

# WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART

Series X

## SUPPLEMENT

WORK GROUP 29: WORKS OF DUBIOUS AUTHENTICITY  
VOLUME 1

PRESENTED BY  
CHRISTOPH-HELLMUT MAHLING AND WOLFGANG PLATH

1980

Neue Mozart-Ausgabe (New Mozart Edition)\*

WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART

## The Complete Works

BÄRENREITER KASSEL ● BASEL ● LONDON

En coopération avec le Conseil international de la Musique

Editorial Board: Dietrich Berke ● Wolfgang Plath ● Wolfgang Rehm

Agents for

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS: Bärenreiter Ltd. London

BUNDESREPUBLIK DEUTSCHLAND: Bärenreiter-Verlag Kassel

SWITZERLAND and all other countries not named here: Bärenreiter-Verlag Basel

As a supplement to each volume a Critical Report (Kritischer Bericht) in German is available

The editing of the NMA is supported by

City of Augsburg

City of Salzburg

Administration Land Salzburg

City of Vienna

Konferenz der Akademien der Wissenschaften in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland,  
represented by

Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz,  
with funds from

Bundesministerium für Forschung und Technologie, Bonn and

Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterricht und Kultus

Ministerium für Kultur der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik

Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kunst, Vienna

---

\* Hereafter referred to as the NMA. The predecessor, the "Alte Mozart-Edition" (Old Mozart Edition) is referred to as the AMA.

## CONTENTS

Editorial Principles .....	VII
Foreword.....	IX
Facsimiles: Leaves 1 <sup>r</sup> and 9 <sup>v</sup> of the score copy of the Sinfonia concertante in E <sup>b</sup> .....	XXIV
Facsimiles: Pages 1 and 38 of the score copy of the Violin Concerto in D.....	XXV
Facsimiles: Two pages from the copied set of parts for the Violin Concerto in D.....	XXVI
Sinfonia concertante for Oboe, Clarinet, Horn, Bassoon and Orchestra KV App. I, 9 (297 <sup>b</sup> ; KV <sup>6</sup> : App. C 14.01).....	3
Concerto in D for Violin and Orchestra KV <sup>2</sup> 271 <sup>a</sup> (271 <sup>i</sup> ).....	81
Appendix	
I: Divergent conclusion from the Paris copied set of parts for the third movement of the Violin Concerto in D.....	155
II: Cadenzas for the Violin Concerto in D.....	155

## EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES

The New Mozart Edition (NMA) provides for research purposes a music text based on impeccable scholarship applied to all available sources – principally Mozart's autographs – while at the same time serving the needs of practising musicians. The NMA appears in 10 Series subdivided into 35 Work Groups:

- I: Sacred Vocal Works (1–4)
- II: Theatrical Works (5–7)
- III: Songs, Part-Songs, Canons (8–10)
- IV: Orchestral Works (11–13)
- V: Concertos (14–15)
- VI: Church Sonatas (16)
- VII: Large Solo Instrument Ensembles (17–18)
- VIII: Chamber Music (19–23)
- IX: Keyboard Music (24–27)
- X: Supplement (28–35)

For every volume of music a Critical Commentary (Kritischer Bericht) in German is available, in which the source situation, variant readings or Mozart's corrections are presented and all other special problems discussed.





Within the volumes and Work Groups the completed works appear in their order of composition. Sketches, draughts and fragments are placed in an Appendix at the end of the relevant volume. Sketches etc. which cannot be assigned to a particular work, but only to a genre or group of works, generally appear in chronological order at the end of the final volume of the relevant Work Group. Where an identification regarding genre is not possible, the sketches etc. are published in Series X, Supplement (Work Group 30: Studies, Sketches, Draughts, Fragments, Various). Lost compositions are mentioned in the relevant Critical Commentary in German. Works of doubtful authenticity appear in Series X (Work Group 29). Works which are almost certainly spurious have not been included.

Of the various versions of a work or part of a work, that version has generally been chosen as the basis for editing which is regarded as final and definitive. Previous or alternative forms are reproduced in the Appendix.

The NMA uses the numbering of the Köchel Catalogue (KV); those numberings which differ in the third and expanded edition (KV<sup>3</sup> or KV<sup>3a</sup>) are given in brackets; occasional differing numberings in the sixth edition (KV<sup>6</sup>) are indicated.

With the exception of work titles, entries in the score margin, dates of composition and the footnotes, all additions and completions in the music volumes are indicated, for which the following scheme

applies: letters (words, dynamic markings, *tr* signs and numbers in italics; principal notes, accidentals before principal notes, dashes, dots, fermatas, ornaments and smaller rests (half notes, quarters, etc.) in small print; slurs and crescendo marks in broken lines; grace and ornamental notes in square brackets. An exception to the rule for numbers is the case of those grouping triplets, sextuplets, etc. together, which are always in italics, those added editorially in smaller print. Whole measure rests missing in the source have been completed tacitly.

The title of each work as well as the specification in italics of the instruments and voices at the beginning of each piece have been normalised, the disposition of the score follows today's practice. The wording of the original titles and score disposition are provided in the Critical Commentary in German. The original notation for transposing instruments has been retained. C-clefs used in the sources have been replaced by modern clefs. Mozart always notated singly occurring sixteenth, thirty-second notes etc. crossed-through, (i.e.  instead of ); the notation therefore does not distinguish between long or short realisations. The NMA generally renders these in the modern notation  etc.; if a grace note of this kind should be interpreted as "short" an additional indication "[" is given over the relevant grace note. Missing slurs at grace notes or grace note groups as well as articulation signs on ornamental notes have generally been added without comment. Dynamic markings are rendered in the modern form, e.g. *f* and *p* instead of *for:* and *pia:*

The texts of vocal works have been adjusted following modern orthography. The realisation of the bass continuo, in small print, is as a rule only provided for *secco* recitatives. For any editorial departures from these guidelines refer to the relevant Foreword and to the Critical Commentary in German.

A comprehensive representation of the editorial guidelines for the NMA (3<sup>rd</sup> version, 1962) has been published in *Editionsrichtlinien musikalischer Denkmäler und Gesamtausgaben* [Editorial Guidelines for Musical Heritage and Complete Editions]. Commissioned by the Gesellschaft für Forschung and edited by Georg von Dadelsen, Kassel etc., 1963, pp. 99-129. Offprints of this as well as the *Bericht über die Mitarbeitertagung und Kassel, 29. – 30. 1981*, published privately in 1984, can be obtained from the Editorial Board of the NMA.

Work Group 29 (Works of Dubious Authenticity) has the task of presenting those works whose authenticity is seriously debatable as a collection of examples for future exercises in stylistic criticism. According to the current state of scholarship, the two works brought together in this volume, the *Sinfonia concertante in E<sup>b</sup>* KV App. I,9 (297<sup>b</sup>; KV<sup>6</sup>: App. C 14.01) and the *Violin Concerto in D* KV<sup>2</sup> 271<sup>a</sup> (271<sup>1</sup>), are the only ones in the whole field of Mozart concerto composition which can be earnestly taken into consideration for publication within Work Group 29. Neither the Violin Concerto in E<sup>b</sup> KV 268 (365<sup>b</sup>; KV<sup>6</sup>: App. C 14.04) nor even the so-called “Adelaide Concerto” KV<sup>3</sup> App. 294<sup>a</sup> (KV<sup>6</sup>: App. C 14.05) can contend for a place in this volume: the first (KV<sup>6</sup>: App. C 14.04) because it is very probably not by Mozart, but by Johann Friedrich Eck,(cf. Walter Lebermann in: *Die Musikforschung* 31,1978, pp. 452–

465), the second (KV<sup>6</sup>: App. C 14.05) because it has been shown – once again by Lebermann – to be a 20<sup>th</sup> century forgery (cf. *Die Musikforschung* 20, 1967, pp. 413-421).

Concerning the authenticity of the works presented in this volume, much has been written and fierce discussions conducted. While this edition of the two works within the New Mozart Edition cannot claim to have brought a solution of the question of authenticity closer, let alone to have decided it, it does offer Mozart scholars for the first time a critical edition of the works reflecting the present state of research. The continuing authenticity debate for both works should thus be provided with trustworthy working material.

The Editorial Board

## FOREWORD

**Sinfonia concertante in E<sup>b</sup>**

The history of this piece for *concertante* wind instruments is amongst the most peculiar, indeed most confusing, items in the Mozart transmission and literature. To give the reader an adequate idea of the kind of problem involved, this history will now be told from the beginning and in the necessary detail. (The absence of a practical overview of the problem in recent literature and the quite special position occupied by the work itself are the reason why this Foreword has assumed such over-dimensional proportions compared to Christoph-Hellmut Mahling's Foreword to KV 271<sup>1</sup>.)

