polices boundaries: the entrance of the harem, the limits of musical beauty, the sphere of rational and moral conduct. From a consideration of Osmín, Head finds his way, through Said, to the paradigm of “Othering,” which will prove central to the whole book. But as important as this concept is, it was the idea of irrationality—i.e., “unreason”—that was fundamental to establishing the Other in the Enlightenment period. Head declares that “Mozart’s Orientalism situates Self and Other within a larger rhetoric of ‘humanity’ ” (p. 8). Although the discourse on Orientalism has often invoked the notions of Self and the Other, for Head, “their provenance and precise meaning is rarely clarified” in scholarly literature (p. 8). The model of Self and Other is, according to Head, “fundamentally different” from that in nineteenth-century Orientalist studies, whose models derive, for example, from psychological thought and racial anthropology.

Head therefore stresses the importance of carnival and masquerade as contemporary meditations on difference within a Mozartian context. In this respect, Osmín not only polices boundaries but also crosses them. Osmín functions as the representative of Head’s reading of Mozart’s Orientalism,

embodies the ambiguity over terms and boundaries. Head illustrates this point with a musical example that proves rather problematic, based as it is on inaccurate analysis. He claims that the “key relationships described by Mozart in his letter” in regard to Osmin’s aria in act 1 (No. 3)—i.e., F major–A minor—“are literally reversed” in the Finale of act 3, and that, “to an extent, Osmin’s discourse as Other comes to exert a controlling presence” (p. 10). But in this ensemble, Osmin’s outbreak is not in F major, but in A minor, as in the coda of No. 3. Therefore, Osmin’s section in this ensemble is not a tonal “reversal” of the aria’s coda, nor does it function as a “closure” to the aria in the first act. Furthermore, the principal key of the ensemble is F major, not A major as claimed by the author. The analytical misreading of this crucial example thus calls into question Head’s argument, and in particular his idea of “controlling presence.” Osmin’s eruption into the recall of his earlier rage aria certainly demonstrates this point much more clearly than the dubious juxtapositions of keys, as alleged by Head.

Head’s introduction, for the most part, demonstrates his intention to find his own path, rather than using as a point of departure recent research on exoticism—for example, Orientalism as a component of the “history” of a genre, or as the result of the influence of non-Western music on a Western composer. “To my mind,” Head says,

treatments of Orientalism as a component of compositional craft, as a style category, or as the “natural” or “creative” product of composers’ experiences of non-Western music, are . . . problematic, not only because they re-rehearse Orientalist practices but also because they domesticate them for musicology and on traditional musicological terms. (p. 15)

He further asserts that musicology is “not fully aware of the genealogy and politics of some of its basic disciplinary concerns and activities” (p. 16). His study therefore begins with “reviewing the premises of musical Orientalism, its relationship to empire and imperialism” and to “the society in which it is embedded” (p. 14). In fact, for his purpose—examining Mozart’s Turkish exoticism—he exceeds the boundaries of existing Orientalist research. Head regards “musical materials, including formal conventions, as already and by definition social, prior to any further cultural encoding” (pp. 17–18; italics original). I would contend that such an assumption, central to the whole book, would require far more explanation than that offered by Head. Fortunately, the remainder of the volume is much more consistent and explicative than the vague premises presented in the introduction.

The first chapter deals with Orientalism in history and theater. Taking as his point of departure Said’s observation that the idea of representation is a theatrical one, Head investigates the theatrical Orient, particularly in relation to the knowledge of the East revealed in these staged representations. This leads the author to the main question, “What is Mozart’s Turkish music telling the audience about Turkish music proper and the Ottoman Empire as a whole?”
Such questions as this make Head's book interesting reading, since they go beyond traditional approaches to the exotic. The argument in this chapter is for the most part dominated by questions of representation and power in the musical alla turca style. But Head embraces a much broader view of these issues, incorporating them into the context of national styles in music. Next he considers Mozart's Turkish music in relation to Ottoman-Austrian politics, where he tries to define the paradigm shift concerning the meaning of Turkish music to Austrian audiences. In this chapter, the analysis focuses on Osmin's Lied "Wer ein Liebchen hat gefunden" (act 1, No. 2) and Pedrillo's Romance in act 3, establishing a closer relationship between these two numbers. In particular, the reading of the first stanza of Osmin's Lied as a representation of the "noble savage"—a representation abandoned in the course of the song—merits attention. Osmin's temper is roused by Belmonte's spoken interruptions. Here, Osmin's initial temperament is entirely different from that portrayed in the following aria (No. 3). Head's analysis of Pedrillo's romance "Im M ohrenland gefangen war" (act 3), however, seems to me problematic. Although his suggestion that Pedrillo's song is "exoticised beyond the Turkish colour of the Janissary choruses" (p. 21) is fascinating, he offers no musical evidence of the specifically Spanish element that he claims for this romance. The citation of an eighteenth-century source by Charles Blainville, which Head believes establishes a connection between Turkish and Spanish music because some Turkish songs were sung as serenades under the Spanish ladies' balconies, seems to me far-fetched. (For me, the quotation by Blainville is much more instructive for its formulations "m'a-t-on dit" and "dis-je," which reflect in nuce the problem of knowledge and Orientalist "authority.")

