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Abstract

This dissertation was conceived with the objective of considering the social, literary and philosophical forces of the eighteenth century through the eyes of Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart. The Enlightenment, and particularly in this dissertation the German *Aufklärung*, was an intellectual movement which attempted to amend many of society’s seeming imbalances, such as class structure and church authority. Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart experienced and acknowledged the same *Aufklärung*, but embraced and implemented their understanding in different and conflicting ways.

Among the issues which the Mozarts considered in relation to the *Aufklärung* were: their respective attitudes towards and implementation of education; their mutual fascination with the life and work of Christoph Martin Wieland; their contrastive tolerance towards religious and racial minorities; their patriotism and consequent desire for German institutions; and their opposing attitude to their social standing in regards to the church and state.

In looking at these issues, three main conclusions will be realised: Leopold’s preoccupation with education and his yearning to be considered amongst the Men of Letters of the *Aufklärung*; Leopold and Wolfgang’s incompatible attitude to social structure and the behaviour that was required of their respective standing; and, finally, the difficulties faced by the father–son relationship in the rapidly evolving eighteenth century.
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Throughout the long and lonely journey of writing this dissertation, I was peppered by friends and colleagues with a recurring question. The form of their collective pondering – all variations on a theme, really – related to the justification of writing a 100 000-word thesis on Mozart: Isn’t there already enough written on Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart?

My answer was twofold. Firstly, I borrowed a statement from the respected Mozart scholar David Cairns who, in his 2006 publication, Mozart and His Operas, began his book with a comparison between his subject and Western society’s unwavering attraction to William Shakespeare:

Mozart, like Shakespeare, continues to grow. His music is an ever-expanding universe. The better we know it – the more we explore its heights and depths – the more marvellous it becomes.¹

Secondly, I honestly believed that, despite the rich, voluminous canon of scholarship that already existed on Mozart, there was a void that was yet to be filled. This specific area related to Wolfgang Mozart’s relationship with his father Leopold, and how they each perceived the German Enlightenment. Their fraught relationship had always captivated me from an historical point of view. Anyone who surveys the Mozart family letters will quickly realise how the essence of any father–son relationship – notably its many sources of pleasure and hardship – withstands the changing nature of human civilisation and remains the same. In that sense, Leopold and Wolfgang’s relationship is universally relatable.

To separate this Mozart project from others, I wanted to approach it differently. The most glaring dissimilarity with most Mozart essays is that this dissertation focuses equal attention on Leopold and Wolfgang. While the usual biography centres on Wolfgang with intermittent entrances from his father, I endeavoured to examine Leopold’s life in as much detail as that of his son. While it was a constant challenge to drum up the same quality and quantity of information as that on Wolfgang, further scrutiny of Leopold’s life provided not only challenges but also triumphs. It is true that Leopold owes his place in history to the genius of his son;

¹ David Cairns, Mozart and His Operas (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006) 5.
however his enthusiasm for letter writing, provocative opinions and life-long dedication to the family’s welfare made him a fascinating subject to study. If we accept that Leopold’s life can only be validated by his son’s achievements, we should naturally also assume that Wolfgang’s genius can only be understood following the illumination of Leopold’s incessant involvement in his son’s life and affairs.

The challenges in writing a multi-biography are numerous. It can be a struggle to dedicate equal attention to each subject. The disparity in the literature on Leopold and Wolfgang cannot easily be covered. What was necessarily attempted, therefore, was to focus and accentuate certain aspects in the Mozart father-son relationship that had not previously been explored. For example, Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s mutual enjoyment of the works of Christoph Martin Wieland demonstrates that, amid a rather trying period for the two men personally, they managed to find a common interest. Also, Leopold’s life-long pursuit of an educational ideal and his ambition to be regarded as a leading educator of his age cannot properly be established without understanding the discrepancy between his and Wolfgang’s pedagogical attitudes.

The ultimate task of this dissertation, therefore, was to illustrate the movements of the two Mozarts but only in relation to each other. Even the opening chapter on Leopold’s life before 1756 and the final chapter which explores Wolfgang’s final four years following his father’s death in 1787, are written with the other subject in mind. Wolfgang’s life cannot properly be examined without first exploring his father’s rather tumultuous youth. Similarly, Wolfgang’s final years can only be comprehended following a proper in-depth study of his father’s life and death.

Another intentional feature of this dissertation is the emphasis on the historical, rather than the musical, events in the Mozarts’ lives. I have attempted to include as few musical examples or details of compositional works as possible. I did not want the dissertation to be based on autobiographical meaning in Wolfgang’s works, as I thought that would sacrifice this dissertation’s principle aim: to emphasise the two Mozarts’ non-musical influences and philosophies. Therefore, while the lack of musical discussion may be a glaring omission to some readers, I assure them that it was a necessary and intentional decision.

Before concluding this preface I would like to reinforce the purpose of this dissertation: this project is intended to provide an answer rather than the answer. Some doubt and disagreement have already been thrown at some areas of this study, and while I acknowledge the reservations of some conservative Mozart circles, I can
only urge them to remember that scholarship – particularly Mozart scholarship – is never a closed book.

As the above-mentioned statement by David Cairns suggests, the lively evolution of Mozart academia is a healthy guarantee of the public’s interest in the subject. Chapter 6 and the discussion of Wolfgang’s flirtations with suicide will appear novel to some readers. Backed by references and sources, I assure them that such an assertion becomes viable when it is placed within its context. Considering that this entire dissertation focuses on the Mozarts’ relationship and the German Enlightenment, establishing the spirit of the age or *Zeitgeist* is an essential factor in deciphering Leopold and Wolfgang’s separate attitudes.

For me, the highly spirited and deeply personal relationship between Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart is a source of unwavering interest. While it has formally occupied my mind for the best part of five years, I know it will continue to fascinate me for many more. The Mozarts’ world is understood and penetrable in so many ways, largely through their surviving letters and music. Paradoxically, however, an abundance of issues and answers remain unsolved and unclear. The lives of Leopold and Wolfgang seem well known to us, yet remain hidden and vague. While much is known about the Mozarts, an equal amount remains frustratingly undiscovered. To this, I offer my dissertation – an answer, my answer. With this, may the ‘ever-evolving’ world of Mozart scholarship continue to thrive through fresh ideas and alternative possibilities.

Thomas McPharlin Ford, 2010.
Education gives the individual nothing which he could not also acquire by himself; it merely gives him what he could acquire by himself, but more quickly and more easily.

Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, 1780

I must first become one with myself before I can be one with another.

Friedrich Maximilan Klinger, 1776

I must confess that there is not a single touch in your letter by which I recognise my father! I see a father, indeed, but not the most beloved and most loving father, who cares for his own honour and for that of his children – in short, not my father.

Wolfgang to Leopold, 1781
Introduction

In every age there seems to be an epigraph that becomes its maxim: either because it has the extraordinary potential to change the way in which the human condition exists, or because it defines the state in which human beings evolve from one condition to another. In the eighteenth century, it was a hermitic professor from Königsberg whose writing – thanks to posterity – came to define an extraordinary period in human development. In the autumn of 1784 when Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) penned his reply to the Berlinische Monatsschrift’s question Was ist Aufklärung? (What is Enlightenment?), few at the time would have realised the lasting resonance of his words. Some scholars have unashamedly reverted to his answer in their examination of the social upheavals of the eighteenth century while some critics have highlighted an overemphasis placed on Kant’s explanation.¹ Kant’s words, however, remain emblematic and generate a significant correlation with a contemporaneous relationship between an individual and his overbearing albeit loving father. Kant’s answer to that conundrum was as follows:

Enlightenment is man’s emergence from self-incurred immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one’s own understanding without the guidance of another. This immaturity is self-incurred if its cause is not lack of understanding, but lack of resolution and courage to use it without the guidance of another. The motto of enlightenment is therefore: Sapere aude! Have courage to use your own understanding!²

In this opening and fundamental passage from his answer, Kant professes the idea that an individual’s maturation from reliance and dependence is the ultimate personal enlightenment. While the answers from his colleagues Moses Mendelssohn (1729–1786) and Karl Leonhard Reinhold (1757–1823) called for a greater emphasis on enlightenment within the confines of society, Kant believed in the ‘freedom to make public use of one’s reason in all matters’.³ This is why his definition is the perfect

---

² KPW, 54.
³ KPW, 55.
overture to the relationship between the musical entrepreneur Leopold Mozart and his son Wolfgang Amadè Mozart.4

During his visit to Vienna under the direction of the Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg, Hieronymous Colloredo (1732–1812), Wolfgang became irritated by the treatment he received from the former’s assistants, most notably Count Karl Joseph Arco (1743–1830). The young composer’s resistance to being treated like a servant resulted in a catastrophic clash of social pride between him and his employers, and left Leopold fuming in Salzburg. The correspondence exchanged between father and son during this time highlights a significant rift between them, one that was never repaired. Wolfgang’s decision to leave the Prince-Archbishop’s service was – following the concept of Kant – his personal ‘enlightenment’ from not only the authoritarian management of the Catholic church and princely patronage, but also his emancipation from the man who had overseen his every individual and creative development since he first placed his hands on a keyboard.

Across the spring and summer of 1781 Leopold received a series of letters from his son in Vienna, each one detailing Wolfgang’s growing animosity towards the church delegate with whom he was travelling. ‘Today is a happy day for me’, reported Wolfgang on 9 May. ‘I am no longer so unfortunate as to be in Salzburg service’.5 With this single sentence, Leopold understood that his once devotedly obedient son had realised his independence and sought maturation in Vienna. In that letter and those that followed, Wolfgang expressed his steadfast devotion to his father, but stated an unalterable desire to remain in Vienna and – as Kant would postulate

---

4 The history of Wolfgang’s name is a fascinating one. His birth certificate states that he was christened Joannes Chrysostomus Wolfgangus Theophilus Mozart. Leopold would casually and irregularly change the Greek ‘Theophilus’ to the German ‘Gottlieb’. Wolfgang then changed it to the Latin form of ‘Amadeus’. As Wolfgang grew up he began to transform his name into numerous variations including Wolfgang Amadeo, C. W. Mozart, Wolf Amadè Mozart, or W. A. Mzt. Most common of all, however, was the form Wolfgang Amadè (or Amadé) Mozart, which he adopted just prior to his trip to Paris in 1777. Today he is known almost exclusively as Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, which was a variation Wolfgang himself used only sparingly. Maynard Solomon wrote: ‘The almost universal adoption of the form Amadeus is a posthumous process, propelled in large part, I believe, by the wide circulation of Breitkopf & Härtel’s Oeuvres Complètes de Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart 1798–1806’. See Solomon, Mozart: A Life, pp. 277–283. Wolfgang would also alternate the spelling of his surname, often signing letters as TRAZOM or ROMATZ. The rotation of letters was, according to Emanuel Winternitz, a not uncommon practice in Wolfgang’s age: ‘It is true that Wolfgang learned to use TRAZOM from his father, who, following the 18th-century custom, frequently used code words in order to camouflage allusions to the Emperor, the Archbishop, and other dignitaries’. See Winternitz, ‘Gnagflow Trazom: An Essay on Mozart’s Script, Pastimes, and Nonsense Letters’ in Journal of the American Musicological Society, Vol. XI, No. 1 (Spring, 1958) Charles Warren Fox, ed., 200–216.

5 Letters, 727; Briefe, III, 110.
three years later – to continue boldly on his way. The young composer’s declaration to his father unfolded thus:

It is always more difficult to get away in Salzburg, for there [Colleredo] is lord and master, but here he is – a nobody, an underling, just as I am in his eyes . . . Believe me, most beloved father, I need all my manliness to write to you what common sense dictates. God knows how hard it is for me to leave you; but, even if I had to beg, I could never serve such a master again; for, as long as I live, I shall never forget what has happened. I implore you, I adjure you, by all you hold dear in this world, to strengthen me in this resolution instead of trying to dissuade me from it, for if you do you will only make me unproductive. My desire and my hope is to gain honour, fame and money, and I have every confidence that I shall be more useful to you in Vienna than if I were to return to Salzburg . . . if you should imagine that I am staying here merely out of hatred for Salzburg and an unreasonable love for Vienna, then make enquiries.

The journey Wolfgang made to Paris in 1777–79 with his mother was the beginning of the end for the once inseparable father-son combination. When Maria Anna, the oft-forgotten member of the Mozart clan, unexpectedly died on 3 July 1778, Wolfgang delayed reporting the news to his father in Salzburg, instead only saying that she was ‘very ill’. His hesitancy to inform his father of the news of his wife’s death reveals an interesting side to his relationship with Leopold. It was the most traumatic and stressful event to have occurred in his hectically brief life. The strain was intensified when Leopold learnt of his son’s procrastination in revealing Maria Anna’s death to him. In hindsight, the combination of Wolfgang’s diplomatic, albeit slow approach in writing to his father in Salzburg, and Leopold’s insensitive and aggressive rebuttal of his son’s plea for sympathy concluded with the pair being left with an irreparably fractured bond. The friction climaxed with Wolfgang’s relocation to Vienna in 1781.