1. *Mozart's Sinfonia concertante KV Appendix I,9: Paris, April 1778*

While Mozart was in Paris in Spring/Summer 1778, four outstanding wind virtuosos were also in the town: Johann Baptist Wendling (flute), Friedrich Ramm (oboe) and Georg Wenzel Ritter (bassoon) – all three were members of the famous Mannheim Court Orchestra – as well as Johann Wenzel Stich, alias Giovanni Punto, considered the best horn player of the day. With the three Mannheimers, Mozart had already made acquaintance, indeed friendship, months before. It was therefore only logical to take advantage of the availability of such a brilliant quartet of soloists. “Now I am going to write a *sinfonia concertante*, for flauto Wendling, oboe Ramm, Punto horn, and Ritter bassoon. Punto plays *magnificently*”, Mozart writes to his father in Salzburg on 5 April 1778.<sup>1</sup> The work was obviously intended for performance in the *Concert spirituel* series managed by Joseph Legros (or Le Gros). Leopold Mozart showed that he was impressed by the plan. “I would like to hear the *Sinfonia Concertante* with these capable people”, he replied on 20

April.<sup>2</sup> But suddenly Mozart had only vexation and difficulties to report to Salzburg:<sup>3</sup>

“But now there is a back-and-fore again with the *sinfonia concertante*. But in this case I believe there is something else in the way. I simply have my enemies here as well. But where have I not had them? – But this is a good sign. I had to write the *sinfonia* in the greatest haste, really pushing myself, and the 4 *concertante* players were, and still are, completely in love with it. Then Le Gros takes it for 4 days for copying. But I find it still lying in the same place. Finally, on the second-last day, I cannot find it – but search thoroughly amongst the musical properties – and find it where it is hidden. I do not do anything immediately. I ask Le Gros: *Apropós* – have you already passed the *Sinfonia Concertante* on for copying? – No, I have forgotten. Since, of course, I cannot give him orders to have it copied and prepared, I say nothing to him. On the two days when it should have been performed, I went to the concert. There Ramm and Punto came to me quite inflamed, and asked why my *sinfonia concertante* was not to be performed. – I do not know. This is the first I have heard about it. I know nothing. Ramm became as wild as an animal, and declaimed in French against Le Gros in the music room that this was a poor show by him *etc.* What depresses me most in the whole matter is that Le Gros did not say a word to me about it, I was the only one not to know anything at all. If he had made an excuse that the time was too short, or something similar, but absolutely nothing – but I believe that *Cambini*, an Italian maestro here, is behind it, for I inadvertently put him in the shade at the first meeting at Le Gros's. He had written quartets, of which I had heard one in Mannheim, and which are very pretty; and I then praised him, and played the beginning to him; but then Ritter, Ramm and Punto joined us, and would give me no peace unless I continued and added something, I don't know what, of my own. So I did exactly that. And *Cambini* was completely beside himself, and could not help commenting ‘*questa è una gran testa!*’ [‘this is a great mind’]. Now, that won't have pleased him.”

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Mozart. Briefe und Aufzeichnungen*. Complete edition, published by the International Mozart Foundation, Salzburg, compiled (and elucidated) by Wilhelm A. Bauer and Otto Erich Deutsch, (4 volumes of text = Bauer–Deutsch I–IV, Kassel etc., 1962/63), with a later commentary based on their work by Joseph Heinz Eibl (2 volumes of commentary, Kassel etc., 1971), register, compiled by Joseph Heinz Eibl (1 volume, Kassel etc., 1975), Bauer–Deutsch II, No. 440, p. 332, lines 95f.

<sup>2</sup> Bauer–Deutsch II, No. 446, p. 341, line 141.

<sup>3</sup> Letter of 1 May 1778: Bauer–Deutsch II, No. 447, p. 345, lines 74ff.

The moderately outraged reaction from his father goes straight to the essentials. “*So your sinfonia concertante has not been performed at all? Did they pay you for it? – and did you not even get your score back?*”, he asks in reply.<sup>4</sup> In what one is tempted to describe as a well-advised answer, Mozart avoids any clear references to this. The next mention of the work is found rather as an incidental within a wordy recapitulation of the latest exchange with Legros:<sup>5</sup>

“– M<sup>r</sup>. Le Gros | Directeur | is trying astonishingly hard to get on terms with me; you should know that I | although I was otherwise at his residence daily | have not been with him since Easter, out of vexation that he had not performed my *sinfonia concertante*; I often entered the building to visit M<sup>r</sup>. Raaff, and always had to go past their rooms – the servants and maids always saw me, and I always asked them to pass on my regards. – It is without doubt a pity that it was not performed, it would have enchanted the public very much – but now he no longer has the opportunity to do it. Where can you ever find 4 such people together? One day, as I wanted to visit Raaff, he was not at home, and they assured me he would soon return. So I waited – M<sup>r</sup>. Le Gros came into the room – It is miraculous to have the pleasure of seeing you again – Yes, I have really so much to do – But you will stay to eat with us today? – I beg your indulgence, I already have an appointment. – M<sup>r</sup>. Mozart, we must get together again sometime – It would be a pleasure. – Long pause – finally: *Apropós*, wouldn’t you like to write a large symphony for me for Corpus Christi? – Why not? – But can I rely on you? – O yes; if I can only rely equally on its being performed, and that the same doesn’t happen again as with the *sinfonia concertante* – here the dance started – he apologised as well as he could, but didn’t really know what to say.”

Only very much later, on the journey home from France (Nancy, 3 October 1778), did Mozart take the trouble to give at least the beginnings of a sober account, which was probably not received with much joy by his father:<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Letter of 11 June 1778: Bauer–Deutsch II, No. 452, p. 372, lines 109ff.

<sup>5</sup> Letter of 9 July 1778: Bauer–Deutsch II, No. 462, pp. 397f., lines 155ff.

<sup>6</sup> Bauer–Deutsch II, No. 494, p. 492, lines 59ff.

“– I cannot bring much new music of my own with me, for I have not written much; – the 3 quartets and the flute concerto for M<sup>r</sup>. de Jean are not in my possession, for he put it, when leaving for Paris, into the wrong packing case, and it resultingly stayed in Mannheim; – but he has promised to send it to me as soon as he reaches Mannheim; – I will certainly do the commission for Wendling; – consequently I will have nothing finished to bring with me apart from my sonatas; – for Le Gros has bought the 2 overtures and the *sinfonia concertante* off me; – he thinks that he is the sole owner, but that is not true; I still have it fresh in my head, and, as soon as I get home, will put it on paper again; –”

It is indeed not much that Mozart has to show here. “*My sonatas*”: these are the Mannheim-Paris Violine Sonaten KV 301–306 (293<sup>a-c</sup>, 300<sup>c</sup>, 293<sup>d</sup>, 300<sup>l</sup>) and the Piano Sonata in A minor KV 310 (300<sup>d</sup>).<sup>7</sup> As far as the flute compositions “*M<sup>r</sup>. de Jean*” are concerned, the story of the mistaken packing cases sounds all too much like an excuse and a cheap sweetening of the pill – not to mention that we know of only one work with certainty (the Flute Quartet KV 285) that it was written in 1778; all other datings to this year are more or less questionable or, in some cases, outright faulty hypotheses<sup>8</sup>. The “2 overtures”, as we know from the most recent investigations, were in fact only one newly composed symphony (namely the “Paris” KV 297/300<sup>a</sup>) and an earlier work he had brought with him from Salzburg;<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Neither the Piano Variations KV 265 (300<sup>e</sup>) and 353 (300<sup>f</sup>) nor the Capriccio KV 395 (300<sup>g</sup>) nor the Piano Sonatas KV 330–332 (300<sup>h-k</sup>) and 333 (315<sup>c</sup>) were written in Paris; information to this effect in the *Köchel-Verzeichnis* (6th edition, Wiesbaden, 1964 = KV<sup>6</sup>) is inaccurate. Cf. my remarks in the *Mozart-Jahrbuch* 1976/77, Kassel etc., 1978, p. 171.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Jaroslav Pohanka’s Foreword to NMA VIII/20/Section 2: *Quartets with one Wind Instrument*. To recapitulate briefly: KV 298 was not written in Paris in 1778, but in Vienna in 1786/87 (on this cf. also *Mozart-Jahrbuch* 1976/77, pp. 170f.), and KV Appendix 171 (285<sup>b</sup>) should rather be placed, on the basis of the only extant sketch, in the time of the *Abduction from the Seraglio*, i.e. Vienna, 1782. – On the other hand, it is only fair to point out that Mozart fails to mention the Concerto for Flute and Harp KV 299 (297<sup>c</sup>) in his compilation.

<sup>9</sup> On this see the recently published Neal Zaslaw, *Mozart’s Paris Symphonies*, in: *The Musical Times* CXIX (1978), pp. 753ff. – Contrary to the intention announced in his letter, Mozart brought, of the “2

there is some reason to suppose that Mozart had deliberately chosen a misleading formulation to deceive his father.<sup>10</sup> In view of this state of affairs, one will now no doubt have to ponder carefully everything that Mozart said in his letters on the subject of the Paris “*sinfonia concertante*”. Did a completed composition in manuscript actually exist, its performance not only frustrated by an intrigue, but in consequence not even written out in parts? How much substance is there in the term “*enemies*”, to whom Mozart refers generally? How painfully must Cambini really have been hurt or annoyed by Mozart, if the latter felt justified in suspecting the Italian of being behind the intrigue?<sup>11</sup> What should one think about the at least highly eccentric behaviour of the concert impresario Legros, who – according to Mozart – honored a composition (“*bought it off me*”), in whose performance he in fact had absolutely no interest? And can it be that the original manuscript then supposedly lay around useless in Legros’ keeping without even so much as an attempt being made in any of the following years to have it performed or published, and without any attempt on the part of Mozart, who remained in fairly

---

*overtures*”, at least the “Paris” Symphony KV 297 (300<sup>a</sup>) home with him in autograph, although it had been “bought off him” by Legros. From details of the autograph (paper etc.), incidentally, it can be ascertained with certainty that this must be Mozart’s original “Paris” manuscript and not, for example, as the passage in the letter might suggest, a second copy written out in Salzburg. (It is constantly necessary to point to the lack of precision in the content of Mozart’s letters.)

<sup>10</sup> At the end of his reader’s letter with the title *Mozart’s Truthfulness*, sent in response to the essay by Zaslav mentioned in footnote 9, Alan Tyson quite rightly affirms (*The Musical Times*, loc. cit., pp. 938f.) that “[...] *there is a lot of evidence that is hard to match with what Mozart says in his letters; his lack of veracity [sic] when writing to his father is still not sufficiently taken into account.*”

<sup>11</sup> Barry S. Brook has found an announcement in the *Journal de Paris* of 12 April 1778, according to which the performance of a Wind Concertante by Cambini in the *Concert spirituel* – N.B. for precisely these four wind soloists – was imminent. The idea that Cambini, under these circumstance, was afraid of the competition represented by Mozart in such chronological proximity and therefore exercised influence on Legros regarding the performance of Mozart’s Concertante can be allowed to remain open as an at least plausible explanation. Cf. Barry S. Brook, *The Symphonie concertante: An Interim Report*, in: *The Musical Quarterly* 47 (1961), p. 493.

continuous contact with Legros until 1783,<sup>12</sup> to get his manuscript back? This is in total so improbable, illogical and incoherent that Mozart’s account in this form simply cannot be accurate. A piece of the whole truth is missing here, or else wishful thinking and reality are being mixing together at will.

