MOZART, MUNICH AND 1762

On 12th of January 1762 Leopold Mozart of Salzburg, his 11 year old daughter Anna Maria (known within the family as 'Nannerl') and his 5 year old son Wolfgang (then approaching his 6th birthday) left Salzburg by coach on what was to be their first journey together of any distance, headed for Munich, the capital of Bavaria where they were to remain around 3 weeks. (Later in the same year travelling more widely and meeting a string of dignitaries in Vienna and elsewhere between September and January of 1763). Although at the time of their arrival in Munich neither of the children had musical achievements to their credit other than a rather wooden minuet (KV2 in F Major) entered by Wolfgang in to a notebook only a few days earlier dated 'January 1762' . With another version made around the same time by Leopold. (We may well ask which was written first). Child prodigies were not unusual at the time although we would be mistaken to believe these early 'tours' now about to start that involved Nannerl and Wolfgang of 1762/3 were of an extrovert kind and whether the principal reason for them travelling was performance related. (A prodigy was used to playing principally on the harpsichord but the Mozarts did not yet own a keyboard).

Neither Nannerl nor Wolfgang were proficient as keyboard performers at this time and it was to be 18 months later (in August 1763) when the family first acquired a keyboard for their own use - a small, portable spinet - bought by Leopold during a brief visit to his home town of Augsburg. Its purchase referred to in a letter back to Salzburg as being 'very useful for exercises on during our trip'. (Singular). Nor do we find any reference in writings of the time to Nannerl or Wolfgang's performing talents or of them composing keyboard or other music. Those things are merely assumed. Nor are there records of Leopold teaching his children music, let alone composition. But all these abilities are routinely assumed and their musical talents are assumed to have been highly developed, virtually spontaneously, since they have always been part of Mozartean folklore. As to Leopold's learning of musical composition its details have never been a subject of critical study. (That he was for some years a part time agent in Salzburg for sale and purchase of music on behalf of German publishing firms such as Breitkopf in the years prior to his two children's birth is certain. But he is not recorded as learning composition or other musical lessons under any recognised teacher). At the time of Wolfgang's birth (1756) Leopold Mozart found himself still employed in a lowly post of 2nd violinist for the Salzburg Hofkapelle, having risen from 4th position only after years of unremarkable service. As for the Violin Treatise (1756) *(*'Violinschule') published by Leopold in the year of Wolfgang's birth this appeared first in German and was translated and sold in French and Dutch editions in later years though it draws heavily for its more technical elements on the contents of a tutorial written some years earlier by Italian virtuoso Giuseppe Tartini (1692-1770). (How Leopold was able to obtain access to Tartini's work (itself still unpublished in 1756) and how he managed to plagiarise some of its more useful contents is a subject worthy of study in itself). Suffice to say the arrival of the Mozarts in Munich was hardly a major event in the musical life of the Bavarian capital. Not to the musical men and women of the Bavarian capital, that is. Nor had their imminent arrival been publicly advertised. Which are strange preparations for a first musical tour of two prodigies of nature. Nor are the three Mozarts recorded as

meeting the Elector Maximilian III Joseph (1727 – 1777) during their stay. There are no surviving accounts of concerts given by them in public, either as a group or individually. (Nor records of any concerts we may reasonably assume were given in Salzburg in the weeks and months prior to them undertaking this, their first visit to Germany). All of which are a sobering list of realities we can and must accommodate. Besides, the practical difficulties of using a portable keyboard for fingering 'exercises' while being jostled along the bumpy roads of western Europe by horse drawn coach over 7 years of continental travel can easily be appreciated. But none of which things have prevented a standard, eulogised and grossly exaggerated collection of stories on the effects of Mozart's early musical performances on the people of Munich and on the Viennese public later in that year (these said by later writers to have generated huge applause and admiration). Such thing are part of folklore and should not be confused with reality.

But 200 years of Mozartean convention is not to be overthrown by reality so easily. The legendary career of Mozart, fortified by a body of music (much of which is indisputably of very high quality) has been remarkably successful in a marriage of endless eulogy, making diplomats of generations of musicologists and teachers who 'go with the flow', especially here in attributing to the young Wolfgang and Nannerl at this time the most prodigious, even extraordinary musical achievements. With the familiar mantra of the word 'genius' a limitless credit card used to support the familiar narrative and which relies on the presumed abilities of him and his sister - though there is no real evidence to support any of it. And never has been. Not surprisingly the legends are an integral and even patina-encrusted part of the Mozart phenomenon though they differ from reality and cross-examination. Though they are a highly successful fusion of public credulity with the cultural and commercial interests of a rapidly emerging and rapacious music industry. As for the findings of musicology on early Mozart (this being a science recognised to be the arbiter of music and musical achievement within a critical context) its representatives have often been persuaded themselves to oversee publications on early Mozart which pay lip service to the legends to accommodate the fascinating, ever expanding and bewildering bubble that is called 'Mozart biography'. With countless amusing episodes of his supposed career being consumed wholesale by an adoring faithful, these supplied as a matter of convention in the name of popular culture, education and musical history. A fusion of the academic and public world unlike most others. The prime source for which tends to have been the pen of Leopold Mozart. And against which there has been minimal criticism and cross-examination over the past two centuries. Dissenting voices to the Leopoldian monologue are heard only rarely (if at all) and always from a safe and sanitised distance. Mozart, biographically, is a mantra, a paradigm invented for wider public consumption along lines preferred by and largely presided over by his own father Leopold with his 'genius' proclaimed and echoed by others within an ever widening cultural circle of contacts within which he and his fraternal supporters operated. The details embellished and overlaid by the ever fertile imaginations of a posthumous and sympathetic writers. With attributions of particular musical works being a specially thorny and still ongoing subject. Presided over by 'experts' whom few have met and who individually remain, largely, unaccountable. Though the young Wolfgang at this time (1762) had yet to study keyboard, or a day at school (musical or otherwise) nor even once attended a class of musical harmony or composition. None of which have however been able to dent the broad appeal of the Mozart story itself. Though it may may make us wonder how these facts can be reconciled with the

subject we now examine - Munich 1762.

