

Volkmar Braunbehrens

## Mozart in Orchestra Concerts of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century

### I.

In the autumn of 1986, an enterprising concert agency set about organizing a series of concerts to present all of Mozart's piano concertos in several cities in Germany. The posters announcing the series (at least those in Munich) proclaimed in large letters: "Amadeus live!" To be sure the names of the performers and the works to be given were all there, but the name "Mozart" was missing entirely. "Amadeus" was enough, thanks to the notoriety and popularity of the film (perhaps the most successful in movie history). "Amadeus" has, at the same time, come to symbolize our separation from Mozart, the gap that lies between us and all that we know or can ever know of his existence.

Mozart never called himself by this name, and it is striking when you think about it that to this day no one seems to have researched the history of this pseudonym.<sup>1/</sup> Yet strangely enough, the world of musicology continues to propagate this false name; so, for example, the complete edition of Mozart's works begun in the 1950s and still unfinished is entitled:

"Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. New edition of the complete works. Published by the International Stiftung Mozarteum in association with the Mozart cities of Augsburg, Salzburg, and Vienna."<sup>2/</sup>

Thus the concert promoters of 1986 in their role as purveyors of culture were only passing along something that scholarship had sanctioned long before. Naturally, apart from the name "Amadeus," the promoters did not want to have anything to do with the film. They did not, for example, dress the performers in so-called period costumes (something they could have found only in a theater wardrobe anyways) – a bit of counterfeit Mozart that actually occurs these days, by candlelight of course and with "original instruments" (which by no means guarantees a "genuine" performance).

It is ironic: we yearn to know and to value Mozart – this most performed composer of an age gone by – and we end up making a stranger of him.

But then, Mozart was always somehow a stranger. Even his contemporaries had their problems with Mozart, although these were probably least on those occasions when he appeared before them as conductor and interpreter of his own compositions. It was as pianist performing his own works that Mozart enjoyed universal acclaim and had his greatest success (financially as well), even though as a composer of operas, he was also one of the most performed of his time. We should not forget that, when he died suddenly at the age of 35, he had had only some ten (at the most fifteen) years in which to make his name before the public as a mature musician and composer, free of

---

*This article originally appeared as a contribution to a symposium on Mozart, published in the "Freiburger Universitätsblätter", Heft 101, September 1988.*

*The footnotes begin at page 10; the INDEX begins at page 13.*

his early and confining reputation as a Wunderkind. In these few years, Mozart had shot up like a comet and achieved what no other (certainly no one so young) had achieved before. At the same age, for example, Haydn still was completely unknown. And in this short (and essentially youthful) span of time, Mozart had succeeded in transcending his past as a child prodigy and become a piano virtuoso of unparalleled renown. More than that, he had emerged as a composer equal to the artistic and intellectual challenges of the time.

It was an abiding problem that Mozart's contemporaries were all too aware of his celebrity as Wunderkind and let themselves be captivated by this aspect of his life, to the detriment of their ability to follow his later development. Mozart the Child Wonder was a notion, a prejudice that stuck to the steadily maturing Mozart: it surrounded him like a fog that let people see only the outlines of that which was not fully hidden. It was, true, a prejudice in his favor; but there were positive expectations implicit in the bias that Mozart failed to meet. Mozart came to be looked on as a "difficult" composer, indeed as one "lacking in style" (Hans Georg Nägeli -- 1826); this was conceded even there where Mozart came early to be celebrated as a "classical composer."<sup>3/</sup>

Mozart was a totally singular event; he belonged neither to the Gluck school, nor to the Italians, nor was he one of the "expressive" composers. He was different, special, individual, and was so viewed by many of his contemporaries: his music with its daring harmonic construction, full of surprising contrasts coming one after another at cost (for example) to the melodic line; the extreme attentiveness demanded of his listeners, which led to the criticism that his works were "overloaded with ideas"; his writing for the orchestra, so rich and complete in itself that it seemed to overwhelm the soloists (especially the singers in the operas) -- behind this criticism, of course, was the view that an orchestra only had support functions, a view thoroughly at variance with Mozart's music-dramatic concepts; and as for his chamber music, people regarded it as shot through with snares both for the instrumental abilities of the players and for the auditory abilities of the listeners.<sup>4/</sup>

Ironically, it was that which today most stands in the way of our coming to know Mozart's music, that is, the notion that his music is open and easy to approach and assimilate (a false idea all too frequently given encouragement by facile performances that have been ironed free of Mozart's brusqueness, especially performances of those works that the music industry elects to program over and over again), -- it was exactly this notion that never occurred to Mozart's contemporaries. When Johann Friedrich Reichardt characterized Mozart's music as a "jumble of contrary qualities and styles", it was a view widely shared.

