

DEREK BEALES

A note of introduction: As fate would have it, the emperor Joseph II and the composer and piano virtuoso Wolfgang Mozart lived out the last ten years of their lives contemporaneously in Vienna. They were two extraordinary individuals, cast in two utterly different roles, and yet their lives came to intersect in ways of mutual benefit. How they intersected and what the benefits were are matters not always clear in Mozart biographical literature. It is particularly the portrayal of Joseph II in this regard that is often deficient, confusing, and inappreciative of the man. In this excerpt from Prof. Beales's recently completed two-volume biography of Joseph II, he rounds out the picture of the relationship of emperor and composer.

From the book

JOSEPH II. VOL. II *AGAINST THE WORLD, 1780-1790*

Chapter 13: *Joseph in Vienna: his routine and his impact, especially on music*

Music and drama, with special reference to Mozart⁸⁶

MUSIC WAS THE ONE ART in which Joseph participated regularly and enthusiastically. Despite the well-known portrayal of him in the play and film *Amadeus* as a musical ignoramus, he was in fact exceptionally knowledgeable about music. The composer Dittersdorf reported a long discussion with the emperor in which Joseph made an intelligent comparison between Haydn and the poet Gellert on the one hand, and Mozart and the poet Klopstock on the other. The essential point of it was that both Haydn's and Gellert's works had an immediate appeal, whereas both Mozart's and Klopstock's had to be heard or read more than once for their beauties to be appreciated.⁸⁷ Joseph's alleged comment to Mozart about the *Entführung*, 'Too many notes', has been taken as evidence of his ignorance. But he probably said something like 'Too beautiful [for our ears], and monstrous many notes.' It is always necessary to bear in mind, when appraising the emperor's remarks, his peculiar brand of humour or sarcasm. He was usually getting at someone. And he did not use the royal 'we'. The ears in question were those of the Viennese audience, whom he was mocking for their limited appreciation of Mozart's elaborate music.⁸⁸

© DEREK BEALES. IN 2009, PROF. BEALES PUBLISHED THE SECOND AND FINAL VOLUME OF HIS DEEPLY RESEARCHED AND AUTHORITATIVE BIOGRAPHY OF THE EMPEROR JOSEPH II. THIS ARTICLE IS FOUND ON PAGES 455-476 OF CHAPTER 13. THE PUBLISHER IS THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2009, AND THE ISBN IS 978-0-521-32488-5. BY WAY OF INFORMATION, THE TITLE OF THE FIRST VOLUME IS "JOSEPH II. VOL. I *IN THE SHADOW OF MARIA THERESA, 1741-1780*" (CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1987) ISBN 0-521-24240-1.

FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS PRESENTATION, THE FOOTNOTES WITH THEIR ORIGINAL NUMBERS HAVE BEEN RELEGATED TO THE END OF THE TEXT AND BEGIN AT PAGE 16.

Paul von Mitrofanov, even though his subtitle was Joseph's 'political and cultural activity', found no occasion in his 857 pages to make the slightest reference to music and theatre or to any composer or literary figure other than political pamphleteers and French *philosophes*. One of the scholars who reviewed the present volume before publication recommended the excision of my discussion of music as peripheral. Even a valuable recent book on 'Mozart's women' says patronisingly that Joseph 'saw himself as something of an impresario'.⁸⁹ But the fact is that, after he had arranged for the Court to resume managing the Burgtheater, in 1776, though he formally put Rosenberg in charge of it, he himself was the impresario. When in Vienna, he saw Rosenberg first thing every morning, since it was the great chamberlain's duty to 'hand him his shirt'.⁹⁰ However far he was from Vienna, he sent specific orders to Rosenberg about the day-to-day running of the theatre. He made all the important and many lesser decisions, personally selecting librettists, composers, singers and operas. When in Vienna, he rarely missed a performance, and he also often attended rehearsals. On one occasion Zinzendorf found him singing an opera to himself from the score.⁹¹ The custom was for plays and operas to be given on alternate nights, but the operas were more costly and more prestigious than the plays, and it is the operas that are now remembered and admired. It may be significant that, not only was he musically talented and well informed, but he had also been coached as an actor in his youth.⁹²

Neither he nor his courtiers and officials regarded the Court theatre as a mere sideshow. In fact it was a more important part of Court life than in most capitals because Joseph so much restricted other Court activities. The great majority of the audience at the Court theatre consisted of members of the aristocracy and officials, who did not dream that anyone other than the ruler would run the major theatre of the Capital. While many of them were musically literate and some were musical enthusiasts, they, their wives and their lovers went to the theatre not only or even primarily to see and hear the play or opera, but to observe and be observed, talk, do business and flirt. But it was an aspect of Joseph's reforming theatrical management that, unlike at most courts, the audience paid for their boxes and seats.⁹³

When taking over the theatre in 1776, Joseph had made the remarkable gesture of calling it the German National Theatre, engaging German actors, seeking out authors to write German-language plays, recruiting a German-language opera company and terminating the contracts of the French and Italian companies. Of the Italians only Antonio Salieri, his Court composer, was kept on, and he only with a retainer: he left Vienna to employ his talents in Italy. This reform appealed to German patriots and promoters of German language and literature but, when it took full effect in 1778, it greatly annoyed the upper classes of Vienna, accustomed as they were to French and Italian, but not German, as polite and literary languages.⁹⁴

Joseph's musical likes and dislikes were certainly idiosyncratic, fluctuating and, as we shall see, in some ways restrictive – but less so than those of most of the other rulers whose tastes, by determining what was performed at their well-funded Court theatres, strongly influenced the development of music in their countries. The patronage of the Hanoverian

kings of Britain was largely responsible for the dominance of Handel's music there. T.C.W. Blanning has written of Frederick the Great:

Although a gifted musical performer and composer, Frederick could appreciate only composers who wrote in the Italian style, such as Hasse, Graun, and Agricola. He employed Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach for thirty years but was unwilling or unable to recognise his qualities as a composer.⁹⁵

Frederick maintained complete control of the Berlin opera house that he had built, sometimes even usurping the role of the official conductor; and his own regular music-making consisted of playing on the flute, over and over again, the sonatas and concertos written by himself and by Johann Quantz, his chief musician. It was fortunate that Joseph's tastes were not so limited, because Vienna ranked as the most important musical centre in Europe, and his personal patronage, his control over the main imperial opera company and his influence on other theatres, together with his reforms of the liturgy, had an immense impact on the practice and development of music there.

