

The Cambridge Companion to

# MOZART

.....

EDITED BY  
Simon P. Keefe



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK  
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA  
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia  
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain  
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa  
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 2003

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without  
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2003

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

*Typeface* Minion 10.75/14 pt     *System*  $\text{\TeX}$  2 $\epsilon$  [TB]

*A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library*

ISBN 0 521 80734 4 hardback  
ISBN 0 521 00192 7 paperback

## Contents

*Notes on the contributors* [page vii]

*Acknowledgements* [x]

*List of abbreviations* [xi]

*Chronology of Mozart's life and works* Simon P. Keefe [xii]

Introduction Simon P. Keefe [1]

### Part I • Mozart in context

- 1 Mozart and Salzburg *Cliff Eisen* [7]
- 2 Mozart in Vienna *Dorothea Link* [22]
- 3 Mozart's compositional methods: writing for his singers  
*Ian Woodfield* [35]
- 4 Mozart and late eighteenth-century aesthetics *David Schroeder* [48]

### Part II • The works

- 5 The keyboard music *W. Dean Sutcliffe* [61]
- 6 The concertos in aesthetic and stylistic context *Simon P. Keefe* [78]
- 7 The orchestral music *Simon P. Keefe* [92]
- 8 Mozart's chamber music *Cliff Eisen* [105]
- 9 Mozart as a vocal composer *Paul Corneilson* [118]
- 10 The *opere buffe* *Edmund J. Goehring* [131]
- 11 Mozart and opera seria *Julian Rushton* [147]
- 12 Mozart's German operas *David J. Buch* [156]

### Part III • Reception

- 13 Mozart in the nineteenth century *John Daverio* [171]
- 14 Mozart and the twentieth century *Jan Smaczny* [185]
- 15 The evolution of Mozartian biography *William Stafford* [200]

### Part IV • Performance

- 16 Mozart the performer *Katalin Komlós* [215]
- 17 Performance practice in the music of Mozart *Robert D. Levin* [227]

*Notes* [246]

*Selected further reading* [270]

*General index* [282]

*Index of Mozart's works* [288]

# 1 Mozart and Salzburg

CLIFF EISEN

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.<sup>1</sup>

For the eighteenth-century traveller, Salzburg could be a paradise. Off the beaten track<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

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.<sup>4</sup>

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,<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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

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.<sup>7</sup>

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

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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup>

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*.



It was the university that also gave rise to an orchestral genre unique to Salzburg: the orchestral serenade.<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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

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.<sup>14</sup>

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.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup>

Nannerl Mozart's diary for 1779–80 documents other, similar occasions, and possibly as a result of Colloredo's relative lack of interest in the court music the local nobility started up a private orchestra, the first meeting of which was described by Leopold Mozart:

Count Czernin is not content with fiddling at court and as he would like to do some conducting he has collected an amateur orchestra who are to meet in Count Lodron's hall every Sunday after three o'clock . . . A week ago today, on the 5th, we had our first music meeting . . . Nannerl accompanied all the symphonies and she also accompanied Ceccarelli who sang an aria *per l'appertura della accademia di dilettanti*. After the symphony Count Czernin played a beautifully written concerto by Sirmen alla Brunetti, and *doppo una altra sinfonia* Count Altham played a frightful trio, no one being able to say whether it was scraped or fiddled, whether it was in 3/4 or common time, or perhaps even in some newly invented and hitherto unknown tempo. Nannerl was to have played a concerto, but as the Countess wouldn't let them have her good harpsichord (which is *casus reservatus pro summo Pontifice*), and as only the Egedacher one with gilt legs was there, she didn't perform. In the end the two Lodron girls had to play. It had never been suggested beforehand that they should do so. But since I have been teaching them they are always quite well able to perform. So on this occasion too they both did me credit.<sup>17</sup>