It is this piece, known only from the family correspondence, which is named by early Mozart scholarship, which Otto Jahn discusses in the first two editions of his Mozart biography<sup>13</sup> and which, as is consistent with all this, is listed in the first edition of the *Köchel-Verzeichnis* in Appendix I (= *Lost Compositions*) under No. 9.

2. *The problematic score in Jahn’s estate – State Library Berlin, Prussian Cultural Heritage (Music Department), signature: Mus. ms. 15399*

The 2nd edition of Jahn’s biography appeared in 1867; Jahn died on 9 September 1869. At some point during the short time between, he must have encountered the manuscript of a piece for concertante wind instruments, which he immediately gave to his copyist in Bonn either for copying or for writing out in score. In the auction catalogue of his musical estate,<sup>14</sup> at any rate, we find the following title under *W. A. Mozart / XXI Concertos* on p. 91: *2365 Concertante for oboe, clarinet, horn and bassoon [!] with orchestral accompaniment. Score copy 8° half cloth bound.*

The score copy was purchased by the former Royal Prussian Library in Berlin (Accession Number: 13205) and subsequently received the signature *Mus. ms. 15399*. The new discovery came just in time for the first Mozart complete edition (AMA), whose publication had already started, still to take notice of it. The reaction in the

---

<sup>12</sup> This can probably be concluded securely enough from Mozart’s letters to his father dated 17 August 1782 and 5 February 1783 (Bauer-Deutsch III, No. 686, p. 221, lines 45ff., and No. 725, p. 255, lines 44ff.). Zaslav (op. cit., p. 755) also pointed out these letter passages.

<sup>13</sup> The literature reference in KV<sup>6</sup>, p. 866, gives the misleading impression that it is the dubious work KV<sup>6</sup>: Appendix C 14.01 with which Jahn deals in the first two editions of his Mozart biography and not in fact the lost composition KV Appendix 9 (= KV<sup>6</sup>: 297B).

<sup>14</sup> *Otto Jahn’s musikalische Bibliothek und Musikalien-Sammlung*, Bonn, 1870 (auction in Bonn on 4 April 1870).



AMA can only be described as extremely cautious. The decision was made not to include it in the regular Series XII (*Concertos for one String or Wind Instrument and Orchestra*), but certainly not because of shortage of time (the bulk of this series did not appear until 1881). Instead, it was granted a place in the Supplement (Series XXIV: *Rediscovered, unauthenticated and [single] unfinished works*), where it appeared in 1886 as No. 7a under the fantasy title *Concertantes Quartett* and with the cautious declaration “probably identical with Köchel-Verzeichnis Appendix I, No. 9”. Unfortunately, it was not considered necessary to publish a discussion covering the identity problem, the question of the divergent instrumentation, the provenance of the source, etc. But even in the new edition of Jahn’s Mozart biography,<sup>15</sup> revised by Hermann Deiters, where one might most likely have expected critical reflection or at least information on the origins of Jahn’s source, the commentary remained in fact rather scanty: “The ‘Concertante Quartet’ for Oboe, Clarinet, Horn and Bassoon with small orchestra is a recent discovery and was published for the first time in the Complete Edition (p. XXIV, 7<sup>a</sup> cf. Köchel Appendix 9).” Deiters further remarks in a footnote:

“Mozart had sold the same to LeGros and received no copy; although he thought he still had it all fresh in his memory and could write it out again when he got back home (3 October 1778), he probably did not get round to this in Salzburg, particularly because the virtuosi who could have performed the work were not present there. Jahn, who still listed it as lost in his second edition, later succeeded in obtaining a copy of the score, now to be found in the Royal Library in Berlin; the same is, according to the practically unquestionable assumption of the Critical Report, precisely the work we are discussing here.”

It is clear that Deiters has nothing to say regarding the circumstances of the discovery, the provenance and characteristics of the source, obviously because Jahn did not leave notes of any kind (in his handwritten copy or elsewhere) on the subject<sup>16</sup>. It is all the less understandable that

Deiters does not make the slightest attempt to develop any arguments relating to the central question: for what reasons and under what circumstances can one assume that Jahn’s score copy transmits Mozart’s lost composition? On the contrary, he follows the “unquestionable assumption” of the AMA, in which arguments were likewise totally absent, and the whole matter is finally left floating in mid-air. Let us suppose that the music itself was felt to be such overwhelming evidence of Mozart’s authorship that the lack of a scientific justification for the attribution was simply overlooked. This most unsatisfactory situation was left unchanged with the appearance of the 2nd edition of the *Köchel-Verzeichnis* (1905); not even Hermann Abert seems to have felt anything needed to be done here, for his revision of the Jahn standard work (1923) is a long way from tackling the root of the problem.

### 3. Friedrich Blume’s edition (*Eulenburg*); Alfred Einstein (KV<sup>3</sup>)

A serious scientific discussion of the problem – or at least a significant sub-problem – of the *Sinfonia concertante* started, strictly speaking, only with the new edition of the work undertaken by Friedrich Blume (Hermann Abert’s pupil) in 1928 (*Eulenburg’s Pocket Score Edition No. 755*). Blume likewise assumes as a matter of course in his foreword that Jahn’s score copy was the supposedly lost Mozart composition – but only in its substance. From the varying instrumentations for the solo quartet, Blume concludes that Jahn’s version (for oboe, clarinet, horn, bassoon) could already represent a re-working of the original version (for flute, oboe, horn, bassoon), especially since it seemed that “the clarinet part [...] is treated in a thoroughly clarinet-like manner”. But who was responsible for this change? Mozart himself? Could he indeed have fulfilled “his intention to write out the work from memory, and at the same time have changed the instrumentation? It would have been strange, however, if Mozart had not taken this opportunity to change other parts of the concerto as well. But in stylistic terms nothing speaks against the stated

<sup>15</sup> 3/1889, vol. I, p. 532. – In the literature, the false information that Dieters first mentioned the newly-discovered work in his 4th edition (1905) persists stubbornly.

<sup>16</sup> I consider it not out of the question that a systematic examination of Jahn’s correspondence would reveal

one pointer or another concerning the source used for the Wind Concertante. My own efforts on this point, taking me to both public libraries and private owners (amongst them retired Ministry Adviser Adolf Michaelis, Bonn, to whom special thanks are due) have, however, not led to any concrete results.

*date* [i.e. 1778]”.<sup>17</sup> These are considerations which are taken up and developed profitably in the subsequent literature. More relevant, however, are the remarks Blume makes regarding Jahn’s score itself:

“If the copy is derived from an autograph or at least a source close to Mozart, it must nevertheless surely include extensive changes compared with the original. The dynamic marks are in many cases entirely un-Mozartian and betray the hand of a late Romantic musician. The same applies to the phrasing. The original (and, following it, the complete edition [i.e. the AMA]) contains countless accents, crescendo marks, dolce and other performance indications, capricious staccati and more of the like, which are quite foreign to Mozart’s style at this time, and are rare even later. These things are occasionally very interesting as a reflection of Romantic views of Mozart, but for an edition aiming at a critical reconstruction of the original [!] they are unusable.”

And Blume risks the editorial consequences:

“In the light of this situation, it is not possible to speak of a ‘revision’ of the work in the strict sense but rather – in the absence of a better source – a kind of reconstruction.”

It is remarkable how firmly he commits himself: in his view, the dynamic indications, the phrasing, and all kinds of performance marks are un-Mozartian; all these are suppressed in this “reconstructed” edition. Like a restorer in an art museum, Blume eases the later layers and retouchings away from the original, which he believes himself unquestioningly capable of discerning in its pristine form. Let us look here at a quotation from Blume in his later years: “[...] *in every detail of the composition* [...] – *Mozart’s hand is clearly recognizable*”<sup>18</sup>. Clearly Blume is very confident about his position.

When one reads Blume’s foreword today, it is difficult to understand why it took 50 years for scholarship to get as far as making a statement of this kind. Perhaps the situation would have been different if Otto Jahn had found time to form an

<sup>17</sup> Eulenburg’s Pocket Score Edition No. 755, Foreword, p. IV.

<sup>18</sup> Friedrich Blume, *The Concertos* (1), in: *The Mozart Companion*, edd. H. C. Robbins Landon and Donald Mitchell, London, 1956, p. 212.

opinion and express it. Perhaps that would have sufficed to prevent subsequent scholarship’s lapsing into the fatal sense of security that characterised its position. Be that as it may, Blume expressed what was felt at the time, and this formulation remained unchallenged for decades. It is therefore no surprise that even Alfred Einstein, no doubt the most authoritative figure in Mozart research in the twentieth century, practically went along with Blume’s view. In Einstein’s revision (3rd edition) of the *Köchel Verzeichnis* in 1937, the consequences of the preceding developments are drawn: the *Sinfonia concertante* – so named, and no longer under the old fantasy title *Concertantes Quartett*<sup>19</sup> – receives, from this point on, a place in the main text of the *Verzeichnis*, receives an appropriate number, is transformed from “KV Appendix I,9” into “KV 297<sup>b</sup>” and thus appears completely integrated into this list of works. And, in its essentials, Einstein’s footnote on the problems surrounding the work hardly goes beyond Blume:<sup>20</sup>

“[...] In the original instrumentation for flute, oboe, horn and bassoon, it is [sc. the *Sinfonia concertante*], we have absolutely no knowledge of it, and the present form can hardly go back to Mozart himself, although he speaks in his letter of 3 October 1778 of his intention to write out again the work he had sold to Le Gros. But he would scarcely have written out in Salzburg a work involving the clarinet; there he would have retained the original instrumentation for the work. Nor do we know who made the only copy, in Jahn’s estate, which was probably at the same time also the re-working. At that time, around 1865, the autograph was probably still extant and may yet turn up.”