Joseph's dismissal of his Italian troupe in 1778 went with his strong dislike of 'boring' *opera seria* – the staple diet of most Court theatres – which treated high-minded themes, mostly from the classics, in a grand and stately manner. Another of his bugbears was wordless ballets performed within operas, a normal feature of French opera. For the five years from 1778 to 1783 the only permitted genre of opera in the National Theatre was German comic opera (with rare exceptions for entertaining special guests). No doubt Joseph's personal musical and literary tastes accounted for these choices, as did his desire to differentiate between his and other courts. But in refusing to mount *opera seria* he was deliberately rejecting a genre that was regarded as 'inculcating in his subjects the most useful and important beliefs' in favour of much less didactic and much more frivolous entertainments.⁹⁶

It has become Joseph's chief claim to fame that he was Mozart's emperor.⁹⁷ Some writers, however, believe him to have blighted the composer's career. Robbins Landon, author of a document-rich biography of Haydn, declares that 'Joseph's negative attitude was of catastrophic effect, particularly in Mozart's case.'⁹⁸ This is a grotesque misjudgement. In fact Mozart was fortunate in finding in the emperor, for all his quirks, a warm admirer and steady supporter.

Although the composer was a much less dominant figure at the time than he now looks, so much has been written about him that to approach musical life of the reign other than through him has become almost impossible. It was during the period of German opera's monopoly, in March 1781, that Mozart, once famous throughout Europe as a child prodigy, now twenty-five and a composer of good but not yet transcendent reputation, came to Vienna in the retinue of his employer, the prince-archbishop of Salzburg, who was visiting his aged and ailing father, Prince Colloredo, the highest imperial official in Vienna. The composer, brilliant and ambitious, small of stature but brimming with energy, decided stay on in the capital, with its vibrant musical life, and earn his living there as a freelance teacher, player and composer, throwing up his relatively secure but

dependent position in sleepy Salzburg. The archbishop was indignant and his steward, Count Arco, pestered by the composer, literally kicked him out of his office.

This was a rash decision on Mozart's part. Nearly all musical careers were founded on a permanent position at a Court, in a noble household, in a church or monastery, or in a city. Mozart was almost the first to take the risk of trying to carve out an independent career, and even he was always hoping that Joseph or some other ruler or grandee would provide him with a permanent post. Vienna offered exceptional musical opportunities in addition to the chance to write operas for the Court – probably more than any other city in Europe. A Berlin musician called Reichardt, when describing his experiences of Vienna's musical life and a discussion he had had with Joseph about it, emphasised that the orchestra of the imperial theatre was by far the best in the city and the only one that could cope with Mozart's operas and his big instrumental works. Joseph permitted the theatre and its orchestra to be hired for concerts when they were not needed for operas and plays, a policy which enabled Mozart to develop and perform his instrumental music.⁹⁹ Although there was no other theatre or opera company with the financial and musical resources of the Court theatre, there were rival theatres, to which Joseph granted, in principle, freedom to mount what entertainments they liked, subject to censorship. In aristocratic houses there were only two permanently established wind ensembles in Vienna, those of the Liechtensteins and the Schwarzenbergs, but many nobles and other wealthy persons, especially the Russian envoy, Prince Galitzin, put on concerts, plays and, less often, operas; and there was a very large pool of orchestral players to draw upon.¹⁰⁰ The singers in the Court chapel were not sacked when the Italian troupe left, though Joseph had decided to let the ensemble wither away gradually, and they were accustomed to taking part in the opera performances at the Court theatre. Gottfried van Swieten, in charge not only of education but also of the imperial library and its great hall, gave Mozart many opportunities to study and play the music of Bach, Handel and other early composers as well as to perform his own works.¹⁰¹ Only 150 miles away, the city of Prague had a thriving musical life, not under Court control, and Mozart's works came to be much appreciated there.¹⁰²

At the magnificent palace of Prince Esterházy at Fertöd in Hungary, scarcely fifty miles from Vienna, Haydn throughout Joseph's reign continued to compose symphonies and operas and to stage other composers' works. But Haydn was bound by his contract to treat his compositions as written solely for his patron, and most of them were performed only in his palace, though some were eventually played in Vienna and a few were published. There were many years when Haydn himself did not once get to Vienna, he and Mozart rarely met although they admired each other greatly, and Mozart never went to Fertöd. Joseph had a relatively low opinion of Haydn's works, partly because he knew only a few of them, and partly no doubt because Haydn's operas were not the most inspiring aspect of his work.¹⁰³ The fact that contact between these two great musical centres was so limited is remarkable evidence of

the difficulties of travel, communication and co-operation within the Monarchy. Prague seems to have been much easier to get at than Esterháza.

The most successful of all the especially composed German operas on new texts turned out to be Mozart's *The Abduction from the Seraglio*, first performed in July 1782. Its libretto was 'freely adapted' from a text by Christoph Bretzner, who had established himself as a German-language librettist at the crucial moment, in 1779. The opera was later to be welcomed by the great Goethe as a landmark in German literary history. But by the time it was staged, it was already becoming apparent that the diet of German opera would not satisfy the Viennese public – or at least its upper echelons. During the visit of Grand Duke Paul and his wife, Joseph thought it necessary to revive operas by Gluck; and, while his *Iphigénie en Tauride* and *La Rencontre imprévue* were given in German translation, *Alceste* and *Orfeo* were not.¹⁰⁴

Salieri had returned to Vienna shortly before Maria Theresa died. Thinking he had given offence by outstaying his leave, he appeared on the Controleurgang, the corridor where petitioners waited to see the emperor. When Joseph saw him, he immediately took him in and summoned him to converse with him during his dinner.¹⁰⁵ This behaviour of Joseph's offers a telling contrast to the archbishop of Salzburg's grudging treatment of Mozart when he outstayed his leave. It also illustrates that the emperor would drop almost anything in order to talk about music – 'endlessly', as Zinzendorf once complained.¹⁰⁶ Salieri, whom Joseph liked and admired, was naturally in favour of a return to Italian opera.

In December 1782 Rosenberg suggested to Mozart that he should write an Italian opera – a remarkably broad hint that Italian opera was about to be revived, which must have had the emperor's approval.¹⁰⁷ But Joseph persisted with the German singers until early in 1783. Then, acknowledging that they were not making headway with the audience, he engaged at great expense an Italian troupe, which made its debut in April 1783. Its most prominent members were Francesco Benucci, a notable bass and comic actor, and Nancy Storace, a charming English soprano. Joseph had re-met Paisiello and his music on his visit to Russia in 1780, and at the end of 1781 Ludwig Cobenzl sent the emperor Paisiello's new version of Pergolesi's classic but short comic opera, *La serva padrona*. This was not performed in Vienna until 1786, but in February 1783 Joseph received from Cobenzl what must have been the score of Paisiello's *The Barber of Seville*, based on Beaumarchais's play, and decided that he wanted his new Italian troupe to perform it. He also asked to be sent all Paisiello's future operas as soon as they were written.¹⁰⁸ As part of the package of restoring the Italian opera, Joseph, on Salieri's recommendation, appointed the Venetian Lorenzo da Ponte, who was incidentally a *protégé* of the Cobenzl family, to write libretti for the opera, a task which was understood to carry with it directing the singers.¹⁰⁹

Joseph maintained his control of the repertoire and the performers, but by reviving Italian opera he had made one of his rare concessions to the opinions of others, a real U-turn. But that was the limit of his retreat.