6 KPW, 55.
7 Letters, 732–33; Briefe, III, 116.
8 Maria Anna’s place in the background of the Mozart family is, in actual fact, in accordance with eighteenth century standards. Furthermore, this was reflected commonly throughout bourgeois tragedies (bürgerliches Trauerspiel) upon the stage. For more on the dramatic works of the middle-class and its depiction of the parental role during the rise of the Sturm und Drang movement, see Gail K. Hart, ‘A Family Without Women: The Triumph of the Sentimental Father in Lessing’s Mß Sara Sampson and Klinger’s Sturm und Drang’ in Tragedy in Paradise: Family and Gender Politics in German Bourgeois Tragedy 1750–1850 (Columbia: Camden House, 1996) 1–23.
9 Letters, 556; Briefe, II, 387.
While Leopold and Wolfgang were experiencing personal turmoil, the world around them was characterised by the revolutionary murmurs and social reforms of the eighteenth century. If we consider the period beginning with Leopold’s birth in 1719 until his son’s premature death in 1791, Europe underwent an enormous transformation from the princely doldrums of the late Renaissance, where the chastisements of important thinkers such as Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677) and Christian Wolff (1679–1754) were common, to the social and religious toleration of minorities, culminating in the chaotic and bloody events of the French Revolution. Having been raised in an environment where the ‘seeds of revolution had already been sown’, Wolfgang was different from his father. It was not until he matured as an individual that he became aware of this difference and the need to be released from Leopold’s ‘tutelage’.

The relationship between the two Mozart men will be examined throughout this dissertation in relation to the events of the eighteenth century. That is, the evolution and ramifications of the Aufklärung will be viewed through their eyes and as it, in turn, affected their relationship. Neither Leopold nor Wolfgang contributed anything original to the philosophy or principles of the age even though Wolfgang, for example, is often seen as one of the torchbearers of Enlightened thought and someone who ‘captured the spirit’ of the age. Many of the ideas that were a product of the German Enlightenment – or the Aufklärung, with its subtle variations on the French and English themes – were either embraced or refuted by Leopold and Wolfgang, depending on their respective viewpoint. Their timeless situation – a once strong father-son relationship that buckles under the weight of the son’s eagerness to gain independence as he enters manhood – is played out in this dissertation with the Aufklärung firmly in the foreground. It is not that the Aufklärung was responsible for the Mozarts’ breakdown in relations, but rather that it was an ever-present component in their lives. By examining the Aufklärung through the eyes of the Mozarts, it provides a clearer and contextualised image of the father-son relationship in the eighteenth century.

* * *

On the whole, the layout of this dissertation will follow a chronological system. The rationale behind this is that it will allow a natural progression and subsequent explanation of events as they occur. Hence, the examination of Leopold’s life prior to the arrival of Wolfgang in 1756 will appear first. This will illuminate the many facets of Leopold’s youth and age which contributed to the manner in which he treated and educated his son.

Apart from two isolated chapters – Chapter 2 and Chapter 5 – the remainder of the dissertation will unfold chronologically until Wolfgang’s death in 1791. Chapters 2 and 5 have been segregated from this sequential process because they focus on two specific issues. Chapter 2 will analyse both Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s understanding of aesthetics, and how these compare with eighteenth century norms. For a partnership such as theirs, which succeeded largely due to their mutual profession, their opinions on musical and artistic taste provide an insightful commentary on eighteenth century principles. The Aufklärer, in particular, set many aesthetic standards to which artists should adhere. The main objective of Chapter 2, therefore, is to reveal how utterly involved and aware both Leopold and Wolfgang were of their society, and how removed they were from an artistic vacuum.

Chapter 5 will concentrate on one of the main objectives of the Aufklärer – the pursuit of tolerance. The chapter will explain Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s understanding of various religious and racial minorities and how they related to them. Most important in this regard will be Wolfgang’s residence in Vienna from 1781 to 1791, which coincided with Joseph II’s reign as Holy Roman Emperor (1780 to 1790), and his pioneering reforms that were based on the spirit of the Enlightenment. Joseph’s radical approach and acceptance of the Jewish community was incredibly visionary. Wolfgang’s circle of Jewish friends during this period – a consideration of which will form a central part of this chapter – is indicative of the sense of tolerance that was surfacing in Josephinian Vienna. By including examples of Wolfgang and Leopold’s own attitudes towards minorities and social prejudices, it becomes possible to examine the eighteenth century from their personal point of view.

Chapter 1 will concentrate on Leopold’s early life, primarily from his birth in 1719 to Wolfgang’s arrival in 1756. The purpose of this is to establish where Leopold’s philosophy and standards had originally arisen. Ever since Franz Xaver Niemetschek published the first full-length account of Wolfgang in 1798, the depiction of Leopold as a learned and dutiful father has been present in Mozartian
biography.\textsuperscript{12} By providing the events of Leopold’s early life and his reaction to the many social changes implemented by the Aufklärung, this chapter will elucidate the reasoning behind his actions later on in life. Of particular importance here are Leopold’s affinity for North German writers such as Gellert, Gottsched, and Günther, and his desire to be included in the circle of Men of Letters from the Aufklärung. This, as will be demonstrated, also contributed to his life-long habit of letter writing.

Furthermore, Leopold’s instruction manual on violin playing, \textit{Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule} (\textit{A treatise on the fundamental principles of violin playing}, 1756) and his disrupted education in Augsburg and Salzburg will be explored. Chapter 1 will establish a link between Leopold’s own education and the strict, authoritative pedagogical routine that he instilled in his own children. Although the results of this will be examined in more detail in later chapters, Chapter 1 will assist the understanding of this educational process by accentuating its origins.

Chapter 3 focuses on the period between Wolfgang’s birth in 1756 and his trip to Paris in 1777. The importance of this chapter lies in its examination of Wolfgang’s education and his early relationship with his father. The chapter will conclude with an exploration of the initial signs of the animosity that eventually becomes the main theme of Chapter 4. It will also provide details of the Mozart family’s many musical tours of other countries, most notably their Grand Tour of 1763 to 1766. By detailing these journeys, it will become evident that Leopold and Wolfgang also learned from the other tangents of the Enlightenment, namely the French, British and Dutch. Leopold and Wolfgang’s subsequent journeys to Italy further complemented their cosmopolitan experience of the European Enlightenment.