However strange and incomprehensible it may seem to us today, the fact is that Mozart effectively divided the aesthetic judgments of his contemporaries and those who came directly after. This alone would suffice to refute the frankly absurd legend (which is still asserted time and again despite knowledge to the contrary) that Mozart had been forgotten even before he died. More significant, however, is the degree to which he had become known through the circulation of his compositions. During his lifetime, Mozart's works had been printed and distributed to an extent hardly matched by any other person of the time. And that means, a time when the production of printed music was still in a rudimentary state, a situation that took a rapid turn for the better only after 1800 with the emergence of more modern production methods. Mozart was brushed by the very beginnings of this development, but it was only in the first twenty years after his death that his reputation came to rest fully on the new diffusion of printed music.<sup>5/</sup> The number of competing editions of the same work by various publishers in the first quarter of the 19th century points to a corresponding degree of interest on the part of the public.

Well into the time of Beethoven, Mozart was looked on as a particularly "modern" composer. Keep in mind that it was only with great reluctance that Mozart released an important part of his compositions for publication and some he reserved entirely for himself. This applies above all to his works for the piano, which he kept private in order to perform them himself. In doing so, Mozart was helping to found the performance practices of the coming age of the virtuoso in which musical happenings drawn from the exclusive repertory of the performer would play an important role.

The concert programs of Mozart's time were devoted almost entirely to new compositions (this was true of the opera repertory as well), or at best repetitions of particularly favored works, and even these were relatively recent pieces. Works written more than ten years before were very seldom programmed and such works by a composer who had since died were practically never performed. This custom, whereby the bulk of the concert program was made up of "contemporary" music, lasted well into the second half of the 19th century. This is not the place to go into the reasons why there has been such an unprecedented decline in interest for contemporary artistic endeavor, a falling-off that has affected music more than any other field of art.<sup>6/</sup> Even composers who were very successful during their lifetime were seldom performed in public again after they died, although in the private performance of music, which enjoyed a higher status, the attention paid to such composers was much slower to end. Händel and J.S. Bach were universally esteemed as great masters of music -- but masters whose music belonged to history and was to be encountered in study; it was almost never heard in public performance.

It would be worth systematically analyzing which composers, who had been highly praised during their lifetime and frequently performed, were still showing up on the programs of public concerts often enough to merit mention ten years after their death. For the period between 1780 and 1840 (that is, before the time around 1850 when the tendency deliberately to mix historical works with current compositions in the concert programs began), there were few such composers and those by no means the ones still known today. Drawing on the concerts in the Gewandhaus in Leipzig whose programs are available back to 1781, we can name the following as composers still being frequently performed in the period subsequent to the decade after their death: Cimarosa, Gluck, Graun, Händel, Hasse, Naumann, Righini, Vogler, and (probably Anton) Zimmerman -- but first and foremost, Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven. It was only after 1840 that J.S. Bach and Schubert began to appear often in the programs. On the other hand, there is a long list of composers who were frequently performed while they lived, who indeed were greatly popular, and yet only ten years after they died were hardly heard from again.<sup>Z/</sup>

Mozart was the first composer who not only came to have an enduring fame following his early and unexpected death (this is evident in the extraordinary number of performances of his works), but who also was able to maintain his position with the public without interruption. Haydn, who lived until 1809, and Beethoven were the other composers to achieve this distinction. Mozart and later Haydn were in effect the first classic composers ("classic" both in the limited sense of belonging to the Vienna classic period and in the larger one of being unsurpassed key figures in the history of music) never to lose their contemporary importance in the concert hall, not even with the epoch-making appearance of Beethoven.

## II.

This brings us then to the question, which of Mozart's works (leaving aside the operas and the music for the church) were to be heard in the concert halls of the 19th century? 8/ Looking first at the situation today: thanks to our audio-visual means, the works of Mozart are all readily at hand, even if they are not all equally well known. The practice today is to separate orchestra concerts from those of chamber music, but for much of the 19th century the two were mixed together. In today's orchestra concerts, both the instrumental concertos and the symphonies of Mozart are frequently played, with the emphasis being on the symphonies. Among the concertos, we most often hear the piano concertos, somewhat less often the violin concertos. The vocal works with orchestral accompaniment (whether excerpts from operas or concert arias) are rather seldom performed and from the operas, we usually hear only the overture. Mozart's chamber music, on the other hand, is by and large broadly represented in concert, both in solo performances and by ensembles.

As they do today, the concert managers of the 19th century drew selectively from the body of Mozart's works, a selection quite different from that at present. This does not mean, however, that those works which were neglected by public performance remained totally unknown thereby. Today, each of us can turn to the phonograph or the radio to supplement what is heard in the concert hall. In the 19th century, this was the function of the great number of musically interested amateurs. They immersed themselves in the published musical literature and performed it -- whether in private or in semi-public house concerts -- in respectable fashion, undaunted by technical difficulties. Amateurism then did not yet smack of the grossly incompetent, where technical ineptitude and musical ignorance combine to produce the ridiculous. Private music-making in the 19th century was characterized by professional musicians and amateurs playing together, not by their division and separation as the result of different aesthetic standards.