THE SEVEN YEARS WAR

Of obvious though rarely appreciated importance to our subject, contextually, is the fact that on 5th January of that year (1762) the Empress Elizabeth of Russia died after several years of illness. News of which reached the west only days before the Mozarts set out for Munich but which (in a military and political sense) was shortly to have a crucial bearing on the outcome of that convoluted and massive war. A war that had involved armies of much of western Europe for over the last 6 years. Including Austria. One that was being fought on many fronts and as cynical as any war has ever been. Having erupted from virtually the year of Mozart's birth and which, as far as western Europe was concerned, had virtually exhausted all associated with it, including the peoples of Russia, Sweden, the German states, Austria/Hungary, Prussia, Portugal, Spain and beyond. With the death toll from its numerous battles estimated at well over a million. And which, by January of 1762 was now about to move in to a decisive and terminal phase that would involve Russia. (The Russian armies at the time of Elizabeth's death pouring in to Prussia in great numbers and at the point of militarily defeating and occupying Prussia itself). And then, suddenly, it was decided, against all odds, and immediately, to withdraw the Russian forces from Prussia at the very moment of their success and return home. This remarkable and last minute order given to the generals by the new, incoming Tsar Peter 3rd within days of his accession. A strange fact known to historians ever since as the, 'Miracle of Brandenburg'. (The chief reason for this being that Peter had already been a friend and admirer of Prussia for years). A final battle in that huge and complex series of events that is today called the 'Seven Years War' was fought at Freiberg in Saxony between rival armies of Austria/Hungary and Prussia on 29th October 1762 when Austria was again defeated by Prussia. But, soon after, came a negotiated end to that long and convoluted conflict.

The standard biographies, detached from any real context, leave readers unaware of these turbulent events. Though they provide the military and political context within which Wolfgang's earliest years were really lived. And which by that January of 1762 had reached a temporary lull during within which the first trip of the family to Munich was undertaken.

THE MYSTERY OF MUNICH 1762

Mystification and obfuscation has always shrouded the first public appearances of W.A. Mozart and details of Mozart in Munich in his first public year of 1762 are no exception. How could it be otherwise when the musical abilities and compositional achievements of the two children were, in reality, so modest ? It is a remarkable but basic fact that Leopold, chief chronicler and effectively manager of the most widely accepted accounts of Wolfgang's childhood years, says nothing, absolutely nothing, of this 3 week visit in diaries or letters, though it was their first to the Bavarian capital and was a crucial start for the musical career of a boy who was to become Europe's most iconic and extrovert composer of the 18th century. Leopold's strange silence on this tour contrasting with the fact that every biographer has written differently of those 3 weeks for over 2 centuries. Because his daughter, Nannerl, asked to provide details of her brother's life by the biographer Friedrich Schichtegroll (1765-1822)

some 30 years later specifically refers to Munich 1762 in a short biographical account she compiled for posterity. Nannerl, married at the time, was asked to send her account first to Von Molk in Salzburg. Who, after making a number of changes, forwarded it in turn to Schlichtegroll. This further edited on receipt and published at Gotha in 1793.

Munich of 1762, according to Nannerl, was the start of Wolfgang's public career. An unforgettable event she had witnessed and been involved in. Appearing within Schlichtegroll as follows -

''He (Wolfgang) had by now advanced so far in his art that it would have been a crime if his father had not visited different cities and countries so that they could witness this extraordinary talent. (12-2) In his 6th year the father, daughter and son made their first journey to Munich, where the two children were allowed to be heard by the Prince with praise and lavish applause. (12-3) When they returned to Salzburg both children became daily more perfect on the piano and the whole family went in the autumn of that same year to Vienna, where the two small virtuosos were introduced to the Imperial Court. ''

(Schlichtegroll '*Nekrolog'* - Paragraph 12 -) on p. 24 - 1793).

She is emphatic about Munich 1762 although she herself wrote nothing of 'praise and lavish applause'. (That part was invented and conveniently added by others before Schlichtegroll's publication). Nor is the type of 'play' to which she refers specified, (whether musical or the kind made with children's toys). And Schichtegroll's writings on Mozart have been well researched in recent years by Bruce Cooper Clarke in '*The Annotated Schichtegroll'*. Far less examined, of course is the cause of the amnesia and strange silence of her father on those weeks. Since his travel diaries are, as said, entirely silent. So that a dense fog shrouds the first years of Mozart's public career. A typical example of wrestling with this rather basic and even fundamental problem of Munich coming from biographer Stanley Sadie -

'According to Nannerl's recollection, 30 years later, the family made a journey in January 1762, when Leopold took both children - Nannerl was hardly less gifted than her brother - to the court at Munich, and played before the Elector of Bavaria, Maximilian 3rd Joseph.