Chapter 3 will also dissect a subject that interested both of the Mozart men – their fascination with the prose writer Christoph Martin Wieland, who occupied much space in their correspondence. As well as owning some of his works, the mutual affinity that Leopold and Wolfgang harboured towards Wieland is an interesting study of father and son commonality. The examination of Wieland falls within this chapter because it was during Wolfgang’s trip to Mannheim in 1777 that he met the author, which prompted Leopold and Wolfgang’s discussion on him.

\textsuperscript{12} Franz Xaver Niemetschek, \textit{Life of Mozart} (London: Leonard Hyman, 1956) Helen Mautner, trans., 13. The author wrote: ‘The comprehensive knowledge of his scholarly father was always available to the awakening genius’. 
Chapter 4 details a highly significant moment of the thesis and, indeed, the relationship between Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart. It begins with Wolfgang’s trip to Paris with his mother, who was taking over the role formerly assigned to Leopold. It was in the absence of his father that Wolfgang began to seek avenues for independence. Through the correspondence between father and son, it becomes evident that differences emerged on personal and musical matters. This chapter will specifically address four matters pertaining to the climactic events surrounding their relationship. The first of these was Leopold’s frustration at not being permitted to travel with his son to Paris. As a result, this became the first time that Wolfgang undertook an extensive tour without his father’s overbearing presence. Having his mother rather than Leopold by his side granted Wolfgang an unfamiliar amount of liberty. This, much to Leopold’s annoyance, contributed to Wolfgang’s failure to establish strong financial patronage.

Maria Anna Mozart’s unexpected death and Wolfgang’s subsequent inability to reveal the details of the event to Leopold forms the basis of the second subject in the fourth chapter. The loss of a wife and a mother left – as their correspondence substantiates – an irreplaceable void in the lives of Leopold and Wolfgang. Letters exchanged between the two Mozart men demonstrate clearly their contrasting priorities: Leopold’s urgent need to understand the measures his son took to help Maria Anna, and Wolfgang’s inability to answer the emotionally charged allegations and questions.

The third section of this chapter will be the dissection of Wolfgang’s relationship with the Weber family, with whom he desired to tour Italy. Much to Leopold’s chagrin, Wolfgang’s defiance of his father’s orders continued to weaken their relationship. As proven in their correspondence, Wolfgang’s affiliation with the Webers continued to alienate him from his father.

To draw Chapter 4 to a close, the rift between Wolfgang and the Prince-Archbishop whilst in Vienna in 1781 will be studied. Their falling out needs to be clarified in order to establish Wolfgang’s and, in turn, Leopold’s place within the context of their century. His defiant action was a microcosm of the attitude the burgeoning middle-class held towards the establishment. The focus here is on Wolfgang’s reaction to the emergence of a new, revolutionary literary movement: the explosive writings of the Sturm und Drang. This, in turn, helps to provide a context for Wolfgang’s quest for independence, his dissatisfaction with his social standing,
his melancholy following his mother’s death and, most importantly, the animosity he felt towards his father.

Owing to the plethora of Mozart research dedicated to the decade Wolfgang spent in Vienna, Chapter 6 – which details the period Wolfgang moved there in 1781 to Leopold’s death in 1787 – will, in the spirit of the entire dissertation, focus largely on Wolfgang’s relationship with Leopold. Considering the wealth of studies already conducted on the subject, the subjects of Freemasonry and the ‘Enlightened’ creations of Figaro and Die Zauberflöte will not be dissected in detail. They will, however, be discussed when required. This is not to suggest that these subjects are not relevant to the dissertation; rather, it is more beneficial to illuminate less studied areas relating to the Mozarts and their view of the Aufklärung.

This chapter examines both the Leopold-Wolfgang relationship and their lives during this period independent from one another. Examined first will be Wolfgang’s relationship and subsequent marriage to Constanze Weber, of whom Leopold did not hold the highest opinion. Leopold’s dissatisfaction becomes clear through his attempts to delay their union. Similarly, Wolfgang realised that his relationship with Constanze would fully emancipate him from Leopold’s control. ‘A bachelor, in my opinion,’ he wrote to Leopold during this period, ‘is only half alive’.

A further matter during this period relates to Wolfgang’s strong push for a German national identity. As is evident in his letters to his father and others, his desire for national institutions was sincere and genuine. Positioned on the cusp of the fervent German nationalism of the nineteenth century, Wolfgang’s artistic anguish was appropriate for a middle-class composer working in the late eighteenth century. As well as dissecting the Mozarts’ respective attitudes to nationalism, Chapter 6 will examine the issue of patronage and its relation to both Wolfgang and Leopold. While experiencing the same social events, it becomes clear through their actions and words that the two Mozarts perceived their age through eyes that were separated by a generation.

Amid Wolfgang’s highly eventful life in Vienna, it is essential that Leopold’s life not be overlooked. It is his ongoing obsession with pedagogy, therefore, that forms the third subject of Chapter 6. Leopold’s quasi-adoption of his grandson, ‘Leopoldl’ Mozart, who was Wolfgang’s nephew, is of particular interest not only for

---

13 Letters, 783; Briefe, III, 181.
the manner in which Leopold instructed the boy, but also for the plan which Leopold envisaged for him. It becomes apparent through the correspondence with his daughter – and equal lack of correspondence with his son – that he saw Leopoldl as a replacement prodigy for the one he had lost to Vienna.

To conclude Chapter 6, Leopold’s death and its impact on Wolfgang will be discussed. In particular, this chapter will contrast the death of his father with that of his mother, Maria Anna, a decade earlier in 1778. By revisiting the issue of his mother’s death – detailed in Chapter 4 – it becomes possible to evaluate Wolfgang’s evolving attitude towards death. The question of whether Wolfgang flirted with the ethical issue of suicide following the death of his mother will also be examined.

The final chapter of this dissertation will focus on only one issue, namely Wolfgang and his attitude towards the education of his son, Karl Thomas (1784–1858). It is a suitable theme with which to conclude this dissertation because of the way it ultimately illuminates Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s respective pedagogical philosophies. By realising the differences in their education platforms, it becomes apparent how contrasting and separated their ideologies had become. Also, by placing their situations within the context of the worlds in which they lived, their circumstances can be more aptly explained. The educational reforms, for example, that Joseph II stipulated during his sweeping reign, will not only be examined in Chapter 7, but will also be applied to the Mozarts’ situation.