He would not put on French-language opera, as some nobles would have liked, and nor would he agree to mount *opera seria*. It was Italian *buffa* that had triumphed. Hence Mozart's *Idomeneo* was never performed at the Court theatre under Joseph. It was, however, given a private performance in 1786 in the palace of Prince Adam Joseph Auersperg, a reminder that Vienna's musical life was so rich that other patrons and theatres could to a considerable extent compensate for the whims of Joseph II and the limitations of the National Theatre.¹¹⁰

The Italian troupe had an immediate success, but already in June there were difficulties. According to Salieri's latest biographer,

Joseph was hardly a perfect manager. Within a few weeks of the debut of the [Italian] company that he had gone to so much trouble to assemble he authorised Rosenberg [on 25 June] to dismiss it, complaining that three singers were costing him as much as one hundred soldiers. He changed his mind, of course, and the troupe stayed. But his indecisiveness, impatience, impulsiveness, and above all his reluctance to spend money meant that the future was never certain.¹¹¹

Not everyone would draw these conclusions about Joseph's management from his immediately preceding letters and his actual words in this letter. On 2 June he had written from Hermannstadt in Transylvania asking Rosenberg to try to get Benucci to sign a year's contract and also to secure Storage. If this could be done, Joseph thought the troupe would be worth keeping; if not, not. On the 19th, from Czernowitz in Bukovina, he wrote that, as Benucci apparently refused to stay, he thought it wasn't worth keeping the others; there was time to cast the *Barber of Seville* on a new basis. The letter of the 25th, from Lemberg in Galicia, reads:

If these gentlemen and fine ladies don't want to remain at precisely the salary at which they are at present engaged, and especially if Benucci must be engaged for three years for us to keep him, it is not worth the trouble. We only need allow them to finish their contracts and make the best use of them, and then simply let them go. Then we'll try to get some German singers to put back German operas on to the stage. This is my last word. We don't want to increase the wages of these warblers unreasonably, especially since the present situation is uncertain and 100 more grenadiers may be worth more than three comic turns who cost the same.¹¹²

It was true that war did at that moment seem quite likely. But, despite that threat, this was not an unqualified order to dismiss the troupe; it was an order to stand firm on the terms of a contract made only three months previously. This was surely an industrial dispute, with the emperor calling the singers' bluff. In fact they stayed, and Benucci and Storage duly performed in *The Barber of Seville*. And it is impressive and extraordinary that Joseph should have managed the details of this affair from these remote locations.

When Leopold came to Vienna in 1784 he found the German troupe still performing, but to a 'most limited' audience. It was soon to be disbanded. Leopold was impressed by how well the new Italian singers were paid and by the fact that there were twice as many employed as were needed for one opera.¹¹³ Among its major early successes were Paisiello's

Barber (1783), his *Il re Teodoro in Venezia* (*King Theodore in Venice*), with libretto by Rosenberg's friend and *protégé*, Casti (1784), and Mozart's *Marriage of Figaro* (1786) with libretto by Da Ponte. Joseph was directly involved in the staging of all three.

Paisiello's *The Barber of Seville* was very important, historically, in re-establishing the appeal of *opera buffa* in Vienna, and in making an opera out of Beaumarchais's already well-known drama, thus preparing the way for the staging of an opera on its sequel, *The Marriage of Figaro*. This was true not only because the two dramas were so closely connected in plot, but also because, in writing the *Barber*, Paisiello had shown that a four-act play could be transformed effectively into a four-act opera, ignoring some of the long-standing conventions of *opera buffa*.¹¹⁴ The *Barber* was not, however, seen as a political statement needing the special attention of the censor.

Paisiello's next opera for Vienna, *King Theodore in Venice*, commissioned by Joseph from Casti, was novel in a different way. It was highly political, and must have been so intended by Joseph and Rosenberg. The emperor knew very well that Casti – though he had been a canon of the cathedral in Italy, Montefiascone, at which the papal nuncio Garampi was bishop – was a witty, satirical and scurrilous poet. Casti had written a lengthy, notorious but as yet unpublished *Poema tartaro*, mocking the Court of Catherine the Great which he had recently visited. This may be why Joseph did not make him Metastasio's successor as court poet, as Rosenberg requested. Casti already held the same office as a virtual sinecure under Leopold in Tuscany, who described him as 'famous, an intriguer and evil'. But at that point Casti seems not to have wanted to act as librettist, leaving the door open for Da Ponte's appointment.

It is not known how detailed Joseph's commission was for *King Theodore*. What Casti chose as the basis of his plot was a scene in Voltaire's *Candide*, in which six deposed kings or pretenders to a throne unwittingly dine together in disguise during the Venice carnival and discuss, among other things, how hard-up they are. Casti modified Voltaire's story very considerably and wrote a disingenuous preface to the libretto. Those in the know recognised that 'the key to the cipher hidden in the libretto were the reports of some adventures of King Gustavus III, king of Sweden, on his recent trip to Italy, which had been the subject of much facetious comment'. He was thought to have made himself ridiculous by his insistence on wearing costly clothes, sporting his insignia even on his dressing gown, incurring large debts, seducing his innkeeper's daughter and consuming vast quantities of oysters. 'Love, glory and oysters are my three favourite passions,' sang King Theodore in the opera. These aspects of the plot, which were entirely absent in later productions of the opera (for example in London), and are mentioned by very few writers on the subject, caused the nuncio and other public figures to protest, on the ground that these were improper attacks on a reigning monarch. Joseph's direct inspiration is only too probable, since he had encountered Gustavus in Italy the previous winter, disliked him and scoffed at him, particularly mentioning, as Zinzendorf records, his cloth-of-gold slippers and his costly dressing-gown.¹¹⁵

The story of *King Theodore* helps to illuminate the issues raised by *The Marriage of Figaro* by showing that certain aspects of absolutely contemporary politics could be referred to critically on stage, not merely with Joseph's acquiescence but probably at his suggestion. This second play of Beaumarchais's trilogy caused a major sensation when it was allowed to be performed in Paris in February 1784.¹¹⁶ This happened for a variety of reasons. The play itself, unlike the *Barber*, in which Count Almaviva triumphs over an aged notary to win his bride, showed the count's servant, Figaro, in collusion with the countess, defeating the count's plans to revive in this particular case the supposed feudal right of *jus primae noctis*, that is, the right to deflower the bride before the husband did. The play was seen as an assault on all noble rights, and a lengthy speech of Figaro's denounced social inequality. Louis XVI made the mistake of first banning the play, thereby giving it more appeal, and then allowing it to be performed. The first night was a triumph but also caused a serious riot. News of these events of course reached Vienna,¹¹⁷ where a German translation was permitted to be printed. But when a performance of the play in German was planned at the Kärntnerthor theatre early in 1785, Joseph himself intervened, refusing permission for the performance in these words:

Since this piece contains much that is objectionable, I therefore expect that the Censor shall reject it altogether, or at any rate have such alterations made in it that he shall be responsible for the performance of this play and the impression it may make.