There is no independent documentation of this journey, nor any later reference to it. When in 1763 Leopold mentioned meeting the Elector, the conversation he reported seems to imply that they had not recently met, and others of his remarks suggest that Mozart had no previous experience of performing there. There must be considerable doubt as to whether that visit did in fact take place of whether Nannerl's memory was confused'

We may with justification consider that Leopold's memory problems were more serious than those of Nannerl. The likelihood of him deliberately avoiding all reference to Munich 1762 rises to near certainty when we consider that in no other year of Mozart's childhood was it possible for them to have spent 3 weeks in that location other than 1762 -

1. They cannot have gone there in January the following year. (1763) Wolfgang was ill for at least a week with rheumatic joints in bed at Salzburg at that time and did not leave the city with his father and sister until 9th June. When they again visited Munich.

2. In January 1764 the Mozarts were staying together in Paris having arrived 2 months earlier and remained there until April.

3. In January 1765 the Mozarts were in London having arrived there almost 9 months earlier. They did not leave England until the end of July.

4. In January 1766 Mozart was recovering from illness was at the Hague with his father and sister from where, at the end of January, they moved to Amsterdam, remaining until early March.

5. In January 1767 the family were in Salzburg having returned from 3 ½ years of touring. And there they remained until a visit to Vienna in September.

6. In January of 1768 the Mozarts were on route to Vienna, remaining in the Austrian capital until the end of December.

And so on. The likelihood of Nannerl's report being factual is still more increased by her providing a specific date - '12th of January' - as the start of that journey. And by refering to its 3 week duration. Which, written at a distance of 30 years, has to be a remarkable feat of memory in itself. Strongly indicating of course that Nannerl had in her possession a diary of the time whose dates allowed her to provide the beginning and end of that first tour. Thus Nannerl records it having lasted 3 weeks. And did so exactly. Further adding her own memory of its highlight for her - that she and her brother had 'played' before the Elector, Maximilian 3rd Joseph. And nothing more.

Leaving us little choice but to consider that Leopold (an otherwise meticulous chronicler of Mozart's movements, and especially during the years of his childhood) believed he had good reasons not to record this period. The reasons being considered sufficiently important he ordered his children to say nothing of it also. Not even recording towns and villages through which they passed on the way or during their return. These are curious omissions and they would have remained unknown to posterity except that 30 years later Nannerl (writing 5 years after Leopold's death) saw no reason to continue with a silence that must originally have been ordered of her and her brother. Its cause probably never explained. But which, she figured at that time, there would be no harm to speak of in 1792, with her strict father now dead for nearly 5 years. So she records that visit in only a line or two and mentions what was the most singular event of that time for her - when she and her brother 'played' before the Elector. Nor does she refer to musical events, concerts or applause (great or otherwise). The strangeness of which things being increased by the fact that virtually every biographer refers to Munich 1762 and has done so for the past 200 years, though only for a line or two, because of Nannerl's surviving, brief and wholly credible account.

It would have been relatively simple for Leopold to have written at least a brief account. For him to have described Munich 1762 as a 'holiday' of some kind. To have

made brief comments upon it. To have recorded the obvious excitement that it must have created within the family before the left their home. And to have justified describing it as the first 'tour' of his son's musical career. These would certainly have been more consistent comments with a proud and eager father whose voluminous travel records are legendary. But he chose to do none of these things. Which strongly indicates that he believed there were good reasons to omit all reference to that first journey. Which, when we consider Wolfgang's short childhood was basically ending at this point (since he was shortly about to become a highly public, musical figure touring for 7 years) adds even more strangeness to our subject. A visit to Munich seems (from Leopold's perspective) never to have occurred. The advantages of him remaining silent on it were considered necessary. But what were they ? And why ?

One obvious reason for his silence was the difficult problem of his son being described widely as a musical prodigy of nature, but also of him obtaining glowing references from the musical and cultural world of European society. That was a desire we cannot reasonably deny but which was far more difficult for Leopold to obtain than he could possibly have obtained on his own. For all the reasons just stated. Not least of which were the abilities (or lack of them) of his two young children. But that hope, that obsession of his, (achievable only with the help of a series of friends in high places) could at least start to be realised by visiting sympathetic contacts, first in Bavaria and later during that same year in Vienna. By which, he surely hoped, the creation of reputations for his two children would start to seem more feasible. Even their lack of musical abilities could, with skilful management be deemed of minor importance - their time really spent during these early 'tours' attending endless meetings, social gatherings, concert going, meeting future patrons etc. All with the helpful input of what must often have seemed an endless line of sociable, fraternal and sympathetic men and women. All of whom, (judging by the names we read of in the surviving biographical material) certainly influential enough. Thus Munich (a city which eventually vied with Prague and Vienna to become the 'City of Mozart' and which Wolfgang was to visit repeatedly during his life) became from the outset crucially important, with its importance beginning in early 1762 as he and his reputation started to be propagated over the Holy Roman Empire and beyond from around that date. Nor should we forget the vital importance of Munich to Mozart's career over the span of his career with stays there as follows -

1762 - Approximately 20 days
1763 - 2 or 3 days
1766 - 28 days
1774/5 - Approximately 84 days
1777/8 - Approximately 14 days and then, slightly later, the 7 last days of the year
1780/1 - Approximately 80 days
1790 - October/November

The problem at the time of them first leaving Salzburg, from Leopold's perspective, was rather simple. How was he to obtain for his son a 'public' and extraordinary reputation in music without him having any verifiable talent or history of musical achievement ? The 'solution' was rather obvious - to surround the details of these early 'touring' years with statements as obscure and as mystifying as those of Stanley Sadie. Since the legendary talents of the genius must be and were assumed real from the outset. And have been ever since.