Apart from the question of national style, Head's broader point that in Die Entführung the dramatis personae are speaking different (musical) languages is important. In this respect, the argument could have been framed in an even broader perspective, asking, for example, whether Belmonte's musical idiom (as in his aria "O wie ängstlich," No. 4) could be considered as "remote" as that of Osmin, in comparison to the language of the other characters. Thomas Bauman has pointed out that Belmonte's aria is "one of the most pictorial arias Mozart ever wrote," and Stefan Kunze discussed the problem of changing affects that break with the conventions of musical language used for serious characters.

The spoken part of Pasha Selim is also treated in this chapter, with particular relevance to the cultural construct of Christendom. Head sees in Mozart's opera "additional genealogical factors at play in the masking of the Pasha" (p. 94). In Christoph Friedrich Bretzner's dramatic treatment, which was the model for Gottlieb Stephanie the Younger's libretto, the Pasha was a renegade westerner, "a detail that was changed by Stephanie/Mozart" (p. 94). This detail "erased the Pasha's Christian background: in Mozart-Stephanie's version he is no longer a renegade" (p. 41). It is not clear whether "no longer" refers to only the final scene or to the opera as a whole; but in any case Head's interpretation contradicts the text in regard to this question (Pedrillo: "Der Bassa ist ein Renegat," act I, sc. 4).6

In the second chapter Head brings to light the fact that Turkish music not only plays an important role in many of Mozart's most popular works (such as the alla turca Piano Sonata K. 331/300i/iii and the Violin Concerto K. 219), but is found in other pieces as well. By taking into consideration the Piano Sonatas K. 310/300d and K. 545, he certainly broadens the scope for Mozart's Orientalism. On the other hand, his criteria for what constitutes the Oriental idiom are at times obscure, in particular when he (rightly) rejects other interpretations, such as Neal Zaslaw's observation that the finale of the early G-Major Symphony, K. 74, contains one of the first manifestations of Mozart's interest in Turkish music (p. 54).7 The second part of the chapter treats the terminological distinction between the terms türkische Musik and alla turca, a discussion centered mostly around orchestration (for example, to what extent Mozart's Turkish music includes piccolo flutes in addition to the typical exotic percussion set). To my knowledge, Head is the first to attempt to discuss in detail these organological questions. But his contention that "Mozart's use of the full complement of additional percussion instruments along with the flauto piccolo in Die Entführung was novel" (p. 59) is certainly not true, since this combination can already be found in Abbé Vogler's Singspiel Der Kaufmann von Smyrna of 1778, an opera with which Mozart seems to have been familiar.8

The third chapter ("A Copy of a Copy: Mozart's Sources") explores the context of authenticity and Turkish music. The idea guiding this chapter is that Mozart's notion of Turkish music was transmitted through Hungarian folk music.9 Apart from the articles by Dénes Bartha and Bence Szabolcsi, cited by Head (p. 67), see also Zoltán Falvy, "Danses du 18e siècle en Hongrie dans la collection 'Linus,' " Studia musicologica 13 (1971): 15–59.

actually contain authentic Turkish elements; according to Head, their specific exotic character lies in their nature as masquerades. Mozart thus took his imaginary starting point from this dance tradition, basing his “Turkish music” on a doubly transformed source, the pseudo-Turkish Hungarian dance. This is a fascinating idea, and Head exemplifies it by emphasizing the masquerade character of this exotic dance and demonstrating its relationship to Mozart’s works. The hybrid nature of the törökös dances clearly supports Head’s argument that the “overlapping musical codes for the rustic, the Hungarian, the Gypsy, the Turk, the Scythian . . . were not the result of accidental confusion or sloppiness, nor of simple compositional expedience: the very confusion was a form of ‘knowledge’ grounded in social-political discourse” (p. 73). The discussion of eighteenth-century commentary on alla turca music that follows is highly illuminating and reinforces Head’s point that Mozart’s music is in many ways “a copy of a copy.” His conclusion, however, though absolutely consistent with his previous argument, extends eighteenth-century views of exoticism:

Authenticity in exoticism is always, by definition, an impossibility because the meaning of a sign, or musical element, is dependent on context, is contingently determined in a system of interdependent signs. In this light, it is inaccurate to speak of different degrees of authenticity in exotic representations, to seek to discover authenticity in details, or to write the history of musical exoticism as a history of ever greater authenticity and depth of engagement with an original. (p. 82)

I am not sure whether such a “history” of exoticism has ever been written, and even Peter Gradenwitz, in his seminal book Musik zwischen Orient und Okzident, seems to me quite cautious in this respect.10 On the other hand, such postcolonial claims cannot supersede the evidence of contemporary testimony, especially that by actual Turks, which disproves the idea that there is only one “accurate” way of characterizing the Oriental in music.11

The subject of masquerade is continued in the fourth chapter, where it is explored in relationship to “self-O-thering” (Head’s term for what Hayden White calls the “technique of ostensive self-definition by negation” [p. 3]). This section of the book seems to me the least convincing, lacking as it does a single unifying argument. The issue of masquerade seems insufficient to maintain Head’s discussion of such heterogeneous subjects as the ballet des nations, Händel, and Lully, and their implications for Mozart’s biography. Bakhtin’s theory of “carnivalization” is also considered here, but ultimately Head raises an issue that Bakhtin only touches upon: the “fate of the carnivalesque in the eighteenth century” (p. 103). I find Head’s criticism rather unbalanced: he blames Bakhtin for not having considered every aspect of the


subject, while at the same time he ignores a central issue of Bakhtin’s notion of the carnivalesque, that of laughter.