By far the most significant word in this decision is 'objectionable', *anstössig*. This was the standard adjective used for all aspects of plays which might justify the censor in banning a performance.¹¹⁸

If Joseph's censorship guidelines for books and pamphlets can be said to have come close to granting freedom, the opposite was true for plays. He kept a very close control over what was performed. Like Sonnenfels and Lessing, he saw the theatre as a school of morality. He thought, like them, that crude old-fashioned *Hanswurst* comedies should be suppressed, but he went much further in trying to purge the theatre of impropriety. He laid down that throughout the Monarchy nothing could be performed that was not on a list of plays approved for Vienna. He thought comedies especially dangerous. The only permitted Shakespeare at the beginning of the reign was a garbled version of *King Lear*, though by the end more of his plays had been added, also in garbled form. Lessing and Voltaire were well represented on the approved list, but the core was recent Austrian drama. Goldoni was thought unsuitable, as were most of the dramatists of the German literary revival. Goethe and Schiller scarcely appeared. The emperor was quite likely to forbid a performance the day before it was due to occur, or to insist on arbitrary cuts.

According to the theatre censor's guidelines, in no circumstances could a piece be performed whose content was in itself 'morally *anstössig*'. No mistresses could figure. Horrible, unnatural and frightening crimes could not be enacted. Improper actions or behaviour must not be shown. Male persons could set traps for virtue, but a lady's room must never be the scene of their success. Two lovers must never leave the stage together alone. Characters who did wrong must get their deserts. Divorce must not

be mentioned. Double meanings were not permitted. Nothing specific to any religion could be shown; no mention was to be made of toleration, church law, atheists, heretics or sectaries.

As for politics, plays were not to be allowed which depreciated monarchical government, and so the death of Caesar, the achievements of William Tell, various delinquencies by Habsburg rulers, and executions of monarchs like Mary, Queen of Scots were excluded. Friendly nations and the Estates must not be criticised. In detail, 'abbot' must be replaced by 'master', 'Solomon' by 'Solon', 'fat as a dean' must be changed to 'fat as a rich farmer'. *Coriolanus* was turned into a family drama and somehow ceased to portray a confrontation between dictator and democracy. At the end of *King Lear* the king and Cordelia remained alive.

I mention all these ridiculous provisions in order to make the point that, when Joseph declared that Beaumarchais's *Marriage of Figaro* contained much that was *anstössig*, he might have meant almost anything, but certainly did not necessarily refer to politics or aristocracy. Most important of all in this context, one of the elements *forbidden* by the censorship in a play was the portrayal of servants as low, ugly, ill-behaved persons in contrast to well-behaved aristocrats. Peasant revolts were explicitly permitted provided that they were not directed against the ruler. In Weidmann's piece *Die schöne Wienerin* the censor made no objection to a black servant saying to his master, Count Fixstern, 'Nature made me free when I was born, as free as you! I am flesh and blood like you. The same sun shines on us, the same earth bears and feeds us; we live and die in the same manner.'

Mozart, his works and his relations with Joseph have inspired an exceptionally large amount of nonsense. We certainly cannot confidently say, as did the notes for the British Library's exhibition celebrating the 250th anniversary of Mozart's birth, that *The Marriage of Figaro* 'was banned from the Vienna theatres because of its overt disrespect for the aristocracy', since Joseph did not explain what he meant by *anstössig* and the censor explicitly permitted anti-aristocratic remarks in Weidmann's play. Nor can it be claimed, given the thrust of *King Theodore in Venice*, that Joseph objected to a political satire, even one directed against a monarch. One might ask whether perhaps the main weight of his banning Beaumarchais's play was on 'the impression it may make', given that Louis XVI's banning of the play in Paris at the last minute and his subsequent climbdown led to its being such a huge *succès de scandale*, seen as a triumph of liberty over royal oppression.¹¹⁹ But that is none too convincing, since the natural response to this example – and very characteristic of Joseph – would have been to decide to allow the play to be performed, as likely to cause less trouble than attempting to forbid it.

To complicate matters, however, his prohibition of the play came during the course of the Transylvanian peasant revolt – but he can hardly have been influenced by this fact, since peasants were scarcely likely to attend a Vienna theatre. Da Ponte's statement that Joseph 'said it was too outspoken for a polite audience' suggests he had a range of objections to it. The papal nuncio reported that the emperor had banned it because of its 'indecenty', another imprecise word.¹²⁰ The most probable explanation

for Joseph's action, given the way in which Da Ponte later modified the play is, first, that he disapproved of the sexual licence displayed by almost everyone in the original play, including the countess. Much of this Da Ponte removed, turning the countess into the spotless heroine of the opera.¹²¹ Secondly, Figaro's immense monologue, most of which Da Ponte cut, was not only far too long to be set to music, but included an overt attack on the Establishment, including all censorship, as well as on the aristocracy.

Other doubtful assertions about the genesis of *Figaro* are current. Some authors assert that Joseph wanted all along to stage it as an opera and actually suggested that Mozart and Da Ponte should do so.¹²² It is hard to believe that, if true, this would not have been recorded by Da Ponte in his *Memoirs*. The librettist said that the choice of subject had been Mozart's idea and that, when approached by Da Ponte about it, Joseph was supportive on the understanding that the play would be modified, which was consistent with the terms of his prohibition. But he certainly gave great assistance during the rehearsal stage. For the National Theatre he was in effect his own censor. So, when Mozart and Da Ponte were told by Rosenberg that, in accordance with the emperor's guidelines, they must remove the ballet from the last act, they were able to appeal to the emperor. They did it rather subtly. Obeying Rosenberg and the guidelines, they converted the scene into a wordless mime. When Joseph enquired what on earth was going on, the position was explained to him: the ballet was not a separate number such as he hated and had forbidden, but an integral part of the action. The emperor ordered its reinstatement and the employment of dancers to dance it.¹²³ His broad-minded approach is also shown with regard to Figaro's aria 'Non più andrai', which scoffs at the young noble Cherubino's being forced by the count to join the army and at the absurdities of military training. Joseph strongly believed that more nobles should serve in the army and he took military training very seriously, but he made no objection to this aria. He certainly possessed a sense of humour.