In 1891, Carl Reinecke wrote concerning Mozart in the concert hall:

"His most beautiful symphonies (those in G minor, in E-flat major, in D major without minuet, and in C major with fugue-finale), individual opera overtures, the Requiem, the Ave verum, certain concert arias and songs, as well as his string-quartets and -quintets: these we come across more or less regularly in the programs of the concert societies and chamber music groups, although as far as I'm concerned, not often enough. But strange to say, it is precisely those works which the Master wrote for his own major instrument, the piano, which are almost never heard in public any more and are used now only for purposes of teaching. We hardly ever hear a public performance of his piano quartets or trios, of his sonatas for piano and violin or a piece for piano alone, or -- most seldom -- of his piano concertos." 9/

The preference for the last four symphonies of Mozart is manifest even today. But the picture of a Mozart concert life without either piano concertos or piano chamber music is as unbalanced, not to say eviscerated, as one of Mozart without his operas would be. Yet Reinecke's comment is valid and pertinent for the entire 19th century. It was in fact the piano works that were the first of Mozart's large legacy of unpublished manuscripts to be made public. Mozart himself had published only seven of his 23 original piano concertos; between 1792 and 1800 all of the remaining concertos appeared except for the concerto for three pianos, which finally came out in 1802. The remaining works for solo piano and for piano with chamber music ensembles appeared for the most part between 1798 and 1806, either in the "*Collection complete des tous les oeuvres*

*pour le Fortepiano de Mozart*" (Braunschweig, Magasin de Musique) or in the "Oeuvres complètes" begun by Breitkopf & Härtel. In other words, the unbalanced character of the programming of Mozart's music even in the early years after his death had little to do with its availability, but reflected rather a situation intimately connected with the emerging 19th century emphasis on the virtuoso performer.

The concert life of the 19th century was fundamentally more open to all possible varieties, categories, and performer arrangements in the works offered than is true today. Then too, the concerts themselves lasted two or three times as long and the first principle in programming was diversity.<sup>10/</sup> Above all, vocal pieces were a fixed part of each concert. It was not at all unusual, for example, that the Gewandhaus in Leipzig had sopranos on long-term contract who contributed opera and concert arias and songs at every concert, along with the orchestral pieces, solo concertos, chamber music numbers, and choral works (often church music) that came in random succession. For some cities, we have the complete catalog of programs from the time when the regular presentation of concerts began on a subscription basis or when a music society and orchestra company were founded.<sup>11/</sup> By comparing these concert programs, we obtain an informative picture both of the degree of similarity and of the extent of the differences.

Of course, the point of departure is different for each of the cities. The Gewandhaus in Leipzig presented some 23 orchestra concerts each year. This was five times more than the number (between four and five) presented yearly by the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna, three times more than those (around eight) given by the Philharmonic Society in London, and twice as many as the number (12) presented by the Museumsgesellschaft in Frankfurt am Main.

The works of Mozart performed in each of the cities in the period examined here -- 1815-1881 -- were as follows:

	<u>Leipzig</u>	<u>Vienna</u>	<u>Frankfurt</u>	<u>London</u>
<u>Symphonies 12/</u>				
C major (mostly KV425)	7	4	1	23
D major (mostly KV504)	31	6	13	24
E-flat (mostly KV543)	35	9	8	39
G minor (KV550)	35	10	21	35
C major (KV551)	44	8	19	37
Others	9	--	3	9
Totals	<u>161</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>177</u>
<u>Pieces for voices 13/</u>				
From:				
Idomeneo	51	2	30	46
Entführung aus dem Serail	18	3	9	20
Le Nozze di Figaro	93	3	22	91
Don Giovanni	48	3	13	94
Così fan tutte	44	3	15	43
Die Zauberflöte	31	2	15	82
La clemenza di Tito	99	11	19	66
Others	155	6	86	54
Totals	<u>539</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>496</u>

	<u>Leipzig</u>	<u>Vienna</u>	<u>Frankfurt</u>	<u>London</u>
<u>Piano concertos</u>				
D minor (KV466)	14	2	7	6
C minor (KV491)	5	--	3	3
For two pianos (KV365)	5	--	3	1
Others	10	--	15	11
Totals	<u>34</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>Other Mozart concertos</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Other Mozart compositions</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>45</u>
<u>TOTAL MOZART WORKS</u>	<u>816</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>358</u>	<u>743</u>
<u>Total concert performances</u>	<u>1545</u>	<u>309</u>	<u>ca.800</u>	<u>531</u>