The life span of Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart (1719–1791) covers a revolutionary period in German history. Considering this, then, it is difficult to believe that their relationship was not affected by the changing nature of politics, society, theology, philosophy, and most importantly, the arts. These two men – each one a middle-class working musician – displayed remarkably perceptive and responsive personalities through both their daily actions and their music. Understandably, the life and work of the younger Mozart has deserved and received more attention. However the significance of Leopold – both his early life and then his relationship with his son – should never be overlooked.14

14 In 1974, the historian Alec Hyatt King highlighted the need to rectify the imbalance between the two Mozarts by investigating the elder’s life prior to the arrival of his son. It was one of four areas in Mozart scholarship that he believed to be insufficiently researched. See Alec Hyatt King ‘Some Aspects of Recent Mozart Research’ in Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association, Vol. 100 (1973–74) 1–18.
1. Leopold Mozart, 1719–1756: The Making of an Enlightened Father

In order to understand the rise and fall of Leopold’s relationship with his son, it is imperative to evaluate his life prior to the birth of Wolfgang. Not only will this provide a greater insight into the background of Leopold’s mentality and methods of education, but it will also shed light on his own personal triumphs and troubles, and how they, in turn, affected the way he interacted with his son. This chapter demonstrates that in order to comprehend the relationship between Leopold and Wolfgang, the illumination of the senior Mozart’s life before 1756 is an essential undertaking.

Although Leopold’s youth contained many interesting and life-altering moments, there are four in particular on which this chapter will focus. They will not only aid the understanding of the Leopold–Wolfgang relationship, but will also show how Leopold was constantly influenced by many facets and sentiments associated with the Aufklärung. It was, as will be shown, his drive and determination to contribute to the social and literary age that defined his early identity.

To begin with, this chapter will examine Leopold’s education and the role it had in his life in both Augsburg and Salzburg. As someone who placed the greatest emphasis on education, an understanding of Leopold’s own success and failings as a student is crucial. This will shed greater light on his decision to take the role of pedagogue and why he preferred to instruct his own children - as will be explained in Chapter 2 - and furthermore, why Wolfgang eventually reverted to a formal, structured education for his own son in the 1790s.1

The second section will then look at Leopold’s influences and model of education. Considering how sure he was of the method in which he instructed his children and students – ‘You know I understand what youth is, I have studied children and young people’2 – it will be shown how he carried the philosophies and ideas of his own teachers throughout his life.

The third subject in this chapter will be Leopold’s early anticlericalism and his admiration of some of the most influential North German writers. His admiration of Gottsched and, in particular, Gellert demonstrate his desire to become a famous Man

---

1 See Chapter 7.
2 Briefe, III, 407.
of Letters, and that his interests lay beyond his immediate southern Catholic homeland.

Similar to his affection for Gellert and Gottsched was his admiration of the introspective poetry of Johann Christian Günther (1695–1723). Leopold’s setting of Günther’s poetry as Lieder explains much about the senior Mozart’s ideological mindset. As well as the poetry, the poet’s brief and turbulent life was a strong reason for Leopold’s attraction: both had experienced an awkward and unfulfilling relationship with their fathers. It is through this connection that a link can be established between the premature loss of a paternal figure and Leopold’s insistent, all-encompassing parenting of Wolfgang. The death of his father, Johann Georg Mozart, left an irrevocable void in Leopold’s life and, as will be shown throughout the dissertation, saddened him constantly and consequently affected the manner in which he treated his own son.

The conclusion of the chapter will concentrate on Leopold’s creation of his Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule, an epoch-making instruction manual on violin performance. Examining the academic approach that Leopold took with this treatise (written in 1755 – the year before Wolfgang’s birth) is fundamental in realising how he would subsequently educate his son. As someone evidently desperate to become a contributor to the Aufklärung, Leopold saw his instruction manual as a giant steppingstone towards that status. His delight when the Versuch was translated into French and Dutch demonstrates his determinedly cosmopolitan view.

Illumination of these four components of Leopold’s early life will not only form the basis of Chapter 1, but also demonstrate the overriding importance he placed on education. A similar emphasis on education by leading contributors to the Aufklärung will further demonstrate how typical Leopold Mozart was of his generation.

* * *

When Johann Georg Mozart (1679–1736) and his young bride Anna Maria (1696–1766) celebrated the birth of their first child in November 1719, the Habsburg lands and the European centres that surrounded them were experiencing a period of

---

3 See Letters, 524; Briefe, II, 335.
4 See Letters, 548; Briefe, II, 374.
great transition. The ambitious Charles VI (1685–1740), grandfather of the
Enlightened Joseph II, had been on the imperial throne for eight years. His niece,
Maria Josepha (1699–1757), renounced her claim to the throne upon her marriage to
Frederick Augustus II, Elector of Saxony (1696–1763) in 1719. It was the year in
which Liechtenstein was formed as an independent principality within the Empire and
when France declared war on Spain. The Swedes conceded the dominion of Bremen-
Verden to Hanover following the Treaty of Stockholm and the War of Quadruple
Alliance raged on for the British, French, Austrians and Dutch against the Spanish.

In the world of the arts Daniel Defoe’s (1660–1731) Robinson Crusoe (1719)
managed to captivate an audience with its depiction of human resilience and
individualism⁵, and following in the late Leibniz’s (1716) path, Christian Wolff’s
(1679–1754) controversial Vernünftige Gedanken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele
(Rational Thoughts on God, the World and the Human Soul) was nearing publication.
Georg Friedrich Händel (1685–1759) became musical director at the Royal Academy
of Music, the music theorist Johann Mattheson (1681–1764) was appointed
Kapellmeister to the Duke of Holstein, and the fourth Brandenburg Concerto of
Johann Sebastian Bach (1685–1750) was completed. The instrument maker from
Königsberg Joachim Tielke (1641–1719) died in Hamburg, and Johann Georg
Leopold Mozart was born in Augsburg.

Amidst the monumental and outstanding events that were taking place across
most of Europe, Leopold’s birth was entirely insignificant. He was one of nine
hundred and twenty four children born in Augsburg in 1719, a number that had barely
deviated from earlier years.⁶ For generations his ancestors had resided in the south
German city of Augsburg as artisans. On the Marriage Register of that city, it was
recorded that his father, Johann Georg, had been a bookbinder, and his great uncle a
master-mason.⁷ Leopold not only turned his back on the family practice of working
with one’s hands to become a composer, but he moved away from Augsburg to do so.