Because Beaumarchais's *Figaro* caused a riot in Paris and embodied anti-aristocratic sentiments, it came to be regarded as a precursor, even an instigator, of the French Revolution of 1789 and of its fundamental remodelling of society and government. This interpretation suits that of a school of historians which has maintained that a 'democratic revolution' seriously threatened – or was genuinely to be hoped for – all over Europe.¹²⁴ Like students of architecture and the visual arts, historians of music have spied revolutionary sentiments everywhere in the 1780s. This is a distortion of history. Aristocracies all over Europe were doing their best, with some success, to annex the concept of merit to their Order.¹²⁵ For centuries they had been prepared to laugh at servants putting nobles out of countenance. In the Austrian Monarchy a fundamental revolution was never even the ghost of a threat, despite the alarm aroused by the French Revolution. The rebellions that broke out under Joseph II in Belgium and the Tyrol and threatened to break out in Hungary were essentially conservative and aristocratic, demanding a return to the situation before 1780, and largely succeeding. The emperor has been seen as a revolutionary, but only as a revolutionary from above. He had no intention whatsoever of allowing

the people a role in politics. Mozart too, on very slender evidence, has been set up as a sympathiser with the French Revolution.¹²⁶ He certainly saw himself as worthy to rank with aristocrats. But his contemptuous remarks about the commoners whom Joseph allowed to attend the ball in honour of Grand Duke Paul and his duchess place him firmly on the side of privilege.¹²⁷ It was only as the struggle between king, Estates-General and public developed in France in 1789-90 against a background of national bankruptcy that a fundamental reordering of society occurred – and became imaginable – at almost the same time. It was French armies that spread aspects of the resulting system across a recalcitrant, conservative Europe.

I have described *Figaro* as a success. But the opera's first run was not as long as that of several others, and its success has been questioned. This relative lack of success has been attributed to aristocratic resentment at its message.¹²⁸ Given Da Ponte's changes to the play, this is unconvincing. In fact the opera's supposed lack of success is dubious. One of the cast, Michael Kelly, remembered it, admittedly years after the event, as a triumph. His evidence was that the main numbers were so well received that they had to be encored, in one case more than once. His recollection was correct, and these repeats caused the already long opera to end so late that Joseph forbade in future the encoring of any pieces for more than one voice. Performances that provoke such an order can hardly be called a failure. In any case, when the opera was revived in 1789, it had a longer run. But if an explanation is needed for its relatively short run in 1786, it is much more likely to be found in the perceived difficulty of Mozart's music, the unprecedented length of the opera and the large forces required than in the alleged subversiveness of the libretto. In his grandiloquent preface to the published libretto Da Ponte described it as 'a quite new type of opera'. He did not specify what was new about it, but one novelty was the length and intricacy of the musical units, requiring of the audience more patience than they were used to showing.¹²⁹ David Cairns, in *Mozart and his Operas*, writes:

the respect in which *Figaro* is a truly revolutionary work, questions of politics and society aside, [is that] for the first time music has found the means of embodying the interplay of living people, the feelings and passions and thoughts of rounded human beings, servants and masters, as they arise in response to life, each speaking in their own characteristic idiom, all inhabiting an actual world, enchanted yet recognizable, companionable but full of danger.¹³⁰

The opera is seen as new also in its elaborate instrumentation, its effective depiction of emotion and character in the music and the extraordinary skill shown in the management of the ensembles.¹³¹

Joseph liked the piece so much that he had it performed for his guests at Laxenburg in June. *Don Giovanni*, Mozart's next full-length opera after *Figaro*, was commissioned by a Prague impresario and not by Joseph, but he hoped to have it performed for the wedding of his niece to a prince of Saxony in Prague in October 1787. When it emerged that the score was not ready for the occasion, the emperor ordered that *Figaro* be performed instead.¹³² At the end of 1787 he appointed Mozart *Kammermusicus* (Chamber Composer) at a salary of 800 florins a year.¹³³ Finally, also in

1789, it was Joseph who commissioned, and perhaps suggested the plot for, *Così fan tutte*, which was first performed a few days before he died in February of the following year. Little is known about this commission, but it has lately come to light that, before Mozart took a hand, Salieri had tried and failed to set the text.¹³⁴

One of Joseph's idiosyncrasies, then, was to be an enthusiastic admirer of Mozart's music, especially his operas. But the emperor took at least two stances that hampered the composer's activity. Joseph's refusal to stage *opera seria* must have distorted Mozart's output to some degree. It was only just before he came to Vienna that he had seen his *Idomeneo* triumph in Munich. He had no opportunity to write another *opera seria* until Leopold came to the throne in 1790 and *La clemenza di Tito* was commissioned for his coronation in Prague. Joseph's policies must have had some influence also on his output of church music. Until very recently it was believed that the emperor's liturgical reforms had rendered elaborate settings with orchestral accompaniment unacceptable in church services. But David Black has shown that the position was much less straightforward. The opportunities to perform such works had been reduced, and certain services like Vespers, for which Mozart had written several settings, had been abolished. But major churches were still allowed to put on elaborate music on important occasions, composers were still writing for such events and, as we saw with Sarti's *Miserere* at Laxenburg, Joseph himself enjoyed them. It therefore remains something of a puzzle why the great C minor Mass, the only significant piece of church music Mozart wrote during his early years in Vienna, was performed only in the abbey of St. Peter's in Salzburg in 1783. Around 1787 he began to write church music again and to seek musical positions in churches. The most likely explanation for the lack of church music in his output of the mid-1780s is that he was kept extremely busy with composing and playing other types of music for which payment was forthcoming.¹³⁵

There were other musical contexts, however, in which Joseph's predilections seriously affected Viennese music and seem to have assisted Mozart's musical development and enhanced his income. Joseph was genuinely enthusiastic about instrumental music and attended many concerts. He enjoyed mounting the famous competition in piano-playing put on during the visit of the Russian prince and princess between the two visiting *virtuosi*, Clementi and Mozart. In April 1782 Joseph told Rosenberg that he wished to engage eight particular instrumentalists both for the orchestra of the National Theatre and for 'my wind music'. How far the creation of a private wind-band or *Harmoniemusik* was an innovation of Joseph's is uncertain, especially since it seems that he already had a smaller ensemble of this type before April 1782. Its main purpose from Joseph's standpoint may have been to play arrangements of opera hits to him during his meals and leisure hours. But his patronage certainly helped to make such bands fashionable and encouraged the writing of music for them, which is again evident from Mozart's glorious serenades for such forces. Zinzendorf records hearing Joseph's band play at a concert a complete opera in transcription.¹³⁶ The emperor was also more attracted by fugal writing than most of his contemporaries, though he did not go to the lengths of Van Swieten in studying the music of J. S. Bach and Handel. Mozart shared this interest in earlier music and set out to please the

emperor by displaying his contrapuntal skills. This was one of the aspects of his work that made it appear difficult to Vienna audiences. The flourishing concert life of the city, patronised to some degree by the emperor, gave Mozart many opportunities. During the 1780s he wrote sixteen piano concertos, nine piano sonatas and six symphonies for such occasions, as well as using many works he had written earlier. It is hard to imagine that anywhere else but Vienna would have brought forth the wonderful series of piano concertos.¹³⁷