--- --

The great variation in the number of Mozart performances between the four cities must be seen in association with the very different frequency of concerts in general. For example, there were three times as many concerts in Leipzig (1545) as in London (531) in this period. The fact that the number of Mozart performances is quite similar in both cities is proof of a special affinity for Mozart in London not found on the continent. For contrast, consider Vienna, which could claim to be the city in which the mature Mozart had enjoyed a congenial milieu and so much success as a free lance artist that he refused to exchange it for a fixed position anywhere else. (To be sure, Mozart was constantly on the lookout for a secure appointment; at no time during the years in Vienna, however, was he willing to trade his success-marked independence for such "security"; he regularly put off travel plans -- to London, for example -- to remain there.) 15/ In Vienna, then, although the four or five orchestra concerts given each year by the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde were about half the number given in London, the number of works by Mozart performed were only about one-ninth as many.

On the other hand, the number of different Mozart operas presented in the music theaters of Vienna during the 19th century was especially numerous and reached high numbers of performances. Under these circumstances, it is understandable why, for example, the concerts in Vienna contained relatively few performances of arias taken from the Mozart operas.

The symphonies. The frequency with which the Mozart symphonies were performed in Leipzig, Vienna, Frankfurt, and London was about the same (taking into account the overall differences in the number of concerts). Nor was there any significant difference in those chosen for performance: the last four (and in particular the G minor) appeared and reappeared with great regularity on the concert programs; the presence of any of the other symphonies was an exception. Out of the musical literature of the past, it was only these last four Mozart symphonies that were regarded as masterworks equal in quality to the Beethoven symphonies which set the standard for the entire 19th century, and these four were much higher regarded than any of the Haydn symphonies. (Haydn at no time even came close to reaching the number of performances of Mozart, not even in London.) The review shows that initially and into the 1820s, people were prepared to give other Mozart symphonies a hearing; by the second

half of the century, however, the canonical position of the "four great symphonies" had become firmly set in place. (A similar tendency will be noted in connection with the piano concertos.) This process of increasing partiality to "the four" is of particular note in London, because there the share of Mozart symphonies in the concerts was especially high and the opportunity for a broader choice should have been more favorable. And yet in London too, we see the same four repeated with mindless regularity.

Pieces for voices. The same tendency is evident in the choice of pieces from the operas. "Die Zauberflöte" is named in the London statistics relatively more often than elsewhere. This frequent mention of "Zauberflöte" in London is largely based, however, on the fact that from the end of the 1850s on, hardly a year passed in which the overture to this opera was not played. (As for the vocal numbers from "Zauberflöte," they were sung partly in German and partly in Italian (!), which suggests that the London audiences were rather more ready to consign Mozart to the realm of Italian opera than to come to an understanding of him in terms of his uniquely personal approach to music-drama; those arias chosen from his other operas lend weight to this suspicion.) Given the trend towards a narrowing of choice, it is hardly any wonder that the 54 "other" items (that is, those pieces taken from operas other than the seven listed) in London contrast with a number almost three times as great (155) in Leipzig. There, the driving inclination was to choose as broadly as possible from the body of Mozart's works and to bring forward compositions not yet known.

Concertos. In each of the cities examined, the one category most neglected was that of Mozart's solo concertos. This surely reflects the fact that, for the most part, the instrumental virtuosos of the 19th century were composers for their instrument as well and not (as today) their instrument's dedicated servant to a classical tradition; they were, rather, heroic instrumentalists determined to demonstrate their mastery through the playing of brilliant little concert pieces. The programs of such musical magicians were relatively indifferent, indeed often rather shabby, intended more for technical than musical effects. And even though Mozart's concertos represented a high order of virtuosity -- particularly when measured against the concert demands of his time -- for many of the 19th century virtuosos intent on parading their own talents, they were at the same time too demanding musically and yet technically (apparently) not ostentatious enough. Thus, Mozart's instrumental concertos fell victim in part to the judgment of important instrumentalists that they could not use them adequately to show themselves off. As a result, audiences seldom had any idea of what they were missing -- apart from those who had the good fortune to be able to hear such selfless artists as Felix Mendelssohn, Ferdinand Hiller, Clara Schumann, or Carl Reinecke.

Chamber music. From 1850 on, the presence of chamber music within the framework of orchestra concerts dwindled and programs became more symphonic in character, even though interwoven as before with pieces from operas and with concert arias and choral works. When soloists appeared, they often played not only concertos for the instruments, but solo pieces as well. As the age of the virtuoso took over, the realm of chamber music, being less suited for the virtuoso display of individual talents, faded away. The progressive narrowing of the concert program thus set in motion becomes clearer when one recalls how much was earlier given over to chamber music: for example, in London between 1815 and 1845, there were 27 performances of Mozart's string - quartets and -quintets, plus another ten involving trios, the piano quartets, the clarinet quintet, and pieces for woodwinds. At the Gewandhaus in Leipzig, chamber music played an important role, particularly under the influence of the indefatigable Felix Mendelssohn. In Frankfurt too, there were frequent

appearances of the string-quartets and -quintets on the concert programs from 1815 on into the 1820s, and other chamber works as well into the 1850s. In Vienna, on the other hand, the custom of including chamber music in the orchestra programs was never as pronounced.