What is said here about the source requires correction. As has already been indicated above,

<sup>19</sup> It is a complete anachronism – and shows ignorance of the elements of the source situation – when Uri Toeplitz expands, in his dissertation *Die Holzbläser in der Musik Mozarts und ihr Verhältnis zur Tonartwahl* (Baden-Baden, 1978 – *Collection d’études musicologiques / Sammlung musikwissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen*, vol. 62) on pp. 115ff. (121!), on the possible significance of the term “konzertantes Quartett”. Nevertheless, a perusal of this work is recommended because of the sometimes unorthodox and therefore fruitful angles of approach.

<sup>20</sup> KV<sup>3</sup>, p. 373, footnote to KV 297<sup>b</sup>.

the “*only copy, in Jahn’s estate*” was by a copyist who also worked regularly for Jahn anyway; the more pressing question is therefore from what kind of exemplar did the copyist work, from where did it come, and to where was it returned. In the light of this, one can at best say that this exemplar was “*at the same time also the re-working*”, as Einstein suspects. And the speculation that the autograph could then, around 1865, still have been extant is under these circumstances quite illegitimate. It is furthermore strangely difficult to follow the arguments presented by Einstein, although he will certainly have known what he wanted to say and how. If one reads him exactly, one is faced with the question of what is really meant by the “*present form*” which “*can hardly go back to Mozart himself*”. Is he speaking about the re-working of the solo instrumentation and about the “*late Romantic*” performance indications in the score, so precisely described by Blume? Does he mean this only, or does he ultimately mean, though without ever stating it consciously, more than this? It is quite appropriate to raise a warning finger at this point, for all those known to me who have defended the argumentation used by Blume and Einstein have indicated, in conversation at least, that they do of course mean more than this. If the discussion ever came to focus on some particular concrete detail, and if it was pointed out that this or that feature seems to be composed so very differently in other works than here in the *Sinfonia concertante*, the regular reply always drew attention to the re-working by a person unknown. This pinpoints a weakness in the debate over this *concertante* wind piece up till now: whoever wishes, as Blume and Einstein do, to differentiate between genuine Mozartian material and foreign reworking and/or mere alien additions must be able to demarcate clearly the one from the other on the object itself. This has not been done; nor has it been attempted. And it is perhaps not possible at all.

#### 4. *The Problem of Identity: the Debate around 1940–1960*

Is the *Sinfonia concertante* a Mozart composition? And – if so – is it identical with the work written in Paris in April 1778, even if in a clearly re-worked form? These two central questions seem always to have been inseparable, and any positive answers have always applied to both together. Can it make sense to answer the authenticity question

positively, but to deny the identity? It could at least offer one substantial advantage. If one does deny the identity, one is no longer obliged to accept to dogma of the re-working as a necessary consequence, and one is completely free of any pressure to speculate on whether the re-working was authentic or foreign. One could thus evade elegantly the uncomfortable implications of Einstein’s interpretation. The first to argue in this way was Wilhelm Altmann in a miscellany from the year 1943:<sup>21</sup>

“No-one [referring to Hermann Deiters, Ernst Lewicki, Georges de Saint-Foix and Hermann Abert] seems to have devoted any attention to the postulation that Mozart, during the re-working, assigned the original flute part to the oboe and made a clarinet part out of the original oboe part. Neither is the case. Nowhere does the oboe part show that it has taken over a flute part which once lay higher. The clarinet part cannot be a replacement for an earlier oboe part, since its range goes much lower and it displays its own uniquely characteristic accompaniment figures. The consequence is that this *concertante*, published in 1886 [in the AMA] is a completely different work from that composed in 1778 for the flautist Wendling and his associates, and which is still lost. The addition of the clarinet allows us to conclude that this *concertante* can be at the earliest from 1782, the point at which Mozart began to use this instrument.”

And, anticipating relevant objections, Altmann continues:

“It is not valid evidence against its authenticity to point out that Mozart does not note it in his handwritten composition catalogue, which he only kept from 1784 on, for undoubtedly authentic compositions are missing also missing from it; it is also possible that it dates from 1782 or 1783. Nor does the fact that it is not mentioned in Mozart’s letters, and that we know nothing about any performances during his lifetime, affect the question of its authenticity. Let us hope that the authenticity will finally be confirmed by the discovery of the autograph. In any case, this magnificent work, especially because it gives four wind instruments the opportunity to step forward

<sup>21</sup> *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 70/5 (5 March 1943), pp. 34–35.

in solo roles, deserves to be performed more often than it has been up till now.”

There is another, more substantial objection, which Altmann apparently does not see. One is seemingly expected to believe the original Concertante (Paris, 1778), of which we have knowledge, lost; but in its place there is supposedly another Concertante of unquestionable authenticity from the early Vienna years, of which we otherwise know nothing. Is this not extremely unlikely?

Altmann's hypothesis, as far as it was noticed at all, was taken very seriously. Referring to Altmann, Erich H. Mueller von Asow comments in his *Mozartiana* of 1955 (*Zur amerikanischen Ausgabe des Köchel-Verzeichnisses*)<sup>22</sup>: “KV. Appendix 9 (297b): – Remark: is probably not the Concertante mentioned by Mozart in his letters of 5 April and 9 July 1778.” And Friedrich Blume, in his 1956 contribution *Concerto* to the *Mozart Companion*,<sup>23</sup> devotes much reflection to the identity problem, owing much here to Altmann (who is not named). Blume likewise concludes from an examination of the solo parts that this cannot be a re-working (or, if it is, then a very radical one). For Blume, doubts regarding the identity also emerge. He joins those for whom it is clear that the use of the clarinet can mean neither Paris nor Salzburg, but indeed only Vienna. On the other side, however, the treatment of the orchestra does not approach at all that chamber music-like transparency of the concertos from the Vienna period, corresponding instead more to the style known from the concertos KV 299 (297<sup>c</sup>) and KV 365 (316<sup>a</sup>) of 1778/79. That the Paris “original version” could have been reworked by a foreign hand is for Blume an entirely improbable hypothesis, for “*there is not one bar in all the sinfonia which does not bear witness to Mozart's authorship*”. There is therefore only one other and – as Blume himself admits – similarly improbable hypothesis left: that Mozart, in his later years and in close co-operation with Anton Stadler, took out the older (Paris) composition again and re-worked it, but – as a re-working – did not enter it in the work catalogue. All these questions could only receive a final answer if Jahn's exemplar or else the autograph which Mozart sold to Legros were to show up.

<sup>22</sup> In: *Die Musikforschung* VIII (1955), p. 82.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. footnote 18.

It is strange how gruffly Blume fends off all questions leading to deeper levels, i.e. doubts directed towards the music itself, as if there was simply nothing there that could be doubted:

*“But though the origin of the work is still obscure, it would be entirely misguided to throw premature doubts on the authenticity of the version we have, since in every detail of the composition – if not in every detail of the variants – Mozart's hand is clearly recognizable.”*

This all goes contrary to Einstein's views, about which we have already spoken. – Once again (and in the “last word on the matter” style so typical for Blume), the matter was recapitulated in 1961 in the major Mozart article in MGG (vol. 9, col. 778):

*“From the transmission situation, questions arise as to whether Appendix 9 = 297b is the Mannheim [!] work at all or a later composition. Doubts on the authenticity would contradict the stylistic evidence; the work belongs to Mozart's most charming compositions between divertimento and concerto.”*

We now find ourselves confronted with three different interpretations. Einstein says that the work is the Paris composition, but in a later, re-worked form, and in this form not by Mozart. The protagonists of the “not identical” theory (Altmann, Mueller von Asow) say that the work is not the Paris composition, and so it cannot be case of re-working. And, finally, Blume says that the identity of the work is questionable; in any case, however, it is not a re-working. All three agree that the composition – whether in its substance or in its entirety – is by Mozart. But only one, namely Blume, clearly realises that an examination of his position leads to the aporia that the resulting contradictions cannot be resolved. A solution can be awaited only from the discovery of either the autograph itself or Jahn's exemplar.

Anyone who analyses the situation in which we now find ourselves will discover that the discussion of the problem of the Sinfonia concertante, despite Blume, has not reached its end. So far, all the possibilities have been considered – except one: that the work is not by Mozart. If one assumes its non-authenticity, there is no identity problem any more, and the question

of its being original or re-worked is irrelevant. On the other hand, one is left with the problem of how it could happen that a work not by Mozart can nevertheless sound so very much like Mozart. The task is to move the academic discussion back to the concrete object, to the music itself.

5. *The Problem of Authenticity: KV<sup>6</sup> Appendix C 14.01. The Debate since 1964*

In the 1920/30s, this wind Concertante did not yet enjoy anything like its later popularity. When Blume writes at the end of his foreword<sup>24</sup> that “*for the wind instruments the concerto is a most gratifying work which, unfortunately, performers today seldom approach*”, it is an adequate depiction of the general situation at that time. Twenty years later, the picture was so fundamentally transformed that from that point on the Concertante can be counted as one of the widely known and popular pieces. Played in concert, broadcast on the radio, available in numerous recordings, the work has come to represent the essence of Mozartian music for practising musicians and music lovers – and it will probably continue this way for some time to come. Public concert and musical life has so far not let itself be impressed in any way by the unexpected flaring up again of scholarly discussion on the authenticity of this Concertante.