Salieri's role presents a special problem, even if the absurd myth about his murdering Mozart is set aside. Salieri had been appointed Chamber Composer to Joseph in 1774, at the age of twenty-four. He was only six years older than Mozart. He proved himself capable of performing all the duties of his office with credit, often with distinction: many of his numerous operas – more than forty of them – were popular and admired, and a few have recently been revived with some success. He did not compete with Mozart in writing instrumental music. Joseph, despite his talk of preferring merit and punishing delinquency, in practice maintained the dynasty's principle of 'clemency', which included not sacking employees whose conduct was good. He also believed in the principle of seniority and in maintaining a pensionable lifelong career-structure in any permanent establishment. On this basis, however transcendent Mozart's genius was perceived to be, there was no possibility of his obtaining Salieri's job. But Mozart himself, and those who realised how superior Mozart's work was, or could be, could not deny merit to Salieri as an opera-composer. It has been shown that not only did Salieri learn from the Mozart operas he knew, but Mozart also learned from Salieri's. That Salieri had as his pupils both Beethoven and Schubert surely confirms that he was a musician and teacher of high quality.¹³⁸

So, unless Joseph created a new post for Mozart or shuffled his musicians around, there was no hope of Mozart's obtaining a Court appointment in Vienna while Salieri was there and doing a thoroughly professional job. Down to and including the early part of 1787 Mozart is known to have earned a good, sometimes a very good, income as a free-lance musician, enabling him to move up the housing ladder to a rather fine apartment near St Stephen's Cathedral. But then his earnings began to fall, and in mid-1787 he had to downgrade his accommodation. In December an amazing letter was written about his situation by none other than Haydn, to an impresario in Prague:

Scarcely anyone can brook comparison with the great Mozart. If I could only impress on the soul of every friend of music, and on high personages in particular, how inimitable are Mozart's works, how profound, how musically intelligent, how extraordinarily sensitive! (for this is how I understand them, how I feel them) – why then the nations would vie with each other to possess such a jewel within their frontiers. Prague should hold him fast – but should reward him too; for without this, the history of great geniuses is sad indeed, and gives but little encouragement to posterity to further exertions ... It enrages me to think that this incomparable Mozart is not yet engaged by some imperial or royal court!¹³⁹

This letter states the situation so exactly as we see it now that it is hard to believe it was actually written in 1787, and it is even harder to credit that in the very month in which it was written Joseph created a Court post for Mozart. There is almost no likelihood that the emperor knew of Haydn's opinion or that he would have been influenced by it if he had known of it.

Mozart's post was that of *Kammermusik* (Chamber Composer) at 800 florins a year. Of course this was far less than he had been earning in total, but it was on top of all other earnings; and he had no specified duties. Many writers have tried to downplay the significance and merit of this appointment. It is natural to suspect that Joseph was being mean, and it has often been alleged that he reduced a salary of 2,000 florins which he had been paying to Gluck, who died in 1787, to a salary of 800 florins for Mozart. But the two payments had been on quite different footings: Gluck's was a retirement pension, while Joseph was literally creating for Mozart a new post, at a time when he was trying to economise by reorganising his musical establishment because he was forced to fight a war against the Turks. He had no need to create the post at all and, if he was going to create it, he could have appointed someone else. It was officially stated just after Mozart's death that Joseph had employed him 'solely out of consideration that so rare a genius in the world of music should not be obliged to seek abroad for recognition and his daily bread'.¹⁴⁰

What has to be understood is that Mozart's music, as Haydn hinted, was generally found difficult. Joseph stated to Rosenberg as matters of fact that the singers found his music difficult and that his accompaniment drowned them.¹⁴¹ It was also very demanding of the players, especially the wind-players. Paisiello himself found that he and his fellow quartet-members could at first manage to play only the slow movements of Mozart's quartets, and had to persevere in order to cope with the difficulties of the other movements and grasp the full merit of the works.¹⁴² Hard though it is to believe now, when Mozart's music is thought 'relaxing' and suitable for soothing young children, in the 1780s it seemed complex, innovative and ambiguous. Joseph himself found that he had to listen to the composer's music 'more than once in order to appreciate all [its] beauties'. One commentator after another remarked that people were puzzled by it at first hearing. This surely helps to explain why the attempts Mozart made to find employment elsewhere, with Prince Fürstenberg and the king of Prussia for example, came to nothing. Leopold II did not favour him, and even the new emperor's liking for *opera seria* proved not to extend to his opera, *La clemenza di Tito*, composed for Leopold's Bohemian coronation.¹⁴³

All in all, Mozart was most fortunate to have found in Joseph an idiosyncratic ruler, one of whose idiosyncrasies was that he really appreciated Mozart's music. Despite the hostility of Kriebich, head of his own band and some attempts by Salieri or his fans to spoil the performances of Mozart's operas, the emperor persisted in giving him commissions. He also stood by Da Ponte when Rosenberg would have given more chances to Casti. Mozart's music surely benefited from the rivalry and emulation between composers which was fostered by Joseph's approach. One wishes he had done more still for Mozart, but it is doubtful

whether any other ruler would have done as much.¹⁴⁴ The notion that Joseph's rule was a catastrophe for Mozart does not bear examination.

If Joseph had been the musical ignoramus and curmudgeonly skinflint which some have made him out to be, he could easily have stifled the creativity and tarnished the reputation of Viennese music. In fact, however, Vienna was an even finer musical centre in the 1790s than it had been in the 1770s. Caroline Pichler, writing in the 1840s, looked back on Joseph's reign as a golden age of culture:

In social circles, instead of the previous stiffness and archaism, a lively vigour prevailed. The theatre, to which Joseph gave his personal care, did a great deal to promote this social benefit. Under the direction of the monarch our stages soon became among the best for German plays, and perhaps the finest then existing for Italian opera, not even Italy excepted; for the emperor had got to know the theatres of other countries on his travels and himself engaged the best singers of both sexes. So from our opera the second and third sopranos went back to Italy and appeared everywhere as first sopranos ...