1762

We might approach our largely unexamined subject more closely by reference to a number of related events of musical significance that were occurring at that time elsewhere in Europe. Each of which, for sure, had a bearing on Mozart's later career.

JOHANN CHRISTIAN BACH

A musician of major influence on young Wolfgang within a few years of their visit to Munich (and with whom he had close association while in England) was the youngest son of J.S. Bach - Johann Christian Bach (1735-1782). Who was about to arrive in England early in that same year (1762) from Strelitz in Germany after having been invited to join the chamber music ensemble of Queen Charlotte in London. Charlotte being the German born wife of British King George 3rd. (With J.C. Bach having earlier enjoyed noted musical success with opera and instrumental music in Italy at Naples and Turin). Queen Charlotte had arranged to recruit Bach from her area of Germany and she was only 18 at the time of his arrival. She was also the former Princess of Mecklenburg-Strelitz and, soon after her marriage to George 3rd in London (the two marrying the first day they met) was provided with her own orchestra. She (and George) both being musical. Directly descended from Magarita de Castro y Sousa: a branch of the Portuguese Royal House and thus a further example of consolidation within the royal bloodlines of Europe. King George continued to retain his personal musical ensemble after their marriage. But it was Queen Charlotte's musical ensemble/orchestra to which J.C. Bach had been contracted. And during which years in England he became known as the 'London Bach'. Although, surprisingly, he was not the first of that famous name to be based in England. (One Johann Christoph Bach (1676 - d. ?) had 40 years earlier been recruited for the musical establishment of the Duke of Chandos which, at the time (c.1721) had G.F. Handel as its chapel master. (That consisted of an ensemble with around 30 members including Francesco Scarlatti, brother of Alessandro. So that a little known and far earlier association between Handel and the Bach family may justify closer study by others).

King George 3rd remained a devoted patron of the music of G.F. Handel after his marriage and was content to listen mostly to performances of Handel's works or others such as Purcell for many more years). Thus the Royal family of England from shortly after the royal marriage had two musical ensembles, and not one. The significance of which is King George 3rd resisted music of the newer and more fashionable composers for virtually the rest of his life. Though his wife (and much later their son, the Prince of Wales) both became patrons of musical visitors to England from the continent who included in later years men such as Josef Haydn and, far earlier, during the year of 1764, two visits to the palace by the travelling Leopold and his young son Wolfgang Mozart, again to the ensemble of Queen Charlotte. It was JC Bach himself, now a member of the Queen's Band for several years who was placed in charge of making arrangements for the Mozarts visits to the royal palace. With King George more detached - establishing in later years a long and successful series of annual concerts on music of the baroque that became widely known as 'Concerts of Ancient Music' (Twelve such concerts were staged each winter with a regular performance of the oratorio 'Messiah'). And, as for Handel, (who had died in

1759), his popularity remained strong in England, largely due to the direct influence of the King.

GLUCK, PICCINI AND PUBLIC PERCEPTION

This same year of 1762 also witnessed the important premiere of the first so-called 'reform' opera '*Orfeo ed Eurydice'* by Christoph Gluck on 5th October in Vienna. Based on a libretto by Ranieri de' Calzabigi. And Gluck (1714-87) was from this time to be associated with one of the most notorious episodes of 18th century music. It was not until 12 years later (1774) that *'Orfeo'* was first staged in Paris to a French text. In spite of which this work was maliciously described from the time of its Vienna premiere as a 'triumph' over Italian opera. With an artificial rivalry directed in particular against the Paris based opera composer Niccolo Piccini (1728-1800) from that date. With the same type of anti-Italian claims being repeated in Vienna newspapers more than 25 years later within days of 'Mozart's' opera '*Le Nozze di Figaro*'. Since it too was proclaimed to be a 'triumph' over the Italians despite that production being withdrawn to booes and hisses after a handful of performances on account of its wretched score at the time. But Piccini in 1762, already well established as a leading composer of comic opera in 1762 in Paris had the misfortune of being based there at the time of this much heralded success by Gluck and he, serving as a target, soon became a victim of the most baseless and unfounded criticisms. These started by managers of the sensationalist Paris Grand Opera themselves and by a number of increasingly vocal supporters of the growing campaign against Italian music as a whole. Gluck's *'Orfeo'* used to ignite that baseless controversy, in fact. A subject that has often been written about and whose real purpose was to give the gullible public the impression Germany and France by Gluck's 'reform' had now become new leaders of opera and musical fashion generally. This view supported with patronage and action from that date in Vienna in the encouraging of a new (and enforced) fashion for French dance troupes and French stage productions. Assisted by Count Durazzo and others. With the French language rapidly being spoken and written by many rulers over western Europe and beyond. France and all things French rapidly becoming the 'zeitgeist' of high fashion. The Gluckian impression of operatic superiority having been created, of course, for wider consumption by a fickle musical public. A ruse which conveniently ignored the fact that, even at the time and for decades more, most musical teaching across continental Europe was still dominated by learned Italian chapel masters and by Italian virtuoso performers whose achievements and abilities (theirs and their ancestors) had been immense and indisputable. Ignoring the fact that the musician of talent (whatever his origins) who wished to succeed during virtually the whole of the 18th century would come to study music in Italy as a matter of plain and indisputable fact. The exceptions being few. JS Bach is one. Although Bach's frequent allusion to Italy and his arrangements of Italian music are themselves indisputable. Again, Bach did not conform with this norm although his Protestantism was another major reason for avoidance of opera as a form and as a natural break with the Roman Catholic world. But, as for Mozart and his own learning of music in Italy, he studied nothing when he travelled there in 3 childhood tours.