What got the ball rolling was the publication of the 6th, revised edition of the *Köchel Verzeichnis* (Wiesbaden, 1964). The editing team responsible for this standard work of the Mozart literature (Franz Giegling of Zürich and Basel, Alexander Weinmann in Vienna, Gerd Sievers in Wiesbaden) took the decision to describe Mozart’s original composition in the main text of the “Köchel” as lost, under the new number “KV<sup>6</sup> 297<sup>B</sup> = Appendix 9”; the work handed down since Jahn’s day and listed by Einstein under the number “297<sup>b</sup>”, on the other hand, was summarily dismissed to the appendix: “Appendix C 14.01”. Regrettably, no grounds were proffered for this measure. (One might choose to speak of poetic justice, for, as may be remembered, the original inclusion of the piece was also enacted without explanation.) The fact that neither in the *Mozart-Jahrbuch* nor elsewhere was any subsequent essay in support of the decision published has reasons of its own. In all questions of authenticity concerning

Mozart, Ernst Hess had functioned as advisor to the editing team. It is to Hess, who was certainly the most brilliant and competent Mozart specialist of the 1950/60s, that we finally owe the decision regarding the Wind Concertante pieces.<sup>25</sup> In the last years of his life, occupied with a plan for a comprehensive investigation of questions of style and authenticity in Mozart, he had always hesitated to devote an advance statement to the special question of the Wind Concertante. Hess died on 2 November 1968 without being able to realise this plan. His death represents one of the gravest losses suffered by modern Mozart scholarship and by the New Mozart Edition in particular.

It is as a first, indirect and thoroughly cautiously formulated reaction to the slight on its authenticity in KV<sup>6</sup> that we should understand the short essay presented by Marius Flothuis in 1966.<sup>26</sup> Not the somewhat conservative tendency in his remarks but rather the kind of the argumentation used was to be characteristic of the new phase of discussion. From a comparison of the parallel measures 190–193 and 356–359 in the 1st movement (clarinet part) Flothuis concludes that here “[...] *what was originally a flute part has been converted into a clarinet part and in the process, for technical reasons, altered*”. He continues: “*Thus we have come a step nearer to the solution of the problem posed by this work. If we are in fact dealing here with a work originally composed for flute, oboe, bassoon and horn in a re-working for oboe, clarinet, bassoon and horn, the chances that it is connected with the concertante symphony by Mozart are increased. Furthermore, the re-working is so skilfully done that it could hardly be by anyone other than Mozart [...]*”. It will be objected that drawing conclusions about probability of the authenticity of the whole work on the basis of a minor technical detail is hardly convincing. And even if one accepts this hypothetical re-working as really proved, deductions about the authenticity do not follow automatically. The important point, however, is that Flothuis – who in the final analysis is simply

<sup>25</sup> I can remember vividly my first reaction of incredulity and shock when Hess started, in a conversation in 1962, to outline to me his reservations regarding the authenticity of the Wind Concertantes.

<sup>26</sup> Marius Flothuis, *Mozarts Konzertante Symphonie für vier Bläser*, in: *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Stiftung Mozarteum Salzburg*, 14th year (1966), double issue 3/4, pp. 18–19.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. footnote 17.

aiming to defend the line taken by Einstein and Blume – took the trouble to compare minutiae and in this way came across inconsistencies that no-one had previously noticed. On this path, which he was the first to take, he was of course later overtaken by a number of later scholars.

The increasingly urgent calls after the death of Ernst Hess for substantiation or refutation of the doubts regarding its authenticity led the Central Institute for Mozart Research at the International Mozart Foundation in Salzburg to devote part of the Salzburg conference in 1971 to this topic. An incontestable achievement was Martin Staehelin's summarising, in a fundamental paper at this event, the central arguments to date against the authenticity of the Concertante.<sup>27</sup> It was surprising that Staehelin initially made his presentation of the evidence more complicated by demonstrating that not only the clarinet part (as Flothuis had already shown) but also the solo oboe displayed unmistakable traces of re-working. At the same time, he disputed, quite correctly, that this observation had any relevance to conclusions about the authenticity of the work in question, "[...] for the simple reason that concertante symphonies for the instrumentation chosen by Mozart for the solo parts [i.e. flute, oboe, horn and bassoon] were composed by other composers as well. So if [...], as I think, we are dealing with an arrangement, this must not necessarily be derived from a work by Mozart, but could without any difficulty be based on a work by some other composer. The observations presented here are therefore not capable of resolving definitively the question of authenticity [...]"<sup>28</sup> Directing his attention to the music itself, Staehelin first of all did not deny in any way that many a turn of phrase in the composition shows traces of a thoroughly "Mozartian spirit"; yet there are other observations that support a different conclusion, "decidedly against authenticity". Here he selected five points:

a. The persistence in the one key of E<sup>b</sup> major in the three movement sequence fast-slow-fast is highly improbable for Mozart.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Martin Staehelin, *Zur Echtheitsproblematik der Mozartschen Bläserkonzertante*, in: *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1971/72* (Salzburg, 1973), pp. 56ff.

<sup>28</sup> Staehelin, op. cit., pp. 58–59.

<sup>29</sup> On the other hand, a dwelling on a single key can be observed with some frequency in concertantes by composers such as e.g. Ignaz Pleyel (cf. Rita Benton,

b. With its continual reappearances, the effect is of a "somewhat cheap, fanfare-like refrain" at the end of each solo variation in the last movement.<sup>30</sup>

c. In the development section of the 1st movement, the long oboe solo (mm. 280ff.) enters without any sensible relationship to the context and disturbs noticeably the equality of the roles in the total picture of the piece.

d. Certain "rather cheap" traits (perhaps better expressed as un-Mozartian coarseness), of which the measures 259–261 in the 3rd movement (semitone step B<sup>b</sup>-C<sup>bb</sup> back-and-fore in the bass against the dominant seventh chord) could be particularly mentioned; "the effect of the whole is, for Mozart, ultimately rather banal."

e. As "the most substantial argument against Mozart's authorship", however, Staehelin mentions "the strange, often note-for-note repeats of single longer and shorter phrases and melodic figures [...]; in the course of the piece, this can be observed in such close succession that one cannot help asking why one had not noticed it before." As only two examples amongst many, measures 377–391 of the first and measures 38–54 of the second movement (three repeated passages in each case) are specified.<sup>31</sup>

At the same conference in Salzburg in 1971, Kurt Birsak pointed, in a printed contribution to the discussion,<sup>32</sup> to a number of more or less obvious analogies between the dubious Wind Concertante and Mozart's Sinfonia concertante for Violin and

---

Ignace Pleyel. *A Thematic Catalogue of his Compositions*, New York [1977], pp. 11ff., Nos. 111, 112, 115).

<sup>30</sup> In terms of form, as Daniel Hertz remarked in an oral contribution to the discussion, this represents an instrumental version of the Vaudeville.

<sup>31</sup> All quotations from Staehelin, op. cit., pp. 60–61. – This is the point at which subsequent investigations should have continued; the biggest task would be to show what the decisive difference is between the repeats condemned by Staehelin and the well-known so-called Mozartian "Redikte" ["restatements"] (which – as one could object regarding Staehelin – are not exclusively composed following the principle of 'inner variation' at all: cf. e.g. the 1st movement of the Paris Symphony KV 297/300!).

<sup>32</sup> Kurt Birsak, *Zur konzertanten Sinfonie KV 297b/Appendix C 14.01*, in: *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1971/72* (Salzburg, 1973), pp. 63ff.

Viola KV 364 (320<sup>d</sup>) with the intention of substantiating the authenticity of the wind composition. Now, a direct comparison of the two Concertantes is indeed revealing: it then becomes apparent that the string Concertante is so infinitely better composed that even the idea that the same composer could have been at work in both seems almost absurd. Although analogies or congruencies may well be observable, they could simply mean, as far as they are of significance at all, that the dubious work was at least partially worked out on the model or example of the genuine work – a piece of evidence, therefore, that backfired. At the Mozart Festival Conference, held by the American Musicological Society in co-operation with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington (D.C.) on 24/25 May 1974, the difficult case of the Wind Concertante occupied an important place on the agenda. But, as no adequately detailed report on this conference has been presented (not to mention minutes of proceedings), it is fruitless to dwell on it. Yet one important paper from that conference was printed later, the essay by Daniel N. Leeson and Robert D. Levin *On the Authenticity of K. Anh. C 14.01 (297b), a Symphonia Concertante for Four Winds and Orchestra*<sup>33</sup>. The two authors, who make no secret of their aversion to any kind of stylistic criticism, concluded on the basis of their own specially developed method for statistical-structural analysis (statistical-structural methodology) that

- a. the solo parts of the work transmitted as KV Appendix C 14.01 are directly related to those in the lost work KV Appendix I,9 (KV<sup>6</sup>: 297B), i.e. are identical in terms of substance;
- b. the re-instrumentation of the solo parts some years after 1778, however, was probably at the instigation of one of the original soloists;
- c. the version of the work which has become known as KV<sup>6</sup>: Appendix C 14.01 (or KV<sup>3</sup> 297<sup>b</sup>) represents a reconstruction, arranged by a person unknown and necessitated by the re-worked solo parts;
- d. the arranger did not draw strictly note-for-note on the solo parts, which provided the basis for his

orchestration work, but rather used them with some freedom.<sup>34</sup>

Reduced to a short formulation: the solo parts are authentic Mozart, the orchestral parts are not. Drawing the consequences of these conclusions, Robert D. Levin presented his own reconstruction of the work, performed for the first time at the end of 1974 for a private circle.<sup>35</sup>

At the moment, the most recent statement on the problem of the Wind Concertante is in a dissertation by Uri Toeplitz on *Die Holzbläser in der Musik Mozarts und ihr Verhältnis zur Tonartwahl*<sup>36</sup> [*The Wind Instruments in Mozart's Music and their Relationship to the Choice of Key*]. The chapter dedicated to the Concertante<sup>37</sup> contains a whole host of original and thoroughly accurate individual observations, but on the whole has a rather aphoristic character and cannot contribute anything essential to the debate.

