

Introduction

S I M O N P . K E E F E

Friedrich Kerst, assessing the significance of Mozart early in the twentieth century, introduces *Mozart: The Man and the Artist Revealed in His Own Words* in unashamedly hagiographical fashion:

Mozart! What a radiance streams from his name! Bright and pure as the light of the sun, Mozart’s music greets us. We pronounce his name and behold! The youthful artist is before us – the merry, light-hearted smile upon his features, which belongs only to true and naïve genius.¹

Packing his prose with overworked generalizations about Mozart and his music – brightness and purity, eternal youthfulness, blissful ignorance aligned with genius – Kerst is one of countless late eighteenth-, nineteenth- and twentieth-century writers to worship at Mozart’s shrine. In the last fifty years in particular, Mozart scholars have attempted either directly or indirectly to negate such stereotypes and the laudatory tone that accompanies them. Thanks to pioneering archival work on written and musical sources, and on late eighteenth-century aesthetic and theoretical trends manifest in his music, scholars are now in a better position than ever to evaluate both Mozart’s impact on his contemporaries and successors, and his continuing relevance to an ever-changing musical world.

While unadulterated hyperbole about Mozart is a distant memory in scholarly circles, it flourishes as never before outside the academy. The bi-centennial celebrations in 1991 outstripped in scope and worldwide participation all preceding and succeeding celebrations of a composer’s work; the critical and commercial success of the cinematic version of *Amadeus* (1984) demonstrated the extraordinary public fascination with Mozart and his life story; and predictable millennial polls, aimed at identifying the greatest composers of all time, put Mozart close to the top, even in the company of twentieth-century pop artists who were always likely to garner the popular vote.²

We might dismiss Mozartian hyperbole as media-charged exaggeration, of course, but in so doing would be ignoring a significant implication of the composer’s exalted public profile. For Mozart captures the popular imagination in a more pronounced fashion than any other composer of the classical tradition; relentless marketing has turned him into the principal standard-bearer for classical music. In spite of this state of affairs, could it

[1]

2 Simon P. Keefe

be credibly argued that Mozart does *not* deserve his elevated status, that he is *not* a touchstone for musical greatness? Judgements of greatness, as out of fashion in post-modern scholarly discourse as they are in fashion outside academia, seem somehow superfluous where Mozart is concerned. Respected and admired in all quarters, his music defines greatness, rather than being circumscribed by it. In short, his place in the artistic pantheon is as secure as those of Shakespeare, Raphael and Goethe.

Irrespective of the critical validity of Mozart's lofty status, the huge gulf between scholarly understandings of the composer and public perceptions of him needs to be bridged. Like its illustrious predecessor from an earlier era, *The Mozart Companion*,³ *The Cambridge Companion to Mozart* brings new, up-to-date scholarship into a public arena. Intended for students, scholars and music lovers alike, it aims to bridge the gap between scholarly and popular images of the composer by enhancing a reader's appreciation of Mozart and his remarkable output regardless of musical aptitude or prior knowledge of Mozart's music.

Each of the four sections of *The Cambridge Companion to Mozart* aligns with a major area of Mozart research; moreover, the sections together paint a balanced portrait of the composer. Part I, 'Mozart in context', builds a foundation for the study of Mozart's works, focussing on the musical environments that most clearly shaped the composer's development (Salzburg and Vienna), the intersection between Mozart's aesthetic views and those prevalent in the late eighteenth century, and Mozart's compositional methods. Part II, considering the most important genres in which Mozart excelled, likewise paves the way for discussions in Part III of how his works – indeed his career as a whole – have been received in critical, cultural and compositional contexts. Part IV complements contextual discussion in Part I by offering insight into Mozart's career as a performer as well as theoretical and practical perspectives on historically informed performances of his music. Although an entirely comprehensive survey of Mozart's works is a practical impossibility in a single volume of essays, this collection will hopefully provide a simultaneously rounded and focussed picture of the composer and his output.