Finally, there were numerous institutions within the state, or just outside its borders, that maintained close contact with the court and other musical establishments within the city. These included the Benedictine monastery at Michaelbeuern, four of whose abbots were rectors at Salzburg University and some of whose musicians, among them Andreas Brunmayer, studied in Salzburg and remained there as part of the court music; and the Benedictine monastery at Lambach, which purchased music and musical instruments from Salzburg and maintained close ties with the Salzburg court and the Salzburg court musicians. Both Michael Haydn and Leopold Mozart were welcome guests at Lambach. Other institutions allied with Salzburg stretched up the Salzach, along what is now the border with Bavaria: Landshut, Tittmoning, Frauenwörth, Wasserburg am Inn, Beuerberg and others. All of these institutions relied heavily on the city, and their surviving archives are still home to important early copies of otherwise unknown works by Salzburg composers.<sup>18</sup>

Mozart's Salzburg was hardly a musical backwater: it offered numerous opportunities for composition and performance, it maintained close ties with nearby cities and religious institutions, and music circulated freely there, including the most recent works of composers active throughout Europe. (The Salzburg archives preserve a wide-ranging eighteenth-century

repertory including the latest orchestral music from Vienna and elsewhere, in addition to operas, vocal music and church music.) Leopold Mozart was in regular contact with Breitkopf in Leipzig, the most prominent German dealer in music manuscripts (and in instruments, several of which Leopold purchased for the court); he was himself the Salzburg sales agent for the music publisher Haffner in Nürnberg. Haffner, in turn, dealt regularly in the latest works published in Holland, Paris and London.

Nevertheless, there were local performance traditions – and beyond that, there were local compositional expectations, even if these were not always spelled out. One of these expectations concerned church music: it was the primary obligation of Salzburg composers to write works for the cathedral. And while Mozart appears to have fulfilled this obligation – his church compositions amounted to some thirty works, including Masses, litanies and offertories – he was, in fact, one of the least productive of Salzburg composers. During the same period, from 1763 to 1780, Michael Haydn composed at least eleven Masses, fifteen litanies and Vespers and more than ninety other sacred works. Several aspects of Mozart's church music fall in line with Salzburg traditions: word-painting is common – including fanfare motives at 'Gloria in excelsis' and 'Et resurrexit' and falling melodies for 'descendit', 'Crucifixus' and 'miserere' – as are multi-movement Credos with changes of tempo and fugues at 'Et vitam venturi'. In other respects, however, Mozart stands outside this tradition. His sacred works are more Italian in style than those of other Salzburg composers, no doubt a result of his contact in the early 1770s with Padre Martini in Bologna and Eugène, Marquis of Ligniville, in Florence, and his composition of Italian opera, a genre not widely cultivated in Salzburg.<sup>19</sup> Beyond that, the disruptive and disjunctive elements that inform his instrumental music of the Vienna period are often adumbrated in the Salzburg church music. Chromaticism is frequent and destabilizing while the Benedictus from the Mass in C major, K. 262, includes choral exclamations of 'Hosanna in excelsis' that interrupt the solo quartet. (In the Benedictus from the *Missa brevis* in C major, K. 258, the fast tempo and antiphonal exchanges between chorus and soloists are also atypical.)

It is with respect to instrumental – and in particular orchestral – music, however, that Mozart most clearly flaunted Salzburg norms. During Schratzenbach's reign, orchestral music was assiduously cultivated: in the 1750s, the court boasted three composers who were associated primarily with instrumental music – Leopold Mozart, Ferdinand Seidl and Caspar Christelli.<sup>20</sup> By the 1770s, however, orchestral music was little cultivated, especially at court. A letter written by Leopold to Wolfgang in September 1778 makes it clear that he was disappointed both with the frequency of the concerts and with their length:

Yesterday I was for the first time [this season] the director of the great concert at court. At present the music ends at around a quarter past eight. Yesterday it began around seven o'clock and, as I left, a quarter past eight struck – thus an hour and a quarter. Generally only four pieces are performed: a symphony, an aria, a symphony or concerto, then an aria, and with this, Addio!<sup>21</sup>