It was, of course, the Italians who had introduced the Symphony, the Concerto, the Sonata, the String Quartet and numerous other forms of music and who, already over centuries, had pioneered in opera. It is equally true however that by this year of 1762

the emerging philosophy of the 'enlightenment', (that ubiquitous term which, at its most accurate is nothing than the dawning of common sense by those who lacked it on centuries of human exploitation) was based largely on attempts to regulate society through the philosophical writings of Voltaire and of Rousseau (the latter publishing an example of its real aims in his *'Social Contract'* of that year) and also on the writings of the encyclopaedists in Paris under Diderot which started to be in great demand amongst the fashionable nobility across the European continent. Hugely influencing taste and patronage in art, music, literature and thought through those publications (the most famous literary examples of which were already being produced for private subscribers under the editorial control of Baron Melchior Grimm and others in Paris) and literally setting the fashion in almost every aspect of western cultural and political society from the 1740's onwards. It is sufficient to note that a generation of Germans and Austrians who had studiously ignored the musical achievements of J.S. Bach (and who continued to do so for decades in Vienna, the self-declared 'city of music') were quite capable (with the encouragement of publishers and theatre managers) of celebrating the miraculous (and apparently spontaneous) advent of a Josef Haydn, also of W.A. Mozart and of one Ludwig van Beethoven.

In the emerging world of 18th century music, and specifically in that era which has been called the 'enlightenment', where amnesia and selective evidence were soon major factors in promoting the first widely available ideas of musical 'history' the public of Italy, Bohemia and England were about to discover the power of propaganda within art, music and culture generally, this being defined, eulogised and pre-determined for them as consumers by these editors of 'enlightenment' publications and by the prejudices of highly fashionable and now 'enlightened' patrons. Since the transition from the shabby deficiencies of an ecclesiastical society to one that had been 'secularised' required rapid change in which fashion and secular heroes were not only deemed to be necessary but were enforced and to a great extent dictated. Achieving for western European society the equivalent, in fact, of a cardinal changing from his ecclesiastical robes in to a tuxedo and a bow tie within a telephone booth within 60 seconds. The scale and speed of which only became apparent by around the convening of the early 19th century Congress of Vienna. And thus ''all changed though nothing changed'. Soon lost from memory by reason of a convenient amnesia were the careers and real achievements of countless musical composers, some of whom had staged major operas with great success in Vienna during Mozart's last decade.

You may think I have digressed in my determination to provide context for an examination of Munich, Mozart and 1762 although were are approaching a subject which, for one reason or another, has been almost completely ignored and which may be considered only within the context of the realities of those times.

The Mozarts (though Leopold was obviously keen to suppress truth of it) were heading towards a Munich which was in an ideal position to positively influence Wolfgang's imminent career. So ideal that a neutral observer would note with astonishment that this Salzburg family were able to make an unprecedented number of social and cultural contacts at high level across Europe within those months, these starting in the Bavarian capital, and without any of them demonstrating real musical ability or potential. Starting with the fact these children 'played' before Maximilian

3rd Joseph. Which is a strange enough fact, for sure. And even more strange that they, within those few months, and still having nothing musical of real significance to offer, should have attended meetings with others in Vienna such as Wenzel Anton Kaunitz, the Emperor Francis of Austria himself etc. And, even more extraordinary, that within a year, their father being able to write from Paris -

'Now we have made the acquaintance of all the foreign ambassadors here. The English Ambassador Milord Bedford and his son are very well disposed to us, and the Russian, Prince Golitsin, loves us like his own children'.

If the extraordinary frequency of such meetings and the scale of social privileges afforded to the Mozarts at this time do not astonish and make us wonder what 'credit card' they must have held to have positively influenced the upper echelons of European society I suppose nothing will. Since they are never more real, more graphic, than here in the events surrounding those early years. Since there were no towns in Italy, France, Germany and Bohemia, Austria and Switzerland, Holland and England who did not have children who could play minuets of their own, at least as well as the Mozarts. It is here with these early years, in fact, where musicology and popular fiction begin to part company and where they become glaringly incompatible and irreconcilable. Since the momentum of the Mozart circus starts to build from this time, the fact of which is acknowledged freely even by even the most devoted admirers of Mozart's music. Acknowledged without loss of credibility to Wolfgang's growing and iconic reputation also. (Wolfgang Hildesheimer, for example, admits to the 'circus' of the Mozarts on tour). While Maria Teresa most famously speaks of them acting like 'beggars'. Hildesheimer balancing this obviously questionable scenario with entire paragraphs of the usual eulogy so that we log in to the Leopold monologue with indifference whenever questions are asked such as 'Who actually wrote what'? and, 'How could this possibly have happened' ? And this version of spontaneous praise is not open to criticism and never has been. Having always been the price of institutionalised and even dogmatic folklore.

The stay in Munich of 3 weeks occurred because the family were arriving at the start of theatre rehearsals for performance of an opera. This due to be held on the evening of Thursday 21st January. 9 days after their arrival. After which the evidence indicates they remained for around 5 more days before returning home. Their stay (as we shall see) being crucially important for making first contacts with managers of a musical network which clearly existed and already stretched across much of continental Europe (that is, within the Holy Roman Empire) and beyond. Requiring of Leopold his meeting of various musicians, singers and potential patrons in Munich who would be able to assist in securing the public success of his young son's career over the years ahead. And thus, from Leopold's perspective, Munich never happened. Though it was vital.