---

⁵ A German imitation of Defoe’s classic was published in 1779 by Joachim Heinrich Campe (1746–
1818), entitled Robinson der Jüngere. Campe was a disciple of the great educational reformer Johann
Bernhard Basedow (1723–1790) and wrote with a young audience in mind. Campe’s work was also
discovered in Wolfgang Mozart’s library: Kleine Kinderbibliothek (Little Library for Children, 1782–
1784). See Francesco Cordasco, A Brief History of Education (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield

⁶ Conrad Sprengell, “The Bills of Mortality for the Imperial City of Augsburg, from the Year 1501 to
1720 Inclusive, Containing the Number of Births, Marriages, and Burials. Communicated by the

⁷ MDB, 3.
A majority of German musicians from the mid to late eighteenth century belonged to the developing middle-class, and like Leopold Mozart, had descended from those whom Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg described as ‘honourable artisans’.  

Leopold’s early years remain an obscure chapter in the vast canon of Mozart scholarship, repeatedly plagued with misconception and falsities. Although Alfred Einstein’s famous remark that ‘Leopold Mozart is, and will remain, in the memory of posterity, the father of his son’ contains substantial truth, it also suggests that Wolfgang’s father, mentor, and most profound influence was nothing more than a necessary and rudimentary figure. When placed against the backdrop of the Aufklärung, his life becomes more easily understood, as is his relationship with his son.

Education, for Leopold, was of the highest importance and he took the responsibility for teaching his son and daughter himself. Having been bred and taught in a Jesuit environment, it appears that Leopold was eager to choose a different path for his own children. As the first in his family to be enrolled at university, he perhaps realised the beneficial nature of a worldly education. Through stern tuition and instruction, Leopold oversaw the complete intellectual development of his son, which, considering the absence of substantial erudition in their lineage, must be fully recognised when taking into account the level of Wolfgang’s genius. Leopold’s thorough formal education was something he was not willing to apply to his own children. As Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz (1751–1792) would write concerning education in his comedy Der Hofmeister, oder Vorteile der Privaterziehung (The Tutor, or the Advantages of Private Education, 1774): ‘Our children should not and must not become what we were. The times are changing: customs, conditions, everything’.  

The mentality that characterised Leopold during his latter years can almost exclusively be traced back to his youthful, impressionable years. His Jesuit-controlled Catholic education in the Imperial-Free city of Augsburg instilled within him a

---

9 Versuch, vii.  
11 Sadie, Mozart: The Early Years, 1756–1781, 14.  
12 FPSD, 3.
tolerant but conservative outlook, an attitude that was carried throughout the Mozart family’s early musical travels. His preliminary education took place in his hometown at the St. Salvator Gymnasium and the Lyceum, Jesuit-run institutions that offered the best education for Augsburg Catholics.\(^\text{13}\) It was the strict and meticulous nature of his early educators that caused in him a lifelong distrust of clerics and the papal hierarchy. When Wolfgang was in Munich in 1777 he met a fellow who recalled Leopold’s early revolt against the church and those who had classified him as fit for the priesthood:

> Ah, he was a great fellow. My father thought the world of him. And how he fooled the clerics to the top of their bent about becoming a priest!\(^\text{14}\)

Nonetheless, Leopold excelled in his education and was only in the preliminary stages of his higher learning at the St. Salvator Lyceum in 1735 when his father’s death forced him to abandon his studies.\(^\text{15}\) Being the eldest of seven surviving children, he suddenly found himself as the head of the family at the age of sixteen. For reasons not clearly documented, but presumably connected to the death of his father, he sought and received a certificate for withdrawal from the Lyceum. What he achieved during the next fifteen months is unknown – one of many ambiguous chapters in Leopold’s early history.\(^\text{16}\) Presumably, he took the year off to assess his options. Instead of taking over his father’s vacant workshop, Leopold eventually decided to resume his education. He enrolled, however, at the Benedictine University in Salzburg. It is important to understand that this University in Salzburg was the only one in the lower Catholic German states that was not run by the Jesuits.\(^\text{17}\) Considering this – and his mistrust of Jesuit officials which will be proven throughout this dissertation – Leopold’s relocation there seems more calculated than random. It has been suggested by the historian Erich Schenk that Leopold’s move to Salzburg was in response to the

\(^\text{14}\) Letters, 307; Briefe, II, 48.
\(^\text{15}\) Layer, *Eine Jugend in Augsburg – Leopold Mozart 1718–1737*, 91. The premature death of Johann Georg Mozart (1679–1736) on 19 February 1736 is a factor not usually included in Mozart biographies. How this must have impacted upon Leopold should not be underestimated. His attitude and behaviour to his own son, and furthermore his grandson (Wolfgang’s nephew), was undoubtedly affected by the absence of his own father.
relocation there at around the same time of the philosopher Rupert Sembler, who initiated a fervent and popular period of Leibniz–Wolffian philosophy in Salzburg. There is little evidence, however, to suggest this as a direct reason for Leopold’s relocation.\(^\text{18}\)

After initial success that saw him matriculate as a student of philosophy and jurisprudence, Leopold’s enthusiasm for further study apparently waned. He was eventually expelled from the university in 1739 for poor attendance. The University’s official version was thus:

Johann Georg Mozart, a Swabian of Augsburg, has from the beginning of the civil year hardly attended Natural Science more than once or twice, and has thereby rendered himself unworthy of the name of student. A few days before the examination he was called before the Dean and informed that henceforth he would no longer be numbered among the students. Having heard this sentence, he offered no appeals, accepted the sentence, and departed as if indifferent: therefore he was not called for further examination.\(^\text{19}\)

Having had musical training, Leopold assumed a position as a chamberlain and musician in Salzburg as a way of avoiding a return to Augsburg. It appears that Leopold worked hard to evade any lingering responsibility back home, as his petition for the renewal of Augsburg citizenry asserts.\(^\text{20}\)

Having abandoned his family and left his education incomplete, Leopold established a life in Salzburg. In 1747 he married Maria Anna Pertl (1720–1778) and together they formed the ‘handsomest couple in Salzburg’.\(^\text{21}\) Although it has been suggested that Leopold’s forgoing of his education was due to meeting Maria Anna upon his arrival in Salzburg,\(^\text{22}\) in all likelihood it was the prospect of success as a musician and composer that lured him away from study. Over the next few years


\(^{20}\) In late 1747, Leopold sought to retain his citizenship of Augsburg as a sign of honour and prosperity. He lied in order to achieve this: ‘My father is a still-living bookbinder, who recently sent me to Salzburg for my studies, and which I assiduously attended to . . . Out of respect for my upright old father, [I petition] to continue my nonresident dwelling and to maintain my citizenship with payment in advance of the customary tax’. Quoted in Solomon, *Mozart: A Life*, 25.