Indeed, the infrequency of the court concerts is indirectly documented by Nannerl Mozart's diary. Of the 151 entries for the period from 26 March 1779 to 30 September 1780, a mere two describe Mozart's official duties and both state only 'my brother had to play at court'.<sup>22</sup> Apparently Colloredo did not allow much time for music, nor was he as concerned with the music establishment as he was with other aspects of court life. The historian Corbinian Gärtner, an observer well disposed towards the Archbishop, paints a picture of court life that leaves little room for entertainment, even if he does mention Colloredo's own occasional participation in the performances:

Social gatherings began after six o'clock, during which [the Archbishop] often discussed business with his civic officials; otherwise he entertained foreign visitors, or played cards, or mingled with the court musicians and played the violin with them. Afterwards he had his evening meal, said his prayers, and went to bed at about ten o'clock.<sup>23</sup>

And Koch-Sternfeld, in his early nineteenth-century account of Salzburg, noted that 'the Prince was less concerned with the court music than with court society and the pleasant life in Salzburg'.<sup>24</sup>

On the other hand, Nannerl's diary includes numerous entries describing private music making, including performances of quartets and quintets and rehearsals for a concerto. One entry describes a public concert given at the town hall while references to two presumably private academies are given in March 1780.

Another venue for orchestral music was the university. Although it is generally thought that the serenades and cassations performed by the court musicians were mostly composed for the traditional August graduation exercises, this may be only part of the story. The university diary for 1769 records a student performance of a *Platzmusik* in May and a similar event is documented – again by Nannerl Mozart's diary – for 24 September 1779 (the work performed was Mozart's 'Haffner' Serenade).<sup>25</sup> The university students, then, regularly performed (or had performed) orchestral works throughout the year, including works of a sort traditionally thought to have been given only at graduation. The same is true of other institutions. The estate inventory of Martin Bischofreiter, *chori figuralis inspector* at St Peter's, shows that orchestral music was a regular feature of musical life at St Peter's, while the monastery at Michaelbeuern at one time had a collection of more

than 120 symphonies, primarily works by composers from Salzburg and Vienna.<sup>26</sup> Salzburg's citizens also required music for their entertainment, and some of Mozart's best-known works of the 1770s were demonstrably written for private performance, including not only the 'Haffner' Serenade (for the wedding of Elisabeth Haffner and Franz Xaver Späth) but also the Concerto for Three Pianos, K. 242 (for Countess Lodron and her daughters), and the Divertimento in D major, K. 334 (for Georg Sigismund Robinig on the occasion of his law examination). The diary of the court councillor Johann Baptist Schiedenhofen describes a private concert made up entirely of Mozart's compositions:

[25 July 1777:] to Gusseti's where the music by young Mozart, which he wanted to perform for his sister in the evening, was rehearsed. It consisted of a symphony, a violin concerto, played by young Mozart, a concerto for transverse flute, played by the violone [double bass] player Herr Castel, and everything was young Mozart's work.<sup>27</sup>

All of this suggests that the court was probably not the principal venue in Salzburg for the performance of symphonies and other orchestral works – and it is in this context that Mozart's overwhelming interest in instrumental music seems more than a curiosity: it seems a provocation. Not only does the number of his symphonies alone almost exceed his entire output of Masses, litanies, offertories and shorter sacred works, but by comparison with his contemporaries Mozart clearly positioned himself as the city's dominant composer of orchestral music.<sup>28</sup>

An obvious question, then, is why Mozart composed so many symphonies and other instrumental works in Salzburg. He was not obliged to. In fact, composition was not a specific obligation of the court musicians, not even the composition of church music. Mozart's appointment as court organist states only that 'he shall . . . carry out his appointed duties with diligent assiduity and irreproachably, in the Cathedral as well as at court and in the chapel, and shall *as far as possible* serve the court and the church with new compositions made by him'.<sup>29</sup>

One possible answer to this question is hinted at in Leopold Mozart's letter of 28 May 1778 to his wife and son:

The Archbishop of Olmütz was consecrated on the 17th. If you had not had so much to do for other people at Mannheim, you might have finished your mass and sent it to me. For at our practices Brunetti was chattering about who should compose the consecration mass and was hoping to arrange for Haydn to get the commission from the Archbishop. But the latter never replied; nor did Counts Czernin and Starhemberg who were approached by Brunetti and Frau Haydn. I therefore produced Wolfgang's mass with the organ solo, taking the Kyrie from the Spaur mass.<sup>30</sup>