The public participated in the theatre in a manner very different from now. It sought intellectual pleasure, not just pastime. They wanted their feelings to be stirred and not simply to make intellectual criticisms.¹⁴⁵

No doubt she allowed nostalgia to exaggerate the glories of Joseph's reign, having had the good fortune to experience them as the daughter of a significant Hofrat. Perhaps the behaviour of the young Beethoven is more telling. He came to Vienna from Bonn to be taught by Mozart in 1787 and had to return home almost at once because of his mother's death. But in 1790 he set to inspiring music an *Ode on the Death of Joseph II* which glorified Joseph's achievements. In 1792 he came back to Vienna for good.¹⁴⁶

Derek Beales

Abbreviations found in the Endnotes

ASVNV	Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Nunziatura a Vienna, Vatican
J.	Joseph II
<i>J. II I</i>	Beales, <i>Joseph II</i> , vol. I (Cambridge, 1987)
<i>JuLC</i>	A. Beer & J. von Fiedler (eds.), <i>Joseph II. und Graf Ludwig Cobenzl: Ihr Briefwechsel</i> (2 vols., Vienna, 1901)
<i>JLuK</i>	A. Beer (ed.), <i>Joseph II., Leopold II. and Kaunitz: Ihr Briefwechsel</i> (Vienna, 1873)
HHSa	Haus-, Hof- and Staatsarchiv (now National Archives), Vienna*
FA	Familien-Archiv
Sbde	Sammelbände
HPB	Handbilletenprotokolle
TZ	Tagebuch Zinzendorf
<i>Relazione</i>	Leopold II's account of his visit to Vienna, 1784 (HHSa FA Sbde 16)

E n d n o t e s

— — — — —

86. The most accessible general survey of the period's music is N. Zaslav (ed.), *The Classical Era* (London, 1989). Professor Peter Branscombe and Dr David Black very kindly read this section in typescript, saving me from a number of errors.

87. K. Von Dittersdorf, *Lebensbeschreibung*, ed. E. Schmitz (Regensburg, 1940), pp. 208-13. See my *Enlightenment and Reform*, pp. 95-6 [AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE IN THE WEBSITE]. Cf. C. Höslinger, 'Zum Musikverständnis Josephs II.', in I. Fuchs (ed.), *International Musikwissenschaftlicher Kongreß zum Mozartjahr 1991 Baden-Wien* (2 vols., Tutzing, 1993), vol. I, pp. 33-42. See also *J. II I*, pp. 316-17.

88. Cf. John Rosselli, *The Life of Mozart* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 51.

89. Jane Glover, *Mozart's Women* (Basingstoke, 2006), p. 231.

90. Da Ponte's graphic phrase is watered down to 'while he was dressing' in Livingston's translation, p. 152 (Cf. L. A. Sheppard, ed., *Memoirs of Lorenzo da Ponte*, London, 1929, p. 132.) Most of J.'s surviving letters to Rosenberg were published in R. Payer von Thurn, *Joseph II. als Theaterdirektor*.

91. HSA TZ, 23 Nov. 1783. 92. HSA TZ, 21 Mar. 1781.
93. On the general relationship between Court and public see Blanning, *Culture of Power*.
94. See *J. II I*, pp. 233-5; John A. Rice, *Antonio Salieri and Viennese Opera* (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 240-4.
95. Blanning, *Culture of Power*, p. 216.
96. On J. II's dislike of *opera seria* J. to Kaunitz, 31 July 1781 (Beer, *JLuK*, p.101). See M. Berry, 'Power and Patronage in Mozart's *La Clemenza di Tito* and *Die Zauberflöte*' [AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE IN THE WEBSITE], in Scott and Simms, *Cultures of Power*, pp. 325-47.
97. Among the huge number of works on Mozart should be mentioned Volkmar Braunbehrens, *Mozart in Vienna* (Oxford, 1991); H.C. Robbins Landon, *Mozart: The Golden Years* (London, 1989); Rosselli, *Life of Mozart*, a short book that is wiser than most of the long ones; and D. Heartz, *Mozart's Operas* (Oxford, 1990). O. E. Deutsch (ed.), *Mozart: A Documentary Biography* (2nd edn., London, 1966) is an invaluable source-book, now supplemented by C. Eisen (ed.), *New Mozart Documents* (London, 1991). Mozart's letters have been translated into English: Anderson (ed.), *The Letters of Mozart and his Family*; a selection has been re-translated in R. Spaethling (ed.), *Mozart's Letters, Mozart's Life* (London, 2000). I have benefited from conversation with both the late Dr John Rosselli and Prof. Cliff Eisen. More generally, the late Dr Stanley Sadie gave me opportunities to publish on this theme myself (see my 'Mozart and the Habsburgs' in *Enlightenment and Reform* [AVAILABLE ELSEWHERE IN THE WEBSITE], pp. 90-116) and was always generous with his vast knowledge of the subject. The late Prof. Peter Branscombe was also a constant help and inspiration.
98. H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn at Esterháza, 1765-1790*, vol. II of *Haydn: Chronicle and Works* (London, 1994), pp. 412-13 and 413n.
99. 'Bruchstücke aus Reichardts Autobiographie', *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 41 (1813) pp. 665-74. N. Zaslav, *Mozart's Symphonies* (Oxford, 1989), esp. pp. 365-76.
100. See the work of Dorothea Link, esp. 'Vienna's Private Theatrical and Musical Life 1783-92, As Reported by Count Karl Zinzendorf', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 122 (1997), pp. 205-57. On the small number of private orchestras see pp. 223-7. Dr Link has been very helpful to me over many years in keeping me much better informed and up to date on Mozart's milieu than I should otherwise be.
101. Zaslav, *Mozart's Symphonies*, pp. 398, 447 has interesting comments on the significance of these studies and concerts, but the importance of Van Swieten's patronage is evident from all biographies of Mozart.

102. On Prague A. Buchner *et al.*, *Mozart and Prague* (Prague, 1956); T. Volek, *Mozart in Prague* (Prague, 1991).
103. On Esterháza the fabulously detailed and original work of Robbins Landon, *Haydn at Esterháza*: on J. and Haydn pp. 412-13 and 413n.
104. Rice, *Salieri*, ch. 8; N. Boyle, *Goethe*, vol. I (Oxford, 1991), p. 382.
105. Rice, *Salieri*, pp. 279-80.
106. HNSA TZ, 6 Dec. 1782.
107. Mozart to his father, 21 Dec. 1782, in Anderson, *The Letters of Mozart*, p. 832.
108. Beer and Fiedler, *JuLC I*, pp. 236, 370, 400. Robbins Landon, *Haydn at Esterháza*, p. 413n., like D. Hertz (*Mozart's operas*, Oxford, 1990, p. 138), assumes that the opera acknowledged by J. on 24 Feb. 1783 was the revamping of *La serva padrona* which Cobenzl sent on 4 December 1781. Such a long delay in acknowledgment is quite inconceivable, and it makes much more sense that the score sent in Feb. 1783 which provoked J.'s request for more of Paisiello's operas was the *Barber*. In any case his *La serva padrona* was not a full-length opera.
109. A. Livingston (ed.), *Memoirs of Lorenzo da Ponte* (New York, 1967), p. 112. Hertz, *Mozart's Operas*, ch. 5, is a most interesting demonstration of the directing role of the librettist in the 1780s.
110. Deutsch, *Mozart: A Documentary Biography*, p. 267.
111. Rice, *Salieri*, pp. 331-2.
112. The three letters are printed in Payer von Thurn, *Joseph II. als Theaterdirektor*, pp. 32-5.
113. *Relazione*, pp. 454-5.
114. See Hertz, *Mozart's Operas*, esp. ch. 8; T. Carter, *W.A. Mozart, Le nozze di Figaro* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 24-6.
115. The original libretto, a copy of which Dr Link generously sent me, is full of these points. They did not appear in the London production of 1787, and they are unmentioned in either the libretto in the British Library or in the feeble introductory material for the CDs of a performance at La Fenice in 1998. There is a full account of the London version and the lawsuit to which it gave rise in C. Price, J. D. Milhous and R. D. Hume, *Italian Opera in Late Eighteenth Century London*, vol. I (Oxford, 1995), pp. 385-95. Horace Walpole knew it had parodied Gustavus III (p. 386). For my quotation and papal objections see Garampi to Pallavicini, 3 Jan. 1785 (ASVNV 184). J.'s commissioning of *King Theodore* is confirmed by a letter from Paisiello