## 6. Summary and Criticism

The situation arising from recent literature can be roughly summarised as follows:

- a. In contrast to earlier stages in the discussion, there are today none who support unreservedly the full authenticity of the work. All parties are can obviously agree on a basic and minimal statement that the Wind Concertante KV<sup>6</sup>: Appendix C 14.01, as it has come down to us, does not originate from Mozart.
- b. Strangely enough, there are two further points on which unanimity prevails, namely that the work, authentic or not, is not transmitted in its original form and must rather be spoken of as an arrangement.
- c. At last, one can rely on agreement that the orchestral writing is not Mozart's. Leeson and Levin maintain this expressly, and Staehelin (who considers all of it non-authentic anyway) will not contradict them.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. the Summary and Conclusion, op. cit., pp. 78–79.

<sup>35</sup> As far as can be ascertained, it has not appeared in print.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. footnote 19.

<sup>37</sup> “*Sinfonia concertante*” oder “*Konzertantes Quartett*”?, op. cit., pp. 115–123.

<sup>33</sup> *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1976/77* (Kassel etc., 1978), pp. 70–96.

d. As far as the identity problem is concerned, there is – since the protagonists of the non-authentic party have no interest in this question – only one view, namely that the work is in its substance the Paris composition of 1778. (I have the impression, however, that the literature reflects only imperfectly the real multiplicity of opinions. In conversation, it is not unusual to hear doubts regarding such an early date of composition. Personally, I consider this question valuable, because it introduces into the further discussion the aspect of stylistic chronology, a point which has received no attention to date, and because this doubt is articulated mainly in circles of practising musicians and amongst music-lovers with a highly developed sense of taste.)

The real point of dissension lies in the differing interpretations offered by the two parties regarding a factual matter about which both speak very similarly. Supporters whether of the authenticity or non-authenticity party distinguish Mozartian and non-Mozartian material in the Wind Concertante. The one side (Leeson and Levin) draws a horizontal line, so to speak, and say that the wind parts are original Mozart, while the orchestral writing is a later addition in a foreign hand. The other side (Staehelin and others) says that the whole thing is a foreign construction, even if some Mozart-like passages and phrases (Mozartisms) are noticeable.

Now, enticing as it may initially appear, the position of Leeson and Levin deserves to be treated with some scepticism. The statistical-structural methodology proposed by both authors for a comparative analysis (see above) is only applied to the the first movement of the Concertante. After detailed study of the richly filled statistical tables, even the most well-inclined of readers will ask how a corresponding application of this method *mutatis mutandis* to the other movements should work as well. If, then, the method can no longer function here for immanent reasons, what value does it have for the work as a whole? And does it really require – staying with the 1st movement – an extensive set of statistics to show credibly how completely un-Mozartian (not to say meaningless) the double run-in to the solo exposition (mm. 88 and 119), and with it the resulting formal disproportion in the movement, appears? On the other hand, I do not see how statistical-structural methodology could in any

way prove, or even suggest the probability of, the authenticity of the solo wind instrument writing.

What does one make of the harmonic structure of the development section, which continually strives in such a strangely monotonous way to lead to the parallel key of C minor? Or of the vexatious oboe solo in mm. 280ff., to which Staehelin has already drawn attention? Is it ultimately to be seen as a foreign interpolation? I admit frankly that I cannot see a fundamental difference in quality between the solo and orchestral writing. Unevennesses are to be found in both. In short, Leeson and Levin can hardly maintain their position against the evidence which has now been presented.

In the end, only the view represented by Staehelin is left standing. None of his arguments has yet been refuted, and I consider them ultimately irrefutable. There is still scope for extending his observations in one direction or another. It seems to me that the question of historical placing is of primary importance, or, put another way, the question of establishing a chronological order in the musical language encountered in the Wind Concertante. If one makes Mozart one's starting point, one would conclude that the language of this work is completely different to what one would expect for Paris in 1778; it is more mature and in any case "*later*". Endings with such a direct appeal to the emotions as in the 2nd movement (mm. 46ff. and 114ff.) are first known in Mozart in the mature Vienna years, and then only in the chamber music (I am thinking of the slow movements of KV 465 and KV 581); these would be quite inconceivable in 1778. Once one has seen this, however, one will perceive the occasionally strongly noticeably proximity to Beethoven ("Gassenhauer" ["popular street melodies"] tones in the style of op. 11 in the solo cadenza of the 1st movement; the refrain of the final variations movement recalls the Eroica Variations) as an additional clue. This is no longer Mozart's language, but that of a later period. Certain banal and coarse features then appear to go hand-in-hand with this (Staehelin has already pointed some of these out), of a kind one would otherwise seek in vain in Mozart. If, on the other hand, there are passages which sound unmistakably "*like Mozart*", these are in fact mostly conscious imitations confined to a certain kind of theme. Here one can mention the well-known triadic fanfare in E<sup>b</sup> major at the beginning of the 1st movement, but also, and especially, the



magnificent subsidiary theme of the variable type as encountered not seldom in both Mozart (for example as the second subject in the Wind Divertimento KV 439<sup>b</sup> No. 1 or at the beginning of the *Hostias* in the Requiem KV 626) and in other masters (Joseph Haydn's Piano Variations in E<sup>b</sup> Hob. XVII: 3 or in the theme of the final movement of Dittersdorf's String Quartet No. 5 in E<sup>b</sup> major). If one compares all these different manifestations of one thematic type, one must pause in examining the Concertante to ask whether such a thematic appendage (mm. 171–174 and parallels) is witty or instead perhaps simply in bad taste. Behind even the best passages in the movement, banality is lying in wait.

These few remarks should suffice to demonstrate why I join Martin Staehelin in declaring the Wind Concertante to be a profoundly dubious work. Much as I hope, incidentally, that this view will gradually prevail in the course of time, it would nevertheless be regrettable if the Concertante were consequently no longer to be played. It is beautiful, even if perhaps not first class music, and this should be borne in mind independently of the question of whether Mozart or someone else is the composer. But for precisely this reason it is foreseeable that the authenticity debate will go on until such time as the true composer can be presented with incontestable evidence.<sup>38</sup> Until that day, however, the question of authenticity has to be considered as undecided, the work itself as dubious. A subjective conviction, even if it is the editor's, is no substitute for proof.

### 7. Concerning the present New Edition

The perhaps somewhat bulky and extended overview of the literature will at least have made the point that, in discussing the work to be edited here, it is not possible to speak of a generally accepted and uncontested authenticity, and that, on the contrary, there are many reasons for instead regarding the authenticity as improbable. Whether one is inclined towards the position of KV<sup>6</sup> (i.e. that of Hess and Staehelin) or that of Leeson and Levin (and thus ultimately that of Einstein) – I personally belong decidedly to the first party – one

<sup>38</sup> Martin Staehelin (Bonn) permits me to communicate that he is busy with a further study of the Concertante KV<sup>6</sup>: Anh. C 14.01, in which it seems possible that he may discover some new source material. I owe particular thanks to Prof. Staehelin for the co-operation he has shown as a colleague on so many occasions.

is generally forced to admit that, in view of the problems and state of the debate outlined here, it is out of the question to include the work in Series V (*Concertos*) of the NMA. A further justification for its inclusion in the present volume is therefore deemed unnecessary.

The text in the source available to us – as already mentioned several times, that in the State Library Berlin – Prussian Cultural Heritage (Music Department) – is flawed, inconsistent (especially as far as articulation is concerned) and overloaded with dynamics. Obvious errors have of course been corrected, if necessary with an explanation of the decision in a footnote. Inconsistencies in the course of the text, particularly in parallel passages, could be largely cleared up by assimilation etc. Furthermore, the *Kritischer Bericht* [*Critical Commentary*, available in German only] contains more detailed information. Finally, the overloading with dynamics could and should not be simply passed over: it is a central feature of the source, and the view that indications in this quantity are simply a “late Romantic addition” can be refuted with a simple reference to the fact that such an accumulation of accent marks, *crescendo* and *decrescendo* hairpins *dolce* directions was already to be seen in both French and German printed music (particularly wind music) around 1800. To be sure, such a heaping of dynamics is “un-Mozartian”, but the present edition – this is the ideological difference compared with the earlier edition by Friedrich Blume – is not based on the premise that it is presenting a genuine Mozart composition. There was therefore nothing to be touched up, nothing to be “restored” or “wiped away” or made more probable in the sense of Mozart. Even such a musically logical improvement as Blume's conjecture regarding m. 25 in the solo oboe in the second movement – which we make available as an *ossia* – is only sensible on Blume's premise of *sub specie* Mozart; on the premises applying in the present volume, this change would be unnecessary.

For an interpretation of the directions SOLO and TUTTI printed in majuscules above the staff systems, we refer the reader to Christoph-Hellmut Mahling's remarks in the Foreword to the Violin Concerto in D (p. XIII below).

The distinction between (long) *crescendo* hairpins over long notes or over a series of notes and

(short) accent marks above individual notes represents, when one considers the exceptionally imprecise notation in the original, a problem of its own, and cannot be resolved without subjective interpretation. The *Kritischer Bericht* gives details of this. While editorially-supplied “hairpins” of the normal kind are rendered in dotted lines, another method of distinction had to be chosen on typographical grounds for the short accent signs: supplied marks of this kind are therefore set in smaller print.

Thus the problematical Wind Concertante KV<sup>6</sup> Appendix C 14.01, with all its undeniable beauty, but also with all its equally debatable inconsistencies, clumsiness and lack of proportion is now presented anew – this time with the character of a dubious work from the periphery of the Mozart transmission. Until such time as the authorship is finally clarified, this is certainly not an inappropriate designation.