Leopold's freedom of action was possible because the choice of works to be performed at court depended almost entirely on whoever was in charge that week, a practice documented by the 'Nachricht':

The three court composers play their instruments in church as well as in the chamber, and in rotation with the Kapellmeister each has the direction of the court music for a week at a time. All the musical arrangements depend solely upon whoever is in charge each week, as he, at his pleasure, can perform his own or other persons' pieces.<sup>31</sup>

This may explain why so few of Wolfgang's works seem to have been heard at court. Music making in Salzburg was strictly *ad hoc*: the choice of works to be performed fell to the music director; the choice of works to be written fell to the composer. And because the Mozarts were not well liked by many of the court musicians, it is possible that Wolfgang's music was performed only when Leopold was weekly director (and even then under duress).

To Colloredo, it may have seemed that Wolfgang, given the opportunity, was slacking off. Certainly Mozart gave him plenty of ammunition, not only during the mid-1770s but also after the disastrous trip to Mannheim and Paris of 1777–8 when he was reinstated at Salzburg under favourable conditions as court and cathedral organist. For although in 1779 and 1780 he composed the 'Coronation' Mass, K. 317, and the *Missa solemnis*, K. 337, the Vespers K. 321 and 339, and the *Regina coeli*, K. 276, Colloredo was not satisfied. In an ambiguously worded document appointing Michael Haydn to replace Mozart in 1782 he wrote:

we accordingly appoint [Johann Michael Haydn] as our court and cathedral organist, in the same fashion as young Mozart was obligated, with the additional stipulation that he show more diligence... and compose more often for our cathedral and chamber music, and, in such cases, himself direct in the cathedral on every occasion.<sup>32</sup>

Why this apparent criticism of Mozart? The answer, perhaps, is to be found in Mozart's other compositions of the time: the Concerto for Two Pianos, K. 365, the accompanied sonata K. 378, the symphonies K. 318, 319 and 338, the 'Posthorn' Serenade, K. 320, the Divertimento in D major, K. 334, the Sinfonia concertante, K. 364, incidental music for *Thamos, König in Aegypten*, K. 345, and *Zaide*, K. 344, and, from the end of the 1770s, *Idomeneo*. Few if any of these works would have been heard at court.

Even the few orchestral works by Mozart that came to the court's notice must have surprised the Archbishop – their complexity, colourful scoring, harmonic richness and, above all, expressive density, even among symphonies of the early 1770s, are not like other comparable works composed in Salzburg. A case in point is the Symphony in D major, K. 133, which has been compared with Michael Haydn's symphony Sherman 81 (Perger 9).<sup>33</sup>

Haydn's symphony, which originally consisted of three movements composed in 1766, was augmented in 1772 by the addition of a finale; the autograph of this new movement is dated 15 June 1772. K. 133 was completed a month later, in July 1772. Parallels between the works seem clear: both have quiet, lyrical main themes that are withheld at the beginning of the recapitulation and reappear only at the conclusion of the movement. And in both works, the theme returns *forte*, with augmented scoring (as early as the development in Haydn's symphony but not until the recapitulation in Mozart's). But these similarities are mostly on the surface and the two composers work out their ideas in strikingly different ways.

Like other Salzburg symphonies of the 1760s and 1770s,<sup>34</sup> Haydn's work consists essentially of blocks of material that are shifted about and rearranged in a different order, occasionally with varied scoring and dynamics, but only rarely with different functions. It begins with a two-part theme contrasting *piano* and *forte* which is then repeated and extended into a transition; the dominant-area material is also given a double statement before moving on to closing material. The recapitulation, as noted, begins with dominant-area material before bringing back the main tune and its continuation as well as the closing. There is little that is dramatic about the movement. The restatement of the opening theme in the central section is developmental only by virtue of its location: the material is tonally stable. Even the return at the end of the movement is unexceptional: the material is stated once, more or less exactly as at the beginning of the work, and it leads directly to the exposition's cadential material, thus preserving a sense of closure that not even the reversed order of the recapitulation can disturb.