If a common theme runs through this *Cambridge Companion* – in fact through the Mozartian secondary literature as a whole – it is that Mozart and his music demand repeated scrutiny and interpretation. Each generation of music lovers has found something new and different to admire in the composer, identifying an element or elements in his music that speak directly to the spirit of that time; there is every reason to believe that this pattern will continue for a composer commonly regarded 'as the most universal... in the history of Western music'.⁴ Just as the great twentieth-century landmarks of Mozart scholarship – the collected letters, the *Documentary*

3 Introduction

Biography of Otto Erich Deutsch, the various editions of the Köchel catalogue and the new edition of Mozart's works (*Neue Mozart-Ausgabe*) – immeasurably enhanced (and continue to enhance) our understanding of the composer, so we trust that twenty-first-century monuments (beginning with the forthcoming *Neue Köchel Verzeichnis* under the general editorship of Neal Zaslaw) will do the same. Evaluation and re-evaluation of Mozart's music, and of sources, documents and material pertaining to it, is not only a historical obligation for musicologists and music lovers generally, but a privilege for professionals and amateurs alike; few composers repay systematic examination and re-examination in so unambiguously pleasurable and inspiring a fashion as Mozart.

Cambridge University Press
0521807344 - The Cambridge Companion to Mozart
Edited by Simon P. Keefe
Excerpt
[More information](#)

PART I

Mozart in context

1 Mozart and Salzburg

C L I F F E I S E N

In the mornings we woke to the most wonderful sounds, floating through the air like the sound of a psalterion. Three times the sweet melody ended, and three times it began again. It was the glockenspiel in the tower across from the *Residenz* which regularly at seven and eleven in the mornings, and at six in the evenings, played a well-chosen melody. We tried, as often as we could, to listen in the square.¹

For the eighteenth-century traveller, Salzburg could be a paradise. Off the beaten track² and set at the foot of the Alps, it boasted natural beauties and a rich history: the city owed its post-Roman origin to the founding of the abbey of St Peter by St Rupert of Worms in 696 and of the cathedral by St Virgil in 774. In 1278 Rudolph of Habsburg made the archbishops of Salzburg imperial princes and during centuries of relative peace (except for the Peasants' War of 1525–6) the power and prestige of the court increased until it was the most important and influential archdiocese and sacred state in German-speaking Europe. By 1700, half a century before Mozart's birth, its boundaries stretched north and west into what is now Bavaria and east and south as far as Wiener Neustadt and Graz.

What the anonymous visitor to Salzburg praised so highly was the mechanical clock tower facing what is now the Mozartplatz. Constructed in the early eighteenth century, it was renovated in the 1750s to include music by the Kapellmeister Johann Ernst Eberlin and the court violinist Leopold Mozart. The works were published in 1759 by Lotter of Augsburg, together with a lengthy description of the Salzburg fortress, a short history of the city, and a charming, engraved cityscape.³ More than a music print, it was a souvenir for the sophisticated tourist, a memento of pleasant hours spent near the banks of the river Salzach or roaming the numerous churches, open squares and fountains that gave Salzburg its nickname, 'the German Rome'.

For the local citizenry, however, life in Salzburg could be less than ideal: the state was old-fashioned, education was out of date, censorship was frequent and society highly stratified. For local musicians, work at the court was full of vexations. This was less the case, perhaps, during the reign of Archbishop Siegmund Christoph, Count Schrattenbach (ruled 1753–71), Mozart's first employer. Schrattenbach was often lavish in his support of the court music, exhibited a keen interest in instrumental works, sent his composers and performers to Italy to study, and rewarded composition with

[7]

8 *Cliff Eisen*

generous presents. And he was a strong supporter of the Mozarts: Leopold advanced rapidly in the court music establishment during Schrattenbach's reign, and during the 1760s and 1770s, when Wolfgang and his father travelled to Vienna, Paris, London and Italy, the Archbishop subsidized their travels, at least in part. Still, Schrattenbach and the archbishops before him were not always attuned to the political currents of court musical life, as an incident from 1743 shows:

At the Archbishop's order, Eberlin's promotion to deputy Kapellmeister had already been drawn up and was considered by everyone to be a closed matter. Then his rival, Herr Lolli (Eberlin's inferior by far in musical experience), grasped a last means, threw himself at the prince's feet, and promised that, should he take over the office, he would serve without [additional] pay. And so the Archbishop, who was determined to economize in every possible way, appointed him to the post, to [Eberlin's] detriment and much grumbling by almost the entire court and others.⁴

Situations like these were exacerbated during the reign of Archbishop Hieronymus, Count Colloredo (ruled 1772–1803), who not only pinched pennies but also tended blindly to hire and promote Italian musicians at the expense of local talent. What is more, Colloredo was far less interested in the court music than many of his predecessors.

To judge by traditional Mozart biographies, Colloredo was a narrow-minded tyrant. And to judge by the Mozart family letters (one of the richest sources of information concerning music in the archdiocese) music making was more or less restricted to the court and cathedral. Seen in this way, it was Colloredo's mean-spiritedness that was largely responsible for Mozart's mistreatment and sorry life in his native city. But the situation was not so simple. Colloredo had an agenda: to modernize Salzburg, to overhaul the education system, to rescue a financially failing court, and to promote both the sciences and the arts. Although he was hampered in these attempts by an unattractive personality, by his aloofness, and by his general unpopularity,⁵ his reforms nevertheless favoured some aspects of local cultural life: a new sense of toleration and freedom of the press in particular attracted prominent writers, scientists and teachers to the court.⁶ At the same time, however, many of his reforms did away with traditional music-making opportunities in the archdiocese: instrumental music at local churches was restricted during some services, German hymns were made obligatory in place of more traditional liturgical compositions, and the important university theatre, home to the school drama, was permanently closed in 1778. For the court music establishment, these reforms represented a dilution of musical life and a source of dissatisfaction. Yet music in Salzburg was not entirely dominated by the court and any musician willing to negotiate the city's numerous

9 Mozart and Salzburg

musical opportunities was able to carve out a decent life for himself. A musician who thought only in terms of the court, however, and who failed to understand its implicit and explicit expectations and deliberately flaunted the Archbishop – whether out of excessive ego, political miscalculation or both, as seems to have been the case with the Mozarts – was bound to be disappointed. It was not Colloredo who was primarily responsible for their misery, but the Mozarts themselves.

The Salzburg court music was a sprawling institution and when Leopold joined as fourth violinist in 1743 its organization was much the same as it had been at the time of its founding in 1591. In general, it was divided into four distinct and independent groups: the court music proper, which performed in the cathedral, at the Benedictine university and at court; the court- and field-trumpeters, together with the timpanists (normally ten trumpeters and two timpanists), who played in the cathedral, at court and provided special fanfares before meals and at important civic functions; the cathedral music (*Dommusik*), which consisted of the choral deacons (*Domchorvikaren*) and choristers (*Choralisten*) and performed in the cathedral; and the choirboys of the Chapel House (*Kapellhaus*), who also performed at the cathedral and who were instructed by the court musicians.

The chief duty of the court music proper, together with the cathedral music and the choirboys, was to perform at the cathedral. For elaborate performances, the musicians numbered about forty, sometimes more; on less important occasions the performing forces were reduced. Sometimes musicians did double duty: because the woodwind players, trumpeters and timpanists played less frequently than the strings and vocalists, they were often expected to perform on the violin; when needed, they filled out the ranks of the orchestra both at the cathedral and at court, where concerts and table music were a regular if occasional part of court life. The trumpeters and timpanists were under the control of the *Oberstallmeister*; their duties are described in a court memo of 1803:

each day, two [trumpeters] sound the morning signal at court and at the court table where another plays the pieces and fanfares; accordingly, each day three [trumpeters] are in service and they are rotated every eight days... For the so-called *festi palli*, all the trumpeters and two timpanists are divided into two choirs, and play various fanfares in the courtyard before the court table... Every three years the trumpeters receive a uniform of black cloth with velvet trim, as well as red waistcoats with wide gold borders and ornamental tassels for the trumpets and gold-rimmed hats. They receive [new] trumpets every six years, but on festive occasions the silversmith sends them silver trumpets.⁷

Additionally, they performed festive music at Christmas and New Year.