discovered by Robbins Landon (*Haydn*, vol. II, p. 493). HNSA TZ 30 Dec. 1783 records both J.'s scoffing at these rich clothes and the satire on crowned heads in the *Poema tartaro*. On Casti Venturi, *Settecento riformatore*, vol. IV**, pp. 855-6 and nn.; Leopold, *Relazione*, p. 455, and of course Da Ponte's *Memoirs*. See my *Enlightenment and Reform*, pp. 101, 114.

116. Blanning, *Culture of Power*, pp. 432-5.

117. The French-language *Journal de Vienne*, begun in 1784, was full of it.

118. J. to Pergen, 31 Jan. 1785 (HNSA HBP). On the origins and significance of the opera see Carter, *Le nozze di Figaro*.

119. This is evident from O. Sashegyi, *Zensur und Geistesfreiheit unter Joseph II.* (Budapest, 1958), pp. 218-22, a section which is the basis of the following discussion of theatre censorship.

120. *Memoirs of Da Ponte*, p. 129; Garampi to Pallavicini, 10 Feb. [1785] (ASVNV 184).

121. In many modern productions of the opera the countess's attraction to Cherubino, found in the play, is restored, but without warrant from the libretto.

122. E.g. R. W. Gutman, *Mozart* (London, 2000), p. 650, is esp. emphatic on this point. But the only evidence for J.'s initiative is Niemetschek's memoir of 1798, which was based on second-hand information and showed its ignorance by stating in the previous sentence that 'the play was triumphing on every stage' - not in Vienna!

123. The original of this story is Da Ponte's *Memoirs*, pp. 159-61.

124. The classic text is R.R. Palmer, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution* (Princeton, 1959, 1964).

125. See G. Chaussinand-Nogaret, *The French Nobility in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1985); for the Austrian and Hungarian nobility O. Khavanova, 'Official Policies and Parental Strategies of Educating Hungarian Noblemen in the Age of Maria Theresa', in I. Cerman and L. Velek (eds.), *Adelige Ausbildung: Die Herausforderung der Aufklärung und die Folgen* (Munich, 2006), pp. 95-116. Dr. Khavanova kindly sent me a copy of this article.

126. See the wishful thinking in G. Knepler, *Wolfgang Amadè Mozart* (Cambridge, 1994), esp. Ch. 23. 127. See p. 128 above (NOT INCLUDED HERE).

128. This is the position taken by W. Ruf, *Die Rezeption von Mozarts "Le nozze di Figaro" bei den Zeitgenossen* (Wiesbaden, 1977).

129. I have found useful the Round Table discussion on the opera in Fuchs, *Internationaler ... Kongreß*, pp. 81-90. Deutsch, *Mozart: A Documentary Biography*, pp. 272-9.

130. D. Cairns, *Mozart and his Operas* (London, 2006), pp. 123-4.

131. Cf. the very recent characterisation of the opera in J. Naughtie, *The Making of Music* (London, 2007), pp. 122-5, though I would downplay the political points.

132. Deutsch, *Mozart*, pp. 299-307.

133. The argument over this appointment has been greatly advanced by Dorothea Link, 'Mozart's Appointment to the Viennese Court' [FOUND ELSEWHERE IN THE WEBSITE], in D. Link and J. Nagley (eds.), *Words about Music: Essays in Honour of Stanley Sadie* (Woodbridge, 2005). W. Brauneis, 'Mozarts Anstellung am kaiserlichen Hof in Wien: Fakten and Fragen' [ALSO FOUND ELSEWHERE IN THE WEBSITE], in H. Lachmager (ed.), *Mozart: Experiment Aufklärung* (Ostfildern, 2006), pp. 559-72, is an interesting attempt to show that the appointment was really intended to provide J.'s nephew Francis with a musical establishment. I find it unconvincing, since (i) no official or first-hand document is produced to support this contention, only newspaper comment and inferences about Francis's love of dancing, and (ii) the article assumes as a fact that J. intended Francis to be his successor in the Monarchy and/or in the Empire even if Leopold was still alive when J. died. This is questionable for the Empire and inconceivable for the Monarchy.

134. Deutsch, *Mozart*, pp. 313-14; Rice, *Salieri*, pp. 474-9.

135. This section is based on David Black's 'Mozart and the Practice of Sacred Music, 1781-91' (Ph.D thesis, Harvard University 2007), of which he generously gave me a copy, and O. Biba, 'Mozarts Wiener Kirchenmusikkompositionen' in Fuchs, *Internationaler ... Kongreß*, pp. 43-45. On some of the problems associated with the Mass in C minor Robbins Landon, *Mozart: The Golden Years*, pp. 91-5.

136. See Payer von Thurn, *Mozart als Theaterdirektor*, p. 31; Robbins Landon, *Mozart: The Golden Years*, p. 33. HNSA TZ, 2 Mar. 1787.

137. See M. S. Morrow, *Concert Life in Haydn's Vienna* (Stuyvesant, NY, 1989) and Link, 'Vienna's Private Theatrical and Musical Life'.

138. This paragraph is based on Rice, *Salieri*.

139. Printed (from Niemetschek) in Robbins Landon, *Haydn at Esterháza*, p. 702.

140. Deutsch, *Mozart*, pp. 305-7, 430, 445.

141. For J.'s statements Rosselli, *Mozart*, p. 51.

142. Robbins Landon, *Haydn at Esterháza*, p. 511.

143. See, e.g., Dittersdorf, *Lebensbeschreibung*, p. 213; J. A. Rice, *W. A. Mozart: 'La Clemenza di Tito'* (Cambridge, 1991); and Berry, 'Power and Patronage'.

144. For another argument on these lines but with some additional evidence, see my 'Mozart and the Habsburgs', reprinted in *Enlightenment and Reform*.

145. C. Pichler, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus meinem Leben, 1769-1843* (ed. K. Blümmel, 2 vols., 1914), pp. 70-1, quoted incompletely in R. Parker (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of Opera* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 109-10.

146. *Thayer's Life of Beethoven*, ed. E. Forbes (Princeton, 1967), pp. 87-8, 105, 114-17, 119-20, ch. VIII.