Mozart's symphony, on the other hand, invites critical response. For although it begins straightforwardly enough, with three *forte* chords, the character of the primary material is already different from Haydn's: where Haydn's main theme is harmonically and rhythmically stable, Mozart's – beginning in the second bar – has no downbeat root-position tonic chords and only deceptive cadences. The entire gesture, from the opening of the movement to the beginning of the transition, is ambiguous. Nor does Mozart anticipate the effect of his reversed recapitulation by giving out the theme in the development. In fact, its reappearance at the end of the movement is not recapitulatory at all: by any conventional description, the movement has run its course and the closing group has already signalled its end. What is more, the weak, unstable theme in Mozart's movement is immediately juxtaposed with its opposite: the full orchestra, *forte*, 'straightens out' the material, investing it with full cadences and strong root movements. It is functionally changed and, as closing material, makes palpable a meaningful reversal between the opening and closing of the movement. For where the opening juxtaposes a stable, *forte* gesture (the three chords) with an unstable,



*piano* one (the main theme), the ending not only reverses this order but at the same time draws out the 'hidden meaning', so to speak, of the three chords: the final apotheosis is, in effect, a 'realization' of the three opening chords and the one gesture that finally gives the movement tonal stability and a convincing close.

It is no wonder Colloredo may have been perplexed by his young composer. And he was not the only one who found Mozart's Salzburg music unsatisfactory. When Charles Burney's correspondent Louis de Visme visited Salzburg in 1772, shortly after the composition of K. 133, he wrote:

Young Mozhard, too, is of the band, you remember this prodigy in England . . . If I may judge of the music which I heard of his composition, in the orchestra, he is one further instance of early fruit being more extraordinary than excellent.<sup>35</sup>

Possibly it was reactions such as these that led Mozart to write to his father:

I confess that in Salzburg work was a burden to me and that I could hardly ever settle down to it. Why? Because I was never happy . . . there is no stimulus [there] for my talent! When I play or when any of my compositions is performed, it is just as if the audience were all tables and chairs.

There is no question that Colloredo was a difficult employer. And his greatest failing may have been a blind trust in foreign-born musicians, Italians in particular, whom he frequently promoted over the heads of better-qualified local talent. Long-time employees such as Leopold Mozart and Michael Haydn, both of whom established their credentials during Schratzenbach's reign, had good reason to be disgruntled: not only were they repeatedly passed over for promotion, but Colloredo's choices, even with respect to ordinary court musicians, inevitably turned out badly. Following the incapacitation in December 1785 of the violinist Wenzl Sadlo, Colloredo enlisted the two oldest choirboys from the Chapel House to play violin in the cathedral, a stop-gap action until the arrival in Salzburg of a new violinist from Italy, Giacomo Latouche. Leopold was upset. Not only had he hoped his pupil Joseph Breymann would be taken on, but Latouche made the worst possible impression:

The new violinist arrived on Good Friday, but hasn't played a note of a solo yet, and as far as I can see, we'll hardly get to hear a concerto from him very soon either; something like a *quartet* maybe, because the Italians are saying: *the poor man – he's a good professor, you've got to give him that, and he'll be good leading the second violins*; but he *hasn't been used* to playing concertos. *At most he can play a trio or quartet cleanly, and what's more he's timid.* Now it can't be held against him that he's timid either, because after all he's only 30 years old. So the archbishop has once again been nicely

diddled and with a salary of 500 fl. to boot, plus 40 ducats travel money here and back making 700 fl. good luck to him! – on top of that the man isn't good looking. He's of medium build, has a pale rather puffed up face, and yet has certain bony bits to it too, like a horse's head, hangs his head forward, and chews tobacco like the Zillerthal farmers; that's what the Italians say. I pity the man, all the same it's a piece of Italian audacity to undertake something you're not capable of.<sup>36</sup>

The upshot was that Latouche left court service in late 1786, excusing himself to Colloredo on grounds of poor health: the truth of the matter is that he left behind a pregnant girl.