10 *Cliff Eisen*

The boys of the Chapel House (founded in 1677 by Archbishop Max Gandolph) usually consisted of ten sopranos and four altos. In addition to their duties at the cathedral, where they sang on Sundays and feast days, they performed at the university, at local churches and occasionally as players of instrumental music at court as well as receiving musical training from the court musicians: Eberlin, Adlgasser, Leopold Mozart, Michael Haydn and the theorist Johann Baptist Samber all taught the choirboys. (Leopold began giving violin instruction at the Chapel House as early as 1744 and it may be that his *Violinschule* of 1756 was based at least in part on his lessons there; it is possible that other didactic music and music theory originating in Salzburg was similarly intended for the choirboys.) Teaching the choirboys meant extra income for the court musicians. It also provided compositional opportunities: the Unschuldigen Kindleintag (Feast of the Holy Innocents) on 28 December was traditionally marked by music composed especially for the choirboys: Michael Haydn's *Missa Sancti Aloysii* (for two sopranos and alto, two violins and organ) of 1777 is only one example (other works composed by Haydn for the chapel boys include the cantata *Lauft ihr Hirten allzugleich*, a *Laudate pueri*, an *Anima nostra*, a litany and several other Masses, among them his last completed work, the *St Leopolds-Messe*, dated 22 December 1805).

In addition to their service at court and at the cathedral, the court musicians also performed at the Benedictine university, where school dramas were regularly given.⁸ These belonged to a long tradition of spoken pedagogical Benedictine plays that developed into an opera-like art form during the seventeenth century. Salzburg University, the most important educational institution in south Germany at the time, played a leading role in this development.⁹ At first, music in the dramas was restricted to choruses that marked the beginnings and ends of acts. By the 1760s, however, the works consisted of a succession of recitatives and arias, based at least in part on the model of Italian opera. A description from 1670 of the anonymous *Corona laboriosae heroum virtuti* shows the extent to which Salzburg school dramas represented a fusion of dramatic genres:

The poem was Latin but the stage machinery was Italian . . . The work could be described as an opera. The production costs must have been exceptionally great. It drew a huge crowd. Part of the action was declaimed, part was sung. Gentlemen of the court performed the dances, which in part were inserted in the action as entr'actes. It was a delightful muddle and a wonderful pastime for the audience.¹⁰

Mozart's sole contribution to the genre was *Apollo et Hyacinthus*, performed in 1767 between the acts of Rufinus Widl's Latin tragedy *Clementia Croesi*.

11 Mozart and Salzburg

It was the university that also gave rise to an orchestral genre unique to Salzburg: the orchestral serenade.¹¹ Every year in August, in connection with the university's graduation ceremonies, the students had a substantial orchestral work performed for their professors. Typically these serenades consisted of an opening and closing march and eight or nine other movements, among them two or three concerto-like movements for various instruments. Although the origin of this tradition is not known, it was certainly established as a regular fixture of the academic year by the mid-1740s. Leopold Mozart, who had composed more than thirty such works by 1757, was the most important early exponent of the genre. Wolfgang followed in his steps: K. 203, K. 204 and the so-called 'Posthorn' Serenade, K. 320, were all apparently written for the university. Other serenades, similar in style and substance to those for the university, were composed for name days or, as in the case of the so-called 'Haffner' Serenade, K. 250, for local weddings.