### III.

The piano concertos of Mozart occupied an odd place in 19th century concert programs. Writing in 1891, Carl Reinecke deplored the fact that one

"encounters his piano concertos very seldom, and if it should finally happen to be the case, then the odds are 100-to-one that we'll bump into the D minor concerto. And this, even though there are at least six out of the 25 piano concertos that Mozart wrote (leaving aside those for two and three pianos) that are at least as good as the D minor and some -- in my opinion -- even better. The situation is all the more striking because Mozart is the true creator of today's piano concerto. This accomplishment of Mozart -- to have endowed the piano concerto with a weight and a worth equal to that of the other great art forms -- is all the more noteworthy because, admittedly, the concerto as such is not devoted solely to achieving its purpose as a pure work of art, as a symphony or a chamber music work is, but has the additional duty of providing its player with the opportunity to display his artistry, his fluency, his brilliance, and his skill as a performer. It is to Mozart's eternal credit that he achieved this latter purpose at the same time that he created a work of art that captivates the soul and the intellect. This must not be forgotten, even if Mozart's own concertos should never be heard from again. "16/

This description of the function of the piano concerto form is expressed completely in the spirit of Mozart; we can find similar sentiments in his letters. And it is certainly true that, among Mozart's almost 50 instrumental concertos, the piano concertos are the most important. Concert programs today without them can hardly be imagined, for they belong to the most popular of Mozart's works.17/ At the same time, several of the piano concertos rank incontestably with the greatest masterworks of Mozart. These coinciding facts confirm Mozart's success at the balancing act of combining the "popular" with the "demanding" (and this includes intellectual demands as well).

In the years immediately following Mozart's death, the piano concertos were performed frequently (and the scores were soon available to all). In Leipzig alone between 1796 and 1814, there were 46 performances of the piano concertos, most of them by August Eberhard Müller and his wife, Elisabeth Katharine Rabert. Partly this reflected Müller's position in Leipzig as a particular favorite with a big reputation and, partly, his role as an eminent Mozart specialist and the guiding spirit behind Breitkopf & Härtel's edition of Mozart's works.18/ Nevertheless, if there had not been a broad interest in the piano concertos of Mozart, Müller would hardly have bothered to put himself forward as the author of a paper, "Introduction to the Performance of Mozart's Piano Concertos," which appeared in Leipzig in 1795.

In the other cities as well, we have reports of frequent performances of the piano concertos in these early years and, although the information that has come down to us is not always very exact, it was not only the same three or four concertos that were played. In London, the credit must go primarily to Cipriani Potter, who alone in the 1820s presented seven of the concertos. It is not surprising that there have always been pianists ready to champion the Mozart concertos. What is surprising, however, is that from the 1830s on there



were so few who were prepared to swim against the current of the then customary concert practice; without the public engagement of Ferdinand Hiller, Felix Mendelssohn, Clara Schumann, Wilhelm Taubert, and Carl Reinecke, the Mozart piano concertos would virtually have disappeared from the concert programs.

Between 1830 and 1881, the number of performances were as follows:

	<u>Leipzig</u>	<u>Vienna</u>	<u>Frankfurt</u>	<u>London</u>
Of these:	<u>29</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>14</u>
D minor (KV466)	13	2	7	6
C minor (KV491)	5	--	3	3

The favorite status of the two minor concertos was evident in all four cities. And even Carl Reinecke and Clara Schumann contributed to this partiality.

All in all, we can see a progressive narrowing in the selection of those Mozart works that were able to hold their own in the concert life of the 19th century. History works like a wide-mesh screen in which but little sticks and remains: in this case, that little being the music which was able to maintain its currency through an era shaped and schooled by the works of Beethoven.

In a review of a concert in Vienna, the critic Eduard Hanslick put it bluntly:

"Many of Mozart's piano compositions have been irretrievably and not undeservedly washed away with the passage of time; at best it is only the piano teacher and the musicologist who pay attention to them anymore, certainly not the public. But the (Vienna) concertos of Mozart are a quite different matter, for they mark the highpoint of his writing for the piano and far surpass his remaining solo pieces, with the single exception of the wonderful C minor fantasy, which not only pointed to Beethoven but erupted, like a miracle, into his second period." 19/

And what Hanslick had to say about the piano concertos, he could have said about the symphonies and Mozart's chamber music as well. It was far from Hanslick's idea that the "complete" Mozart should not only be preserved for posterity as an historical record of the evolution of music, but should also be included in the current doings in the concert hall. Even so classical a musician as Carl Reinecke, active as he was on behalf of Mozart's music, said that "among the 25 piano concertos. . .there are at least six as good as the D minor and some are even better" 20/ and meant thereby that it was chiefly these seven which deserved to be presented more often to the public.