At the same time, however, the Mozarts were not good employees. Leopold made no bones about his dissatisfaction. (Although he often wrote in cypher to keep his plans hidden from Colloredo and his censors, it is almost certain they were public knowledge.) And Mozart took over many of Leopold's opinions – whether musical or political – lock, stock and barrel. Most importantly, Leopold wrote from Schwetzingen on 19 July 1763: 'The orchestra is undeniably the best in Germany. It consists altogether of people who are young and of good character, not drunkards, gamblers or dissolute fellows.' And Mozart wrote, some fifteen years later: 'one of my chief reasons for detesting Salzburg [is the] coarse, slovenly, dissolute court musicians. Why, no honest man, of good breeding, could possibly live with them! Indeed, instead of wanting to associate with them, he would feel ashamed of them ... [The Mannheim musicians] certainly behave quite differently from ours. They have good manners, are well dressed and do not go to public houses and swill.'<sup>37</sup>

Men of good breeding, honest men, the Mozarts withdrew from the court music – from Colloredo who at least implicitly sanctioned ill behaviour and from their drunken, dissolute colleagues. And this withdrawal, at least in Wolfgang's case, manifested itself not simply as non-participation but in the seemingly deliberate cultivation of non-institutional music making, of a type of music – instrumental and orchestral music – openly shunned by the court, and of a style foreign to local taste.<sup>38</sup> Clearly the Mozarts saw themselves as moderns: Leopold says as much when in 1755 he describes one of his symphonies as 'composed in the most up-to-date fashion'.<sup>39</sup> And they may have felt trapped in Salzburg, Colloredo's reforms notwithstanding. Certainly they felt unappreciated.<sup>40</sup> Nevertheless, considering their strong attachment to the court and neglect of other institutions in the archdiocese, the Mozarts' reaction – haughty withdrawal – was bound to cause friction.

If blame is to be apportioned for the breakdown of Mozart's relationship with his native city, then, it is clear that both sides were at fault. And yet history has adopted only one side of the story, namely Mozart's. It is worth asking how this came about.

Biographical accounts of Mozart published prior to the late 1820s make virtually no mention of his mistreatment in Salzburg. Not even Nannerl Mozart, in her reminiscences, has much to say about this. But with the publication in 1828 of Georg Nikolaus von Nissen's *Biographie W. A. Mozart*, the story of Mozart's early suffering became a standard biographical trope. What gave Nissen (Constanze's second husband) such authority was his publication of lengthy abstracts from the family correspondence – indeed, his is as much an epistolary biography (and as such at least indirectly related to the idea of the epistolary novel) as a scholarly one. The biographical power of these abstracts, including bitter complaints and frequent accounts of abuse, was beyond measurement: not only were they 'authentic', straight from the horse's mouth, but they reinforced the then current 'idea' of Mozart as a quintessentially Romantic artist – discarded and neglected, passed over in favour of lesser talents, sickly and impoverished, doomed to an early grave. And the music composed between 1784 and 1788: so powerful, so moving, so 'absolute', so Viennese. Could a better foil be found for the creation of this classical (in the sense of exemplary) style than his miserable life in Salzburg, where he was subjugated by his father and the Archbishop and where, as most accounts have it, he was forced to toe the line musically? Almost inevitably, Salzburg came to occupy an important and thoroughly negative place in Mozart's history, fuelled by the composer's own words. Most important of all, perhaps, he was relieved of any personal culpability: it was not Mozart's fault that his life turned out the way it did – his true spirit, and the rewards that he deserved, are manifest in the grace and beauty and purity of his works.

It is a convenient story but not a convincing one. Salzburg, like all courts large and small, had its share of problems. And it was the Mozarts' misfortune to be just as problematic as their employer. Curiously, however, recognizing the complexities and realities of the situation does not much change the final outcome: whether he was a neglected Romantic artist or a rebellious *ancien régime* hothead, Mozart's story remains exceptional. And that, above all, is what posterity wants to believe.