Mozart's first sight of a big city was not Vienna but in Munich. And the first large theatre he was to see was the Cuviliestheater located at the Residence of the Elector at there, opened for only 3 years at the time - the same venue where Wolfgang 18 years later would be commissioned to write '*Idomeneo*'). Details of which are a study in obscurantism worth reading !. But the opera about to be staged within a week or so of their arrival was to be a setting of Metastasio's *'Themistocles'*. As the major musical part of the annual Munich carnival. The version about to be revived by its Munich

based composer for the first time since its premiere there 8 years earlier. By Italian resident Kapellmeister Andrea Bernasconi (1706-84). And whose 1762 revival was also to feature Bernasconi's own 21 year old stepdaughter Antonia (1741-1803) with her taking the lead role of Aspasia. (Her stage debut, in fact). With the same Madame Bernasconi being a soprano who, by another fortuitous coincidence, would soon be involved in various Mozart stage productions over the next years and who, wholly on merit, became a highly paid singer from the time of that performance onwards. Wolfgang Mozart (by 1781 onwards), well aware of her justifiable success on his arrival to stay in Vienna in 1781 was not keen to encourage her success - since he was of the view she had a voice only suitable for opera seria. (A more likely reason being she and the people of Munich were well aware of the silence that had actually surrounded Mozart's modest role in Munich since 1762. The sobering facts of which required Mozart in 1781 to reduce the possibility of her describing the year of her own debut and of his arrival on the scene across musical Europe. Since that would do him no credit.). This entirely consistent with deleting all reference to Munich of that year by his father Leopold.

Within a few months of this gentle tourism being enjoyed in Munich over 3 weeks by the Mozarts (which involved taking promenades, playing games in front of the Elector and making various visits to powerful and strangely favourable men) emerged the first astonishing reports of their first visit to Vienna from the Viennese themselves. Reports of mercurial and previously unknown performing talents, nay, musical 'genius', relating to Wolfgang himself. Bye products of a series of high level meetings held somehow by the Mozarts in late 1762 with the Austrian Emperor, also with Wenzel Kaunitz, and many others such as newly arrived Russian Ambassador, Golitsin. (The same Russian whose spontaneous support for the miraculous Mozart was to last for the rest of the latter's life). Not a bad return for a young composer whose musical achievement was only a single wooden minuet at the time, you may agree ? And especially for one still to learn the keyboard. And who, by the following year, having been feted as widely as any minuet composer in history had yet to compose anything of note. And yet those achievements and abilities which we may justly call in to question today were deemed good enough to be accepted by the credulous musical public of Vienna, causing them to erupt in raptures when, in October of that year, the gossip/conversation of the city focused on the arrival amongst them of that musical phenomenon, the young boy Mozart.

This was the same Vienna of late 1762 where Leopold (whose talents included an amazing ability to meet friends in high places) was able to meet and discuss his plans with the French ambassador for planned musical tours across western Europe (including England) and to discuss the artistic career of his son. The progress of whose son, was another of those remarkable things was to be conveniently reported in the enlightenment publications of a certain Baron Melchior Grimm, Wolfgang's future patron in Paris. Grimm's edition of *'Correspondence Litteraires'* from Paris of 15th July 1766 (over which he had been editor for some years) explaining that young Mozart now had high ambitions to become a major opera composer. And Grimm being a favoured product of Regensburg, (as had been Leopold Mozart all those years earlier when securing his first Salzburg post as a valet), but with the former now firmly managing the increasingly fashionable encyclopaedist views of Voltaire and Rousseau, the light bringers of the above mentioned philosophy of the 'enlightenment'. This increasingly achieved by a series of publications intended for a

growing number of far flung aristocratic subscribers and enthusiasts. With Grimm's literary customers rewarding him by granting him a series of consultant posts such as cultural minister for Gotha and, less well known, trusted confidant for Russian leaders at the highest levels of their government). This being the same Melchior Grimm who by 1777 became (and remained) a patron of W.A. Mozart during and after his musically and personally disastrous adventures in the French capital.

But Mozart, by the evening of 10th October 1762 was already the talk of Vienna as he and his father attended the Burgtheater to witness a concert. The amazing fame and celebrity of the young composer of the phenomenal F Major Minuet KV 2 was greeted by jubilant commands to appear with his proud father at the Palace of Schonbrunn before smiling members of the admiring nobility. Followed by an invitation to share the opera box of a certain Countess Lodron with whom, on 23rd November, the Mozart's found themselves hearing for themselves a performance of the now famous opera *'Orfeo e Eurydice'* by the said Herr Gluck, again at the Burgtheater. Thus ensuring that, whatever young Mozart would become in future he was now, firmly, and already in the safe hands of his 'enlightenment' friends.

OPERA 'TEMISTOCLE' (MUNICH 1762)

The libretto of the 1762 performance of Andrea Bernasconi's *'Temistocle'* may still be seen at the Bavarian National Library. Its contents providing us with an opportunity to see details of the staging of opera and of opera performance which at the time involved a continental network of criss-crossing performers, patrons and composers. (The score itself strangely held in Madrid). A scenario not unlike that of a keen actor seeking admission to the film industry or the publishing world. Without the appreciation of which we cannot claim to be examining the realities of that time. For example on Page 5 of this libretto the major singers are listed - none of whom had appeared in its premiere 8 years earlier but each of whom were highly talented. In one case (that of Antonia Berlasconi, the step daughter of the composer) she was about to appear for the first time on the operatic stage. A fact not advertised when the libretto was published in Munich (since the singer of the role of Aspasia had not yet been named within it). But records show she had been well coached by her father over years and was to be hugely applauded by the audience when she gave an outstanding performance. On the same libretto appears the name of a hugely famous Italian tenor Guglielmo Ettore (later known as d'Ettore on account of him being knighted) who was at this time already widely acknowledged to be one of the finest and most highly paid tenors of his generation. A closer examination of the major singers in this performance of *'Temistocle'* provides a series of connecting facts which also relate to young Mozart and especially to his future. The lead singers listed as follows -