Wolfgang Plath

Augsburg and Kassel, June, 1980

### Violin Concerto in D

The discussion surrounding the authenticity of the Violin Concerto in D major KV<sup>2</sup> 271<sup>a</sup> (271<sup>i</sup>) has not fallen silent since it was edited for the first time in 1907 by Albert Kopfermann. Scepticism and rejection<sup>39</sup> on the one side, firm conviction about the authenticity of the work<sup>40</sup> on the other – these characterise the extreme positions. Finally, an intermediate view, that Mozart had indeed created the “framework” and the “core” of the work but that it had received its final appearance from a foreign hand, was added.<sup>41</sup> Since this version gained increasing favour in the course of time, the problem became less that of Mozart’s authorship at all but rather that of the extent of his

<sup>39</sup> Particularly, after the first performances, from, amongst others, Xaver Scharwenka, Karel Halíř, Gustav Hollaender, Henri Marteau, Andreas Moser, T. Witschern, Rudolf Gerber and Marius Flothuis.

<sup>40</sup> As with Albert Kopfermann, Ernst Lewicki, Ludwig Schiedermayr, George Enescu *et al.*

<sup>41</sup> This view is supported by A. Gois, Alexander Eisenmann, Hermann Abert, F. O. Souper and Alfred Einstein, amongst others. Théodore de Wyzewa – Georges de Saint-Foix, *W.-A. Mozart*, Vol. II, Paris 1936, S. 376, while they do not doubt the authenticity, believe there was a later re-working by Mozart himself.

contribution to this work. At the beginning of the 1960s, Ernst Hess, probably one of the most capable experts as far as Mozart’s “writing style” was concerned, raised however renewed and substantial doubts regarding the authenticity of this concerto. Since the concerto bears the date “16 July 1777” in the Paris copy, Carl Bär and Dimitrij Kolbin arrived, independently of each other, at the conclusion that the Concerto in D major is identical with the one Mozart probably wrote for the violinist Franz Xaver Kolb and which was apparently performed in Salzburg in July 1777 on the occasion of his sister’s name-day on 26 July 1777.<sup>42</sup> While Kolbin remains firmly convinced of the authenticity of the concerto and attempts to support this view with numerous examples,<sup>43</sup> Bär sounds substantially more cautious in this regard: “*It cannot have come down in its present form from Mozart. How, when and by whom the distorting changes were made to the autograph score can at the moment not be ascertained.*”<sup>44</sup>

The D major Violin Concerto has been transmitted in two copies which apparently originated independently of each other: 1. as a score copy from the Aloys Fuchs Collection (today State Library Berlin – Prussian Cultural Heritage (Music Department), signatur: *Mus. ms. 15419*) and 2. as a set of parts copies in Paris (privately owned). While the latter was supposedly made from the autograph by Eugène Sauzay in 1837 for his teacher and father-in-law Pierre Marie François Baillot – the autograph said to have been in the possession of François Antoine Habeneck – it has remained unclear to the present day from what exemplar Fuchs made his copy. Whether this copy likewise dates from 1837, as an incipit marked 24 May 1837 and entered on f. 24<sup>v</sup> of the Fuchs Catalogue of the State Library Berlin (signature: *Kat. ms. 694*) suggests, cannot be

<sup>42</sup> Carl Bär, *Betrachtungen zum umstrittenen Violinkonzert 271<sup>a</sup>*, in: *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Stiftung Mozarteum*, 11th year, Issue 3/4, Salzburg, 1963, and Dimitrij Kolbin, *Zur Frage der Echtheit des Violinkonzertes D-dur von W. A. Mozart (KV 271a-i)*, in: *Musykalnoje ispolnitelstwo*, No. 7, Moscow, 1972.

<sup>43</sup> In this context, Kolbin also discusses the publications to date on this topic and evaluates them critically.

<sup>44</sup> Bär, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

stated with certainty.<sup>45</sup> According to information provided by Richard Schaal, the handwriting in the copy suggests with a high degree of probability “during Fuchs’ main productive period, around 1825 to 1845”.<sup>46</sup> Since the exemplar from which Fuchs worked was certainly not the autograph but only a copy of the score or parts, and as Fuchs probably did not even know the precise provenance of the copy, he exercised caution regarding the question of authenticity. He noted in his catalogue: “*Violin Concerto – with orchestra, which is said to be known in Salzburg as an autograph score? The authenticity is at the moment yet to be ascertained.*” Where Fuchs got his information from is completely unclear, but it could have come from Johann Anton André.<sup>47</sup> It is striking that the score copy differs in its layout both from Mozart’s autograph scores and from Fuchs’ other copies: the solo violin part is notated not in the top staff, but in the lowest staff of the staff-system.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>45</sup> On this, Wolfgang Plath remarks in a letter of 4 May 1976 to the present editor that “*The motley array of paginations, foliations and numerus currens [...] seems rather to suggest separate pages of notes compiled at a later date. From this point of view, the date 1837 in the title attached to the incipit entered for KV 271<sup>i</sup> does not necessarily mean anything.*”

<sup>46</sup> Richard Schaal’s letter of 16 April 1976 to the present editor.

<sup>47</sup> A supposition of this kind is reasonable, since the entry is found in the *Thematisches Verzeichnis von einigen älteren Compositionen W. A. Mozarts aus der Periode von den Jahren 1760–1784 und von welchen Herr Hofrath André in Offenbach die Original-Manuskripte Mozarts besitzt* [Thematic catalogue of some earlier compositions by W.A. Mozart from the period of the years 1760–1784 and the Mozart’s original manuscripts of which are owned by Court Counsellor André in Offenbach]. In this context, it should also be pointed out that in the “Notebook” kept by Aloys Fuchs “concerning all letters written by him in the time from 1820–1853”, of a total of four thousand letters, only three were addressed to Johann Anton André, and these deal with other matters (information supplied to Wolfgang Plath by Richard Schaal on 28 May 1979). This in turn seems to suggest that Fuchs had received relevant information during personal contacts with André, probably during the latter’s numerous visits to Vienna (letter of 19 June 1979 from Wolfgang Plath).

<sup>48</sup> Rudolf Gerber, in the introduction to the edition of the concerto for which he was responsible, Eulenburg Pocket Score Edition No. 766 (1934), p. IV, therefore supposes that this copy was made “by a non-musician”.

The Paris copy of the Violin Concerto in D major is not a score but a set of parts copies.<sup>49</sup> This was rediscovered by the present editor in spring 1976, thanks to the great obligingness of Daniel Lainé, grandson of Eugène Sauzays, amongst the sheet music left by Julien Sauzay. The set of parts consists of the principal part, one each of Violin I, Violin II, Viola and Violoncello/Bass as well as a Violoncello/Bass part obviously added later. The wind parts – two oboes, two horns – are not included with this material as single parts. They had been transcribed for the piano, a practice normal in France, faithfully and note-for-note – a comparison with the wind parts in the Berlin score copy confirms this. In the present case, this must have been done either directly from the autograph score or else from copied parts which had been handed over to the “arranger” and are therefore no longer to be found amongst the present material. As a possible “arranger” one could propose Alexandre Pierre François Boëly (1785–1858), who was close to the circle around Sauzay/Baillet and who had already transcribed the wind parts for a large part of Mozart’s piano concertos for the piano.<sup>50</sup> The Paris material shows clear signs of use, with the condition of the solo violin part in particular giving some idea of how intensively it has been worked on. We should therefore confidently conclude that this was the performance material used, for example, in the “house concerts” mentioned by Eugène Sauzay in his memoirs.<sup>51</sup> Sauzay, or even Baillet himself,

<sup>49</sup> On this cf. Wyzewa–Saint-Foix, *W.-A. Mozart*, Vol. II, op. cit., p. 375. Here we read that “*La partition du concerto nous est connue par deux copies anciennes, dont l’une, faite par le violoniste français Baillet, porte la même date [...] tandis que l’autre copie a été retrouvée à Berlin parmi les papiers de l’infatigable collectionneur allemand Aloys Fuchs.*” [“The score of the concerto is known to us via two copies, of which one, made by the French violinist Baillet, bears the same date [...] while the other copy was found in Berlin amongst the papers of the indefatigable German collector Aloys Fuchs.”]

<sup>50</sup> A “collected volume” with observations of this kind, the majority by Boëly and visibly distinguished as such, were also found in the estate of Julien Sauzay. See on this also Félix Raugel, *Autour de Sauzay, de Boëly et de Reber*, in: *Recherches sur la Musique française classique XV/1975*, Paris, 1975, pp. 147/148.

<sup>51</sup> On this cf. Brigitte François-Sappey, *La vie musicale à Paris à travers les Mémoires d’Eugène Sauzay (1809–1901)*, in: *Revue de Musicologie*, Tom. LX (1974), No. 1–2. There we read e.g. on p. 179: “*Nous*

may have taken the solo part on these occasions. It accords with this that, on a leaf glued onto the inside of the cover of the solo violin part and on another piece of manuscript paper pasted in at the end of the part, two extensive cadenzas for the first movement, which may be the work of Baillot, are notated. A further cadenza, likewise glued into the part, is for the second movement and could have been written by Julien Sauzay. On the back of this glued-in leaf there is the draft of the first cadence for the first movement, notated on the next page. In the solo part itself numerous marks have been made in pencil, principally applying to bowings, dynamics and fingerings, but also including a sketch for a “bridge passage” from the 2nd to the 3rd movement. The majority seem to have been made by Baillot.