A different question concerning masquerade and self-O ther ing seems to me much more interesting, namely, the issue of musical style and the German language in Mozart’s “Turkish” operas Die Entführung and Zaide. For a composer trained in the Italian operatic style, the setting of a German text did raise the problem of finding an appropriate musical language. In this respect, a comparison of the musical style of the earlier Singspiel Zaide could have been helpful. The absence of significant discussion of Zaide (which Head inexplicably terms a “melodrama”) is a real loss, since Head might have usefully employed his notion of masquerade to explain its lack of Turkish musical language. The same idea might explain the lack of exotic color in the “Albanian scene” of Così fan tutte.

It must be said that Head’s detailed explication of Mozart’s Orientalism in the Sonata in A, KV. 331/300i, is one of the highlights of the book. In this discussion, he discloses an interesting relationship between the outer movements of the sonata. In the closed binary form of the first movement’s theme, he sees “its internal equilibrium and completion” as contrasting with the “disorienting, additive, sectional rondo,” which transcends the normal rondo model in its complexity of design (p. 117). This contrast is described in Bakhtin’s terms as “grotesque.” Even if one does not find the Schenkerian reduction (shown in ex. 5-3 on p. 117) an adequate support for the point “that the coda of the finale hammers out a varied form of the opening of the variation theme” (p. 117), Head offers fine insights into the relationships between the Turkish elements in these movements, including an illuminating examination of the variation theme itself.

The last chapter (“Mozart Imperialisms”) summarizes the main issues of the book and places them within the larger picture of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Orientalist reception, in which Head believes Mozart plays an influential role. The argument is very dense, and is made more so by quoting E. T. A. Hoffmann. It embraces such diverse topics as military music in present-day Turkey and the universality of German music in the Nazi regime. Having read this book while another war in “the East” (Iraq) was being fought, I wondered whether there might be a connection between


13. Head conflates two different reviews of Hoffmann, citing the reference to Friedrich Witt’s Sinfonieturque (p. 142). But the whole passage concerning the context of the universality of the symphony does not stem from Hoffmann’s review of Witt’s Sinfonieturque, No. 6, but from his review of Witt’s Sinfonie No. 5. See E. T. A. Hoffmann, Schriften zur Musik: Singspiele (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1988), 7.
these postcolonial paradigms and current Western attitudes toward the “Oriental.” By merely pointing out the relationship “to the second siege of Vienna in 1683 and the Gulf War of 1990–91 [which] are telescoped and overlaid as part of an anti-Islamic rhetoric” (p. 138), Head seems to me to be dealing with just the surface of the problem. To my mind, a book that is so rich and thought-provoking as Head’s should have attempted to relate its own methodology to possible ideological implications for today’s East/West confrontation.

But this is only a minor criticism compared to the larger problem: Head’s study does not adequately investigate the literary background of the subject. I believe this is as important as exploring themes of postcolonialism or engaging in meta-discourse on Said. The omission of some seminal studies—for example Alain Grosrichard’s La structure du sérail (1979/1998), Cesare Questa’s Il ratto del Serraglio (1979), and Paolo Gallarati’s Musica e maschera (1984)—from the bibliography is symptomatic of Head’s limited interest in the study of libretti. But this only touches the surface of an even deeper problem. When he deals with masquerade in Cosi fan tutte, for example, he assumes that Mozart was responsible for every detail of the libretto; the librettist Da Ponte appears nowhere in the book. (The lack of interest in a musico-literary approach to analysis, including verse structure, prosody, and so on, is especially evident in the absence of any reference to Kunze’s monograph on Mozart’s operas.) I entirely disagree with an approach to opera in which the libretto as the poetic basis of the work is overlooked. Employing a broad theoretical approach, while for the most part minimizing the literary side, seems to me inadequate for such a subject. Furthermore, the focus on a single composer is not without problems. Even if Head, suspicious of an “Orientalist lexikon” (p. 16), is unwilling to contextualize Mozart’s exoticism within the musical language of the late eighteenth century, he should at least inform the reader why, apart from its reception, Mozart’s Turkish music is so “special.” In my view, only such an explanation would justify this study’s exclusive focus on Mozart. Despite these objections, the book has undoubted strengths, especially in the broad variety of issues discussed. It is innovative, and its exploration of the issue of exoticism is quite striking. Head’s study deserves an attentive readership, disclosing, as it does, new pathways in Orientalist research.

THOMAS BETZWIESER