LEAD SINGERS IN ANDREA BERNASCONI'S 1762 MUNICH PRODUCTION OF 'TEMISTOCLE'

1. **PIETRO SANTI** (c.1730-80)

Pietro Santi was a famous castrato/contralto of the time who appears to have made his operatic debut around the age of 18 in 1748 in Vienna when singing the lead role in *'Demetrio'* of Baldassare Galuppi (1706-85). Then appearing in 1751 in Rome in

another opera by the same Baldassare Galuppi. 5 years later appearing in Rome again in a third opera by the same Italian composer. (A Galuppi whose church works seem to have been of special interest to the young Mozart). Santi also appearing in Rome during 1756 in a musical farce entitled *'La Caffetteria Astute'* by Gregorio Sciroli (1722-81). A gap of 6 years occurring before travelling to Venice (1757) for a part in *'La Conversazione'*. Then to Naples in 1760 for the 3rd revival of Venice based German Hasse's opera *'Artaserse'*. Remaining (1760) in Venice once again to appear in Antonio Mazzoni's *'Adriano in Siria'*. In June of 1761 in *'Zenobia'* at Padua by GB Pesctetti (1704-66) , before travelling by November that year to Ludwigsburg, Germany to sing in *'L'Isle'* of Niccolo Jomelli (1714-74). From where he was commissioned to appear in Bernasconi's opera in Munich for the carnival celebrations of 1762.

No obvious link exists there between Santi and the recently arrived young Mozart. Although only a year later the Mozart's visited friend and pupil of Padre Martini, the opera composer Niccolo Jomelli (1714-74) at the above mentioned Ludwigsburg during their second tour which began that year (Jomelli having been Kapellmeister for Duke Karl Eugen of Wurttemburg (nr. Stuttgart) since 1753. And 8 years after in a performance given in performance on 30th May 1770 Naples Santi sang the part of 'Rambaldo' in Jomelli's opera *'Armida abandonnata'* (3 acts - based on *Gerusalemme liberata* by Torquatso Tasso) Premiered at the Teatro San Carlo. In whose audience was none other than Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart on their first Italian tour at the time. This opera, despite Mozart's criticism of it, being widely performed across Italy for years. And in 1773 Santi, then in Naples appeared as Acronte, in Myslivececk's *'Romolo ed Ersilia'*.

2. **DOMENICO PANZACCHI** (1733-1805)

Panzacchi had been employed as a singer in Munich since 1760 and sang the title role in Bernasconi's *'Angelmondo* in the carnival production of that year. He was over many years one of the highest paid tenors in Europe and is another example of how freely major performers were able to tour widely despite being employees of the Munich musical establishment. Panzacchi also sang the first Arbace in Mozart's *'Idomeneo'* in Munich 1780 having sung the title role in Bernasconi's *'Agelmondo'* (1760). From around 1760 until he was pensioned in 1782, he was one of the highest-paid tenors in Europe.

3. **ANTONIA BERNASCONI (1741-1803)**

Already refered to. Antonia Bernasconi was later to be recruited to sing Ninetta in the abandoned Mozart opera *'La Finta Semplice'* (Vienna, 1768) cancelled due to Mozart family irregularities and complaints of wholesale 'ghost writing' by managers and musicians in Vienna. This after a torrid few months of criticism of the Mozarts in Vienna. Causing a major scandal. But Antonia went on to sing the role of Aspasia in Mozart's *'Mitridate'*, 2 years later in Italy, premiered 26th December 1770 in Milan - an opera greatly influenced by music composed earlier by Josef Myslivecek (1737-81) and also by Gasparini. (- See the ground breaking study on the great influence of Myslivececk's music on W.A. Mozart in Daniel E. Freeman's - *''Josef*

Myslivecek, "Il Boemo": The Man and His Music'. Bernasconi's success was resented by Mozart himself as late as 1781 who, by that time, considered she had a salary far too high. Describing her as not suited for anything except opera seria. (Letter of 29th August 1781). By another of those strange coincidences Bernasconi was the adopted daughter of a valet of the Duke of Wurttemberg (see above). It was for Bernasconi that Gluck is said to have written his opera '*Alceste'*. (One of 3 of Gluck operas specially performed in Vienna in the summer of 1781 at the Burgtheater for the hearing of Grand Duke Paul of Russia).

4. **GUGLIELMO ETTORE** (c. 1740-1771)

It is with tenor Guglielmo Ettore where we arrive at the first obvious connection between Munich and Mozart's early career. Ettore had made his operatic premiere in Naples in yet another work by Jomelli, his version of '*Themistocles' (*1757) . He then appeared in Hasse's '*Achille in Sciro'* (1759). Later moving to Bologna from where Padre Martini wrote to Munich to recommend him personally for employment to Andrea Bernasconi. (A clear indication of Martini's powerful role in obtaining musical appointments of the time) The correspondence between Bernasconi and Padre Martini on Ettore (later d'Ettore) is only partially preserved. Ettore was engaged for Munich in Bologna for this production and remained in Munich service 9 years despite frequent singing tours to Italy.