It is easy for us today to pride ourselves on our ready access to Mozart's complete works, where even the smallest fragment is ours to hear on the stereo any time we wish. And yet so far as the concert hall is concerned, we too indulge ourselves in our own partialities. It is certainly true that the 19th century in some areas, especially those of the symphonies and the concertos, cut the Mozart oeuvre back in a way that we can hardly comprehend; at the same time, there were other sides of his work, such as the concert arias and those from the operas, that were enjoyed in concert and performed there with a frequency not seen since. (Here too Beethoven may have played a role. His works for voice never achieved great popularity nor did he come to be thought of as an exceptional composer of song. Thus he never stood in the way of an appreciation of Mozart's artistry in writing for the human voice, as light and

sensitive as it is masterly and flexible, a vocal art that never sounds pushed or forced, yet achieves the utmost subtlety of expression.)

We can well be envious of one thing that the 19th century was free of: Mozart's music was not then served up merely for the purpose of immunizing the audience against the playing of contemporary music. Where Mozart was performed, it took place despite the competition from the new music of the time and his music had to earn its place as worthy of attention in the face of the current fare. And that was surely a more honest way of appreciating Mozart than the sentimental "Amadeus" approach of today, abetted by a highly subsidized concert life, to say nothing of the abuse of Mozart's music these days as filler on either side of radio and TV commercials, or as background music for advertising, or simply as "mood" music.

It would be an undertaking worthy of the stature of Mozart's music if we were to perform it less often perhaps, but then, when we did, to perform it under conditions that enhance an aware and concentrated listening, a listening that paid full attention to this music's significance in our cultural history and actively sought after its meaning for today, instead of just letting it somehow mindlessly go to waste.

-----

### Footnotes

**1.** Mozart usually signed himself Wolfgang, Wolfgang A., or at most Wolfgang Amadeo or Wolfgang Amade Mozart. He was baptized with the names Johannes Chrisostomos Wolfgang Gottlieb. Amadeus is one way to translate Gottlieb into Latin. If there is a rather stolid, devout, even pietistic sound to Gottlieb, then Amadeus sounds rather precious, learned, even a bit playful. "Favorite of the Gods" would be one way to translate back from Amadeus -- and it is just for that reason that the Romantic era seized upon this nickname to proclaim its veneration for Mozart (E.T.A. Hoffmann, for example) or to bestow upon promising youngsters (as sometimes happens today), thus dooming them in advance to failure. The first time Mozart was presented to the general public as Wolfgang Amadeus was when Breitkopf & Härtel began to publish its "*Oeuvres complètes*" in 1798. It was only after 1810 that "Amadeus" began to take hold. Even so, when the noted "*Neue historisch-biographische Lexikon der Tonkünstler*" of Ernst Ludwig Gerber was published in four volumes in Leipzig in 1812-1814, it still spoke correctly of Johannes Chrysostomos Wolfgang Gottlieb Mozart (Vol. 3, p.475). The first biographers -- Schlichtegroll, Niemetschek, even Rochlitz -- also adhered to Gottlieb.

**2.** It would appear as though the only ones concerned with accuracy were some of those outsiders who have been so important in the realm of Mozart research -- Ludwig Ritter von Köchel, for example, who entitled his catalog, "*Chronologisch-thematisches Verzeichnis sämtlicher Tonwerke Wolfgang Amade Mozarts*", when it appeared in 1862. Despite this, the editor of the Third edition (1936), the famous musicologist Alfred Einstein, reverted to the pseudonym Amadeus in the very first sentence of the first paragraph of his Foreword.

**3.** For example, in the obituary in the Oberpostamts-Zeitung (Prague) of 17 December 1791. Gernot Gruber (in his book, "*Mozart und die Nachwelt*," Salzburg/Vienna 1985, p.73) is undoubtedly correct in his assumption that Franz Xaver Niemetschek was the obituary's author.

**4.** Gernot Gruber's excellent book, "*Mozart und die Nachwelt*," is highly informative with respect to the historical process of Mozart's assimilation, the more so since many relevant questions have so far received but little research. (See also Alexander Hyatt King, "*Mozart im Spiegel der Geschichte 1756-1956*"; Kassel 1956.)