\(^{21}\) MDB, 462.

Leopold enjoyed a rise through the musical ranks of the Salzburg court, first as a violinist and eventually as Vice-Kapellmeister.\(^{23}\)

During Leopold’s success in Salzburg a survey entitled *Nachricht von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande der Musik Sr. Hochfürstlichen Gnaden des Erzbischoffs zu Salzburg im Jahr 1757* (Report on the Present State of the Musical Establishment at the Court of His Serene Highness the Archbishop of Salzburg in the Year 1757) was produced by Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg (1718–1795). Sections within the survey focused on the various musical faculties and personnel in Salzburg, and the description of Leopold Mozart is considerably detailed. This has led to a lengthy – albeit unprovable – debate on the authorship of Leopold’s entry.\(^{24}\) The small biography in the report, nonetheless, describes how ‘Herr Mozart’ not only ‘entered the archiepiscopal service in the year 1743’, but that he had also ‘completed his studies in philosophy and law’.\(^{25}\) As is proven by many of his letters contained within this dissertation Leopold would bend the truth if it worked to his favour. His assertion that his philosophical and jurisprudence studies were complete also suggests that he was embarrassed that he had left his education incomplete. Being such a strong supporter of education during his children’s childhood, Leopold’s own failure as a student became a thorn in his side. When Maria Anna and Wolfgang travelled through Augsburg *en route* to Paris, Leopold became quite agitated and nervous as to what they would unearth about his early history. ‘So nothing can be kept secret?’ Leopold barked from Salzburg, after Wolfgang had reported a chance meeting with one of his father’s former pupils in Augsburg.\(^{26}\) Leopold’s uneasiness was not at the pupil’s recollection, but rather that his wife or son might discover the truth behind the fabricated history he had been spinning for years.

Yet, despite his imperfect educational record, Leopold eventually came to consider himself a teacher of the highest capacity. The success of his *Versuch* and the talent his children had for musical performance led Leopold to believe he had


\(^{26}\) *Letters*, 311; *Briefe*; II, 52.
perfected a formula for pedagogical instruction. Even during the last years of his life, when Wolfgang had moved to Vienna, and his infant grandson Leopold Alois Pantaleon (1785–1840) became the object of his tuition, he held to the idea that he was an educator – an ‘enlightened’ one at that. As already mentioned, Leopold’s declaration to his daughter in 1786 that he had spent his life studying young people underlines his mentality.27

The emphasis that Leopold placed on educating his own two children should not be trivialised. Education was a determining factor in the course of the Aufklärung generally and, also, in the lives of the Mozarts. Wolfgang’s cool attitude towards education – which becomes apparent during his residence in Vienna during the 1780s and is subsequently examined in Chapter 7 – is indicative of how two successive generations can differ so much in attitude and principles in such a short period of time.

* * *

When considering the attitude to pedagogy of Leopold Mozart, it is imperative to understand the personal situations in which he and Wolfgang were placed at the time of Leopold’s educational crusade. From the elder Mozart’s perspective, education was regarded and subsequently implemented with the utmost care and consideration. His own premature exit from university however, may have instilled in him a distrust of formal, institutionalised education. The greatest indication of this is in the manner in which he raised his son and daughter. The cosmopolitan education that they received was a conscious effort by Leopold to instruct them in an ‘enlightened’ fashion. He embraced the honour of educating his children as his God-given paternal right. It was according to Moses Mendelssohn (1729–1786) – a figure whose writing was familiar to the Mozarts28 – a necessary responsibility of parenthood, and something that Leopold embraced both passionately and uncompromisingly:

---

27 Briefe, III, 407.
28 MDB, 602.
In one word, having consummated their marriage through cohabitation, the parents have tacitly agreed to enable the human being they produce to attain the happiness he is meant to achieve – that is, to educate him.  

It was not only his children, however, that Leopold considered it his obligation to teach. As a prospective man of the Aufklärung, he welcomed the opportunity to write a musical treatise on the art of playing the violin – Leopold’s instrument of choice. In the preface to the work, Leopold’s ideology is revealed: he saw himself as the educator of the masses. So confident was he in his ability to instruct properly, that he wrote:

Finally, I must confess that I have written this Violinschule not only for the use of pupils and the benefit of teachers, but because I desire earnestly to convert all those who, by their bad teaching, are making failures of their pupils; because they themselves have faults which they would easily recognise, could they for but a short space of time renounce their self-esteem.

Considering his own incomplete studies, how did Leopold manage to obtain such an indestructible level of confidence? How did this university dropout re-form himself into the author of one of the greatest instruction manuals of the eighteenth century? Perhaps the greatest clues are those which Leopold himself mentioned.

Routinely overlooked by historians and scholars are Leopold’s fleeting yet pertinent references to Desiderius Erasmus (c.1469–1536) and François Fénelon (1651–1715) in his correspondence. When considered individually, Leopold’s allusion to these two men seem insignificant; when examined collectively, however, Leopold’s educational agenda becomes all the more clear. His references to Erasmus and Fénelon during the family’s Grand Tour could, in fact, be seen as indications of his own pedagogical philosophy. Erasmus had written a grand treatise on the proper education for boys, while Fénelon’s Traité de l’éducation des filles (Treatise on the education of girls, 1687) was still regarded in Leopold’s time as the central study on the young female’s education. It is all the more appropriate that Leopold mentioned these two men while on the Grand Tour for he intended the expedition to serve as an educational experience.

---

30 Versuch, 7–8.
On 19 September 1765 Leopold wrote: ‘I should also like to add that I enjoyed seeing the statue of the famous Erasmus of Rotterdam (Erasmi Rottersdami) in the square of that city’.\(^{31}\) Although it was not part of any specific pilgrimage, Leopold seemed genuinely pleased to have come across the memorial and was evidently aware of Erasmus’ importance.\(^{32}\) While exquisitely executed, the statue (see Plate 1) is rather simple in style and does not adhere to Leopold Mozart’s more Baroque taste, which is detailed in Chapter 2. The delight he expressed at visiting the statue in Rotterdam, therefore, should perhaps be attributed to the monument’s symbolic significance rather than any aesthetic craftsmanship.