According to 'Grove' in 1767 he sang in Bertoni's *Tancredi* and Quirino Gasparini's *Mitridate, rè di Ponto*. By then he was a Cavaliere ('d'Ettore'). He sang the title role in Andrea Bernasconi's *La clemenza di Tito* at Munich in 1768 and Admetus in Guglielmi's *Alceste* the next year in Milan. Burney reported he was the most applauded of the singers in Sacchini's *Scipio in Cartagena* in Padua in 1770; elsewhere he referred to him as reckoned 'the best singer of his kind on the serious opera stage'. Schubart wrote that he had 'never heard anyone sing with the feeling of a d'Ettore' (*Schubart's Leben und Gesinnungen*, Stuttgart, 1791–3, i, p.94). Ettore's range extended from *A* to *d''* and his vocal abilities included a capacity for wide leaps.

In 1770–71 Ettore was recruited to sing the title role in Mozart's *Mitridate* in Milan although the young composer was not able to supply a satisfactory version of his entrance aria after 5 attempts and was finally humiliated by having his efforts being replaced by one from Gasparini. (7 years after Ettore's death the very mention of his name evoked unpleasant memories for Mozart). And yet Ettore was also connected to the Württemberg court on 28 January 1771 but died suddenly of an unspecified illness during the next winter. His compositions, which are all unpublished, include arias and many 'Duetti Notturni' written in a fluent melodic style which have been strikingly compared with those of Mozart himself by writers such as though the former predates his by many years. The style used most famously in Mozart's 'Cosi fan tutte'.

5. **SEBASTIANO EMILIANI** (c. 1739-1800)

1749 appeared as Roberto in Goldoni's 'Il Finto Principe'
1750 in Vivaldi's 'Enerlinda' at Venice

Was later to appear (1767/8) in Josef Myslivececk's '*Il Trionfo de Clelia'* at Turin. Also (1767) in Myslivececk's '*Triumph Klelie'* as Tarquinus.

The huge importance of Munich to Mozart's life and later career is and always has been indisputable. Besides this little known visit of 1762 and that of the following year (the latter being well documented by Leopold) it was Munich where he stayed no less than 3 months when his first opera of any size, *'La finta giardiniera'* was premiered at the Salvatortheater in 1775 (13th January). Mozart again visiting in November 1780 to begin work on *'Idomeneo'* (premiered on 29th January 1781). His last stay being in October/November 1790 during a state visit made by King Ferdinand IV of Naples/Sicily. Also of relevance are performances in Munich of '*Don Giovanni'* (1791), '*Die Zauberflote'* (1793) and '*Le Nozze di Figaro'* (1794). (In the 19th Century Hermann Levi and Felix Mottl were keen to begin a Mozart 'renaissance'there. Later Richard Bunch and Ernst von Possart wanted to integrate him and his music within the performance repertoire of the city. Describing Munich as the real musical home of Mozart. With his works a regular part of opera festivals. Even the known addresses where he stayed in the city during his stays remain tourist attractions).

Almost certainly visited by the Mozarts during those 3 weeks of 1762 was the residence of Duke Clements Franz von Paula (1722) cousin of the Elector of Bavaria, Maximilian. Since Von Paula maintained there a small orchestra of his own. And from 1763 onwards (during a second visit) the Mozarts were certainly in frequent contact with that musical establishment. (Von Paula was due to succeed Maximilian on his death but died himself in 1770). Their interest and connection is certain. Amongst various musical employees of von Paula was Giovanni Valesi (1735-1816). A singer who was sent to Italy for training from around this very time (1762) and who took a part in the premiere of Mozart operas '*La finta giardiniera'* (1775) and, much later, *'Idomeneo'* (1780). Valesi was also known as 'Johann Evangelist Wallishaser' during his career and was appointed to the music establishment of Munich in 1770, remaining attached to them until 1798. With his pupils including Adamberger and later Carl Maria von Weber, (the latter being associated with Abbe Georg Vogler).

By the time of their second visit (1763) Wolfgang, having undergone the necessary formalities of meeting many helpful 'friends' in Munich and Vienna began to connect with a musical network which, as we can see, was already spread widely over Europe, of which Munich and Wurttemberg were vital, even integral parts, using the influence of Padre Martini and others such as Abbe Vogler and Duke Karl Eugen. Indeed, one of Padre Martini's star pupils had been the opera composer Niccolo Jomelli (1717-74) who had been appointed Kapellmeister to the same Duke Karl Eugen of Wurttemberg in Stuttgart since 1753. Mozart and his father happening to meet this good friend of his when they visited Ludwigsburg during their tour of 1763. The same Duke Karl Eugen (1728-93), whose mother Maria of Thurn and Taxis of Regensburg had instilled in him his love of music and who, when residing at Mannheim was accused of 'indulging his passion for music to such an extent as to ruin his country and

people’.

In the mountain of literature on Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart it is surely of note that the strange scarcity of biographical material on the events of January 1762 and their obvious significance within Mozart studies contrast with the spontaneous emergence and wholesale propagation of Wolfgang’s heroic, even ‘genius’ status that began only a few months later in Vienna. The importance of the former able provide a balance to the latter and whose incorporation may help restore reality to a version of Mozarts life that is told within the real context of his own time - the result being a more fair, more honest, and free account. So that Mozart, the real Mozart, may be seen in his place, at last, within a musical history freed from two centuries of wholesale obfuscation and from the routine even wholesale suppression of its details.

R. Newman
London
2011

(To be added - image of title page libretto Andrea Berlasconi (1762)
Image of Score Mozart Minuet in F Major KV2)