**5.** Of the 627 numbered entries in the Köchel catalog, 131 were published in authorized editions during Mozart's lifetime; in addition, according to Deutsch/Oldmann (ZfMW, April 1932), there were some ten collections of works, about 45 revisions, and some 30 arrangements (more recent research would surely cause the numbers to increase). This leaves aside entirely the numerous *Abschriften* (scores prepared by a copyist); Mozart's music for the church, for example, was disseminated very largely in *Abschriften*. Looked at this way, one could say that a fifth of Mozart's works were published while Mozart still lived. If we discount the works from his youth, most of which were published for the first time in the Breitkopf & Härtel "Werke"-Ausgabe from 1877 on, then we can say that a third of his works were published during his lifetime, and most of the remaining works were put into print within twenty years after his death. The numbers in the Köchel catalog are not very informative, by the way, for there, particularly among the works of his childhood, even the slightest minuet receives its very own number just as, later on, an entire opera of the dimensions, say, of "Don Giovanni" is also represented by a single number.

**6.** Literature has been the least affected by this shift in interest. It is apparent that appreciation for the arts has not developed uniformly; there are those who regard the need for only the very latest in literature as obvious, even imperative, but who have nothing but scorn and disdain for "new music." To understand what this means for music, try to imagine a situation where what we were offered in radio and on tapes and records, etc., consisted almost exclusively of works from the 20th century, where the most recent musical compositions were performed and discussed like "best sellers," etc. -- such a situation would then have at least partly balanced the shift in music interest with the situation in literature and still not have achieved the absolute priority that new music had in Mozart's day. (And let's not overlook the fact that the separation into "serious" music and "popular" music has been one of the gravest reasons for this development.)

**7.** The list of the latter runs as follows: Anfossi, J.C. Bach, Dittersdorf, A. Eberl, Gazzaniga, P. Guglielmi, Gyrowetz, F.A. Hoffmeister, L. Kozeluch, Krommer, A.E. Müller, Neukomm, Paer, Pasiello, F. Pichl, Pleyel, J.F. Reichardt, A. Romberg, Rössler (Rosetti), Sacchini, Sarti, Schicht, J. Schuster, Seydelmann, Stamitz, Sterkel, Vanhall, Weigl, P. Winter, E.W. Wolf, Wranitzky. This list includes only those composers who died between 1780 and 1840. Source: Alfred Dörffel, *Die Gewandhauskonzerte zu Leipzig 1781-1881*, reprint of the 1884 edition, Leipzig 1980. The concerts of the Gewandhaus lend themselves particularly well to such a study for two reasons: they are well documented, and the concert undertakings in Leipzig were more ambitious than in other places and were distinguished by conscientious programming. In other cities, much greater concessions were made to the public's taste with the programming of particular favorites (probably driven by financial considerations).

**8.** Deliberately not considered here are the following: the operas, because their form of presentation necessitates an organization of its own for performance, and the church music, which for the most part was performed as a normal part of the liturgy.

**9.** Carl Reinecke, *Zur Wiederbelebung der Mozart'schen Clavier-Concerte. Ein Wort der Anregung an die clavierspielende Welt*, Leipzig 1891, p.4.

**10.** In the nature of things, the historical framework of 19th century concert life was much narrower: works composed before 1780 practically never appeared and hence the programming choice was essentially limited to compositions written between 1780 and the time of the concert, in other words, to works only a few decades old at the most. By contrast, we make our selection today out of a body of music that reaches from 1720 to the present, that is, one that embraces more than 250 years of music history.

**11.** This examination looks at concert series in Leipzig, Vienna, Frankfurt, and London. For one thing, the concert programs for these cities are available over a long span of time (1815-1881). Moreover, despite historical, sociological, and regional differences, music life in these four cities had developed in similar ways, allowing us to draw comparisons between them. Sources are: Alfred Dörffel, *Die Gewandhauskonzerte zu Leipzig 1781-1881*, Leipzig 1884 (reprint Leipzig 1980); Helene de Bary, *Geschichte der Museumsgesellschaft zu Frankfurt am Main*, Frankfurt/M. 1937; Richard v. Perger/Robert Hirschfeld, *Geschichte der k.k. Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien*, 3 vols., Vienna 1912; supplemented by the work of Eduard Hanslick, *Geschichte des Concertwesens in Wien*, 2 vols., Vienna 1869 (reprint Hildesheim/New York 1979); Myles Birket Foster, *History of the Philharmonic Society of London 1813-1912*, London/New York/Toronto 1912.

**12.** In the years after Mozart died until about 1820, symphonies generally were not otherwise identified on the programs. Later they began to be identified by key. As a result we cannot always be sure which works are meant. When "G minor symphony" appears on a program, it almost certainly refers to the later (KV550) of Mozart's two symphonies in this key. The Prague symphony (D major, KV504) is to be understood when the term "without minuet" appears and the "Jupiter" symphony (C major, KV551), when "with fugue-finale" is given. In this way, we can have some assurance of having correctly identified the symphonies.