Aside from the court, Salzburg was home to several important religious institutions closely tied to, but still independent from, the state church establishment. Foremost among them was the archabbey of St Peter's, where the music chapel consisted largely of students; only a few musicians at the abbey were professionals, among them the *chori figuralis inspector*, who was responsible for the music archive.¹² Nevertheless, St Peter's offered the court musicians numerous opportunities for both performance and composition. In 1753, Leopold Mozart composed an *Applausus* to celebrate the anniversary of the ordination of three fathers, and some years later, in 1769, Wolfgang wrote the Mass, K. 66, for Cajetan Hagenauer, the son of the Mozarts' landlord Johann Lorenz Hagenauer. Cajetan, who took the name Dominicus, was also the dedicatee of two of Michael Haydn's works, the *Missa Sancti Dominici* and a *Te Deum*, both composed to celebrate his election as abbot of St Peter's in 1786. Haydn had established close ties with St Peter's almost immediately after his arrival in Salzburg in 1763 and it was the source of his most important students and closest friends, for whom he composed his innovatory lieder for men's chorus.

In addition to St Peter's, Salzburg also boasted the important *Frauenstift* Nonnberg, founded by St Rupert c.712–14.¹³ Although strict cloistering was in effect from the late 1500s – access to the church and other external areas was walled off – some court musicians were excepted: Franz Ignaz Lipp, a contemporary of Leopold Mozart, served as music teacher there and the court music copyist Maximilian Raab as cantor. The court music frequently appeared for special occasions, such as the election of a new abbess: when M. Scholastika, Countess Wicka, was elected in 1766, the Archbishop celebrated her installation with a grand feast at which the court music played instrumental works and performed a cantata by Michael Haydn (*Rebekka als Braut*). For the most part, however, the nuns performed themselves, not

12 *Cliff Eisen*

only at Mass, but also the fanfares traditionally given on festive occasions or to welcome guests. Of the instruments traditionally used for these purposes only the high-pitched clarino seems not to have been cultivated by the nuns, who instead played the tromba marina. A description from 1704 of a Mass celebrated by the Bishop of Chiemsee and performed by the court music is telling:

On 10 September at ten o'clock the Bishop celebrated Holy Mass in the cloister church with the women performing the music. In the Johannes Chapel, where Baron Firmian also celebrated Mass, a song was sung, written specially for the occasion and set to music by Frau Anna Ernestina, who also accompanied.¹⁴

The uncommon festivity of the ceremonies described here notwithstanding, this account includes a reference to what was perhaps the chief musical distinction of Nonnberg and other local churches: the performance of German sacred songs. Such works were composed and printed in Salzburg as early as the first decade of the eighteenth century, including the anonymous *Dreyssig Geistliche Lieder* (Hallein, 1710) and Gotthard Wagner's *Cygnus Marianus, Das ist: Marianischer Schwane* (Hallein, 1710). These songs, frequently performed instead of an offertory, continued to be written throughout the century, some of them by Salzburg's most important composers, including Eberlin and Leopold Mozart. More importantly, the cultivation at Nonnberg of German sacred songs provided opportunities for women composers; aside from singing at court, women in Salzburg had little opportunity to shine musically, no matter how exceptional they may have been (as the case of Nannerl Mozart shows).

Beyond the court and other religious institutions in Salzburg, civic music making was important as well. Watchmen blew fanfares from the tower of the town hall and were sometimes leased out to play for weddings, while military bands provided marches for the city garrisons.¹⁵ Often there was a close connection with the court: it was the watchmen, not the court music, that played trombone in the cathedral during service. By the same token, private citizens – or court musicians off duty – also played. Concerts to celebrate name days and serenades to celebrate weddings were common, as was domestic music making generally. In a letter of 12 April 1778, Leopold Mozart wrote:

on evenings when there is no grand concert [at court], he [soprano Francesco Ceccarelli] comes over with an aria and a motet, I play the violin and Nannerl accompanies, playing the solos for viola or for wind instruments. Then we play keyboard concertos or a violin trio, with Ceccarelli taking the second violin.¹⁶