On the last page of the copied part, Baillot noted: “*Concerto pour le Violon, Composé par Wolfgang Amadée Mozart, de Salsbourg, le 16 de Juillet 1777. Copié par Eugène Sauzay sur la Partition manuscrite de l’auteur appartenant à Mr. Habeneck ainè 1837./B*” [“*Concerto for the Violin, composed by Wolfgang Amadée Mozart, of Salzburg, 16 July 1777. Copied by Eugène Sauzay from the composer’s manuscript score belonging to Mr. Habeneck the elder 1837./B*”] (cf. facsimile p. XXVI). Alexander Eisenmann<sup>52</sup> reported in his essay that Julien Sauzay had “*sent a copy of the title and the first measure to Breitkopf and Härtel [...] which show Mozart’s own handwriting from a tracing made by Mr. Sauzay the elder (or by Baillot?)*” and printed a facsimile of this copy. It is precisely this “slip of paper” that is now to be found glued to the inside of the cover of the principal part (cf. facsimile p. XXVI). Comparison with the handwritings of Eugène Sauzay and Baillot and with the handwriting of the cadenza written immediately

---

*occupions, rue du Faubourg Montmartre, un petit appartement [...] Si le décor laissait à désirer, comme la musique nous charmait, nous et nos auditeurs, aussi jeunes que nous, lorsque ma femme et moi, Boëly et Baillot sans oublier Norblin, nous faisons revivre les concertos de Mozart.*” [“*We occupied, in the rue du Faubourg Montmartre, a little apartment [...] If the decor left something to be desired, how the music charmed us, us and our audience, who were as young as we were, when my wife and I, Boëly and Baillot, not to forget Norblin, revived the concertos by Mozart.*”]

<sup>52</sup> Alexander Eisenmann, *Mozarts VII. Violinkonzert. Für oder Wider?*, in: *Neue Musik-Zeitung*, Year XXIX, No. 7, Stuttgart–Leipzig, 1908, p. 145 and 146.

above the “slip of paper” makes it clear that this “copy” was probably made not by Sauzay, but by Baillot.

The score copy made by Fuchs and the parts copies are essentially in agreement. Small divergences can be seen as “improvements” or else as copying errors. The two most fundamental differences were already clear to Georges de Saint-Foix in his comparison of both sets of material, and Ernst Lewicki wrote on this in the *Mitteilungen für die Mozartgemeinde in Berlin 1920* (cf. p.3 there). The score copy by Fuchs contains cadenzas for the individual movements – but a short time later Albert Kopfermann described them as “*not Mozartian*”<sup>53</sup>; furthermore, the 3rd movement there is 37 measures longer. The Paris material shows after measure 496 a shorter ending amounting to only seven measures. As evidence that this abridgement may have been by Mozart himself, Mozart’s letter 11 September 1778 to his father is often quoted, where the comments include: “*as far as the symphonies are concerned, most of them are not according to the taste here; if I have time, I will yet arrange all the violin concertos – making them shorter – for with us in Germany we have the long taste; but in fact short and good is better [...]*”<sup>54</sup> In the light of this, the Fuchs copy must represent the “original version” of the concerto, especially since it otherwise hardly differs from the Paris copy. Only in the 2nd movement, Andante, is there one further striking difference, in the solo violin: the notes written two octaves above middle c in den measures 60/ 61 and 64/65 in the Berlin copy (a–c–b and b<sup>b</sup>–g–a respectively) are notated one octave above middle c in the Paris copy. This difference is noted – along with other divergences – on a piece of music paper in the Paris material, probably in Eugène Sauzay’s hand: “*Passages du C°. de Mozart en ré écrite trop élevés*”. [“*Passages in the Mozart concerto in D written too high*”.] The author of this “note” must apparently have known also the “original version” (or the Fuchs copy?). In the text of this edition, both versions appear with equal validity next to each other.

---

<sup>53</sup> *Mitteilungen für die Mozartgemeinde in Berlin*, 3rd Series, Issue 2 (Nov. 1907), pp. 53ff. – On this cf. e.g. also Mozart’s cadenzas for the Sinfonia concertante KV 364 (NMA V/14/2).

<sup>54</sup> Bauer–Deutsch II, No. 487, p. 476, lines 141ff.

The present edition largely follows the text of the Berlin copy; i.e. considers this as its main source. Assimilation by analogy has been carried out tacitly, and differences between the two copies, Berlin and Paris, listed in the “Lesartenverzeichnis” [List of Readings] in the *Kritischer Bericht* [Critical Report, available in German only]. The cadenzas of both the Berlin and Paris copies are rendered in the Appendix, as are the bridge passage to the 3rd movement (measure 187) from the Berlin copy and the altered, or shortened, ending of the 3rd movement in the Paris copy. The relegation of the cadenzas to the Appendix seemed justified because those in the Paris material were clearly attached at a later date and represent, in terms of quality and form, typical examples of virtuoso “everyday production” in the 19th century, and also because those in the Berlin material cannot stand comparison with extant autograph Mozart cadenzas. If one does indeed make such a comparison, it becomes clear that Mozart stays much closer to the thematic material and “re-works” this in a suitably artistic manner, i.e. is not prepared to settle for empty playful figures or rhythmic filling-out of octave intervals. The bridge passage to the 3rd movement comes nearest to Mozartian procedures. In the cadenza for the 1st movement in the Berlin score copy (Appendix II/1/a), the notes in the third line must probably be read an octave higher, since an unprepared position change would be at least very unusual (for which reason  $\delta^{va}$  has been supplied).

Contrary to the procedure encountered in the sources, phrasing marks are only placed over triplets when they are obviously intended as directions for articulation. The indications TUTTI and SOLO printed in majuscules above the staff-system are also found in the sources and, in keeping with the performance practice of Mozart’s day, are to be understood at the same time as general directions regarding instrumental forces. SOLO thus calls for a reduction in the the orchestral forces at the point when a solo section begins, e.g. by employing only the front desks in the strings. The entry of the solo instrument in Violin Concerto KV 271<sup>i</sup> is indicated additionally, however, by the “Solo” printed above the corresponding staff. The reason why this is necessary is that it was usual for the solo instrument to join in the orchestral *tutti* sections, stepping out into greater prominence in the solo sections only as a “primus inter pares”. This role

is indicated in our sources by the remark “col Violino primo”, usually written beside the staff or part for the solo instrument, at the end of a solo section. That the *Violino principale* also plays in all *tutti* sections, even where this is not expressly demanded in the score or part, should therefore not only be seen as a historical fact, but should also be put into practice in today’s performances.

Amongst the “unevennesses” in this Violin Concerto which give cause to doubt Mozart’s authorship are – besides such things as the “pizzicato episodes” in the 2nd movement – for example the “insertion” in the 1st movement (measures 146/147) compared to the parallel passage (measure 68); although this is present in both sources, it is fundamentally superfluous and can hardly be justified, even under the aspect of “*variatio*”.<sup>55</sup>

\*

The editor owes sincere thanks to the State Library Berlin – Prussian Cultural Heritage (Music Department) and to Daniel Lainé, Paris, for making source material available, to Professors Dr. Marius Flothuis, Amsterdam, and Karl Heinz Füssl, Vienna, for their help with the proof-reading, and also to the Editorial Board of the *New Mozart Edition* for their customary support in word and deed. We can only hope that the numerous questions<sup>56</sup> still open regarding the D major Violin Concerto KV 271<sup>i</sup> will receive clear answers in the foreseeable future.

Christoph-Hellmut Mahling  
Saarbrücken, March, 1980

Translation: William Buchanan

<sup>55</sup> Cf. on these “unevennesses” see also Christoph-Hellmut Mahling, *Bemerkungen zum Violinkonzert D-dur, KV 271<sup>i</sup>*, in: *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1978/79*, Kassel etc., 1979, pp. 252–268.

<sup>56</sup> On this see also the contribution named in footnote 55.

*Concertante.*  
Allegro

Oboe.  
Clarinetto  
in B.  
Corni  
in E $\flat$ .  
Fagotto.  
Violino  
I.  
Violino  
II.  
Alto  
Bassi.  
Oboe.  
Corni

Facs. 1, 2: Sinfonia concertante in E $\flat$ : folios 1<sup>r</sup> and 9<sup>v</sup> of the score copy from the estate of Otto Jahn (State Library Berlin – Prussian Cultural Heritage (Music Department), signature: *Mus. Ms. 15399*). Cf. page 3, measures 1–6, and pages 16–17, measures 159–168.

Allo maestoso  
 Concerto per il Violino. Composto da W. A. Mozart.  
 Coro 1<sup>o</sup>  
 in D.  
 Coro 2<sup>o</sup>  
 Oboe 1<sup>o</sup>  
 Oboe 2<sup>o</sup>  
 Violina 1<sup>o</sup>  
 Violina 2<sup>o</sup>  
 Viola  
 Violoncello  
 Contrabbasso  
 Violino principale.  
 Andante maestoso.  
 Ex Bibliotheca Regia Berolinensi

Tutti  
 Violino princip.

Facs. 3, 4: Violin Concerto in D: pages 1 and 38 of the Berlin score copy from the Aloys Fuchs Collection (State Library Berlin – Prussian Cultural Heritage (Music Department), signature: *Mus. ms. 15419*). Cf. page 81, measures 1–4, page 155, II/1/a, and page 106, measures 167–172.

The image displays two pages of handwritten musical notation. The left page (Fac. 5) features a section labeled 'Cadenza' at the top, followed by several staves of musical notation. At the bottom, there is a handwritten note on a slip of paper that reads: 'Canto per il Violino di Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, 2. ed. Salzburg, li. 163. Gio: 1777. Anno MDCCLXXVII. Parigi chez M. C. Leclercq. Violino. Solo. In un Violino Solo.' The right page (Fac. 6) contains the concluding part of the concerto, with dense musical notation and dynamic markings like 'p' and 'f'. At the bottom of the right page, there is a handwritten note: 'Canto per il Violino, Copiato per Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, 2. ed. Salzburg, li. 163. Gio: 1777. Copiato per Signor Luigi de' Lotti, Maestro di Camera di Sua Altezza Serenissima, li. 167. 1777.' The paper shows signs of age, including a tear at the bottom left of the left page.

Facs. 5, 6: Violin Concerto in D: two pages of the *Violino Principale* part from the copied set of parts in Paris (privately owned). On the left-hand page are the cadenzas for the 1st and 2nd movements (cf. page 158, II/2/b and page 156, II/1/b) with the “slip of paper” which was considered to be proof of the authenticity of the concerto (cf. Foreword); on the right-hand page, which contains the close of the concerto (cf. pages 141 ff., measures 364 ff.), is Pierre Marie François Baillot’s remark on the copying (cf. Foreword).