**13.** The vocal pieces from the operas include individual arias and complete finales as well. The playing of the overture is also counted here. Included under "others" are arias from operas other than the seven named, and concert arias and those vocal pieces for the concert hall taken from Mozart's church music.

**14.** "Other Mozart compositions" refers chiefly to his chamber music works performed as part of an orchestra concert program. We have too little information about concerts that were devoted exclusively to chamber music, especially solo concerts, to include them in the statistics. There were almost no established chamber music groups regularly performing as such. An early, isolated example was the Müller quartet made up of four brothers who tired of their service in the Braunschweiger Hofkapelle and decided to form one of the first permanent string quartets. They often performed within the framework of orchestra concerts.

**15.** For more on this view of Mozart during his years in Vienna, as contrasted with other representations, see in detail "Mozart in Wien" (Munich/Zürich 1986), 508 pages, by Volkmar Braunbehrens.

**16.** Carl Reinecke, *op.cit.*, p.4 ff.

**17.** Of the 14 Mozart compositions chosen for the film "Amadeus," three are excerpts from piano concertos.

**18.** During his years in Leipzig, A.E. Müller was active primarily as organist in the Nicolai-Kirche; from 1804 to 1820, he served as Thomas-Kantor and was the first in this position to resign after getting fed up with the constant frictions. He was an important adviser and reader for the publishing firm of Breitkopf & Härtel.

**19.** Printed in Eduard Hanslick, *Geschichte des Concertwesens in Wien*, vol. 2, p.424.

**20.** Carl Reinecke, *op.cit.*, p.5.

— — — — —

### Index

"Amadeus" as name, 1, 10

"the four great symphonies," canonical position of, 7

Bach, J.S., 3

Beethoven, 3, 9

Breitkopf & Härtel's edition of M.'s works, 5, 8

Chamber music, discussion of, 7

Cimarosa, Domenico, 3

*Collection complete des tous les oeuvres pour le Fortepiano de M.*  
(Braunschweig), 4

Concert programs of M.'s time, 3; diversity of, 5

Concertos, discussion of, 7, 8

*Così fan tutte*, 5

*Die Zauberflöte*, 5, 7

*Don Giovanni*, 5

*Entführung aus dem Serail*, 5

Frankfurt, 7

Gluck, Christoph Willibald von, 3

Graun, Karl, 3

Händel, Georg Friederich, 3

Hanslick, Eduard, review of M. piano concertos, 9

Hasse, Johann, 3

Haydn, Joseph, 3, 6

Hiller, Ferdinand, 7, 9

*Idomeneo*, 5

K 365, Concerto in E-flat for two pianos, 6

K 425, Symphony in C („Linz“), 5

K 466, Piano concerto in D-minor, 6, 8, 9

K 475, Fantasia in C-minor for piano, 9

K 491, Piano concerto in C-minor, 6, 9

K 504, Symphony in D („Prague“)(...without minuet), 4, 5, 6

K 543, Symphony in E-flat, 4, 5, 6  
K 550, Symphony in G-minor, 4, 5, 6  
K 551, Symphony in C („Jupiter“)(...with fugue-finale), 4, 5, 6  
K 618, „Ave verum corpus“, 4  
K 626, Requiem in D-minor, 4

*La clemenza di Tito*, 5  
*Le Nozze di Figaro*, 5  
Leipzig, Gewandhaus in, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8  
London, Philharmonic Society in, 5, 6, 7, 8

M. "always a stranger", 1  
M. "forgotten before he died", 2  
M. as Wunderkind, 2  
M. concert arias, 9  
M.'s music "overloaded with ideas", 2  
M.'s piano concertos, Reinecke on, 8  
Mendelssohn, Felix, 7, 9  
Müller, August Eberhard, 8  
Museums-gesellschaft, Frankfurt am Main, 5  
Musically interested amateurs, function of, 4

Nägeli, Hans Georg, 2  
Naumann, Johann Gottlieb, 3

*Oeuvres complètes* (Breitkopf & Härtel), 5

Piano concertos, discussion of, 8  
Pieces for voices, discussion of, 7  
Potter, Cipriani, 8

Rabert, Elisabeth Katharine (pianist and wife of A.E. Müller), 8  
Reichardt, Johann Friedrich, 2  
Reinecke, Carl, concerning M., 4; 7, 9  
Righini, Vincenzo, 3

Salzburg, International Stiftung Mozarteum, 1  
Schubert, Franz, 3  
Schumann, Clara, 7, 9

Taubert, Wilhelm, 9

Vienna, Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, 5, 6  
Vogler, Georg Joseph (Abbé Vogler), 3

— — — — —