The middle ground between orthodox Catholicism and fundamental Protestantism, to which Erasmus adhered, may have contributed to Leopold’s fascination. Furthermore, owing to the senior Mozart’s predilection for educational instruction, it is not beyond likelihood that he was aware of Erasmus’ *De pueris statim ac liberaliter instituendis declamatio* (*A Declamation on the Subject of Early Liberal Education for Children*, 1529), which was published widely across Europe.\(^{33}\) If this were so, not only would it explain much in relation to Wolfgang’s childhood, but would account for Leopold’s pleasure in seeing Erasmus’ statue.

A collection of passages from the opening of the work by Erasmus draws a number of parallels with Leopold’s instructive ideologies. From the necessity of early tuition to the benefits of letter writing, Erasmus’ *Declamation* would have had quite a significant impact on Leopold and his enlightened agenda:

If you follow my advice, or rather, I should say, the advice of that most penetrating of philosophers, Chrysippus, you will see to it that your infant son makes his first acquaintance with a liberal education immediately, while his mind is till uncorrupted and free from distractions, while he is in his most formative and impressionable years, and while his spirit is still open to each and every influence and at the same time highly retentive of what it has grasped; for we remember nothing in old age as well as what we have absorbed during our unformed years . . . First of all, the basic elements of knowledge depend above all on the memory; and this faculty, as I have said, is very strongly developed in children. Secondly,

\(^{31}\) *Letters*, 59; *Briefe*, I, 203.

\(^{32}\) The statue itself was sculpted by Hendrick de Kayser (1565–1621) and eventually cast by Jan Cornelisz Ouderogge (1573/4–1625) in 1622. Originally commissioned in copper, bronze was decided upon as its final medium. See *Sculpture in Rotterdam* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2002) Jan van Adrichem, Jelle Bouwhuis & Mariette Dölle, eds., 140.

since nature has brought us forth so that we might acquire knowledge, it can never be too early to satisfy this urge, of which the seeds, as it were, have been implanted in us by nature, the mother of all things. Furthermore, things which are also essential to an adult’s store of learning, such as the alphabet, a command of languages, and morally edifying stories in prose or verse, are mastered much more quickly and easily at a tender age, thanks to some natural inclination, than at a sturdier one. Finally, why should children not be fit to be instructed in letters if they can be taught good behaviour at this age? What better occupation can there be for children once they have mastered speech? For they must turn inevitably to some activity or other. It will be so much more beneficial for them to combine play with education than to waste their time on frivolity.\textsuperscript{34}

Erasmus’ claim that ‘only a misdirected education ought to be blamed for any harm that is done’,\textsuperscript{35} seems a likely inspiration for Leopold’s attempt to correct improper instruction with his \textit{Versuch}. That most men, according to Erasmus, are ‘taught by uneducated or (even worse) by wrongly educated men’,\textsuperscript{36} was something that Leopold wanted to eradicate by properly and thoroughly instructing his pupils and son.

The most comparable passage between the \textit{Declamation} and Leopold’s method, however, is found in Erasmus’ introduction, in which he defines the relation a father has to his son. Erasmus was justifying a father’s right to remain inextricably associated with his son’s life:

\begin{quote}
Remember that a man without education has no humanity at all . . . When you reflect upon this, you will not allow your child, in whom you are, as it were, reborn and destined to live on, to waste any portion of his existence during which he may gather resources that will greatly benefit his entire life and keep it from evil.\textsuperscript{37}
\end{quote}

If Leopold did consider Wolfgang as himself ‘reborn and destined to live on’, then the misunderstanding and confusion which engulfed their relationship during its final decade must have been truly devastating.

Leopold was again delighted to visit another of his pedagogical icons during the final leg of their Grand Tour. This occurred in France when he discovered the final resting place of the Christian Humanist, François Fénelon, whose ‘just and

\textsuperscript{35} Erasmus, ‘A Declamation’, 346.
\textsuperscript{36} Erasmus, ‘A Declamation’, 345.
\textsuperscript{37} Erasmus, ‘A Declamation’, 298.
loving manner of thought’, according to Johann Gottfried Herder, was ‘universally known’. Leopold wrote to Salzburg in 1766:

In Cambrai I saw the tomb of the great Fénelon and his marble bust. He has made himself immortal by his ‘Télémaque’, his book on the education of girls, his dialogues of the dead, his fables, and other sacred and secular works.

Unlike the memorial to Erasmus in Rotterdam, the Fénelon tomb and bust in Cambrai that Leopold wrote of have since changed. They are not to be confused with the monument to Fénelon that currently resides in the church of St. Géry, Cambrai, for that was created in 1826 by the sculptor Pierre Jean David, also known as David d’Angers (1788–1856). Most likely, the tomb and bust to which Leopold referred were destroyed in 1793 in the tumultuous aftermath of the French Revolution, hence the need for d’Angers to create a new one. Nonetheless, considering Leopold’s descriptive letter detailing Fénelon’s canon of work, it can be concluded that his interest lay not in the aesthetic appearance of the tomb and bust dedicated to the great theologian and pedagogue, but rather at being in the presence of Fénelon’s final resting place. As will be noted in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, Leopold did not intend the family’s Grand Tour across Europe to be exclusively the opportunity to demonstrate the remarkable musical abilities of his Wunderkinder. For the elder Mozart, it was also the chance to experience the different cultures and branches of the Enlightenment, and to visit the monuments to some of his heroes, such as Erasmus and Fénelon.

The importance of the Fénelon reference is that both he and Leopold considered the education of boys and girls as equally important, a novel notion for that period. Fénelon, who saw the education of girls as a heavily neglected
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38 HPW, 387.
39 Letters, 65; Briefe, I, 220.
40 In St. Géry, there was a mural painting of The Entombment by Rubens. Considering his seeming interest in Rubens’ work and subsequent detailing of such viewings – all of which are detailed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation – it can be assumed that Leopold did not visit this particular church because he makes no reference to it. See George Wharton Edwards, Vanished Halls and Cathedrals of France (1917) (Kessinger Publishing, 2003) 81–82.
41 On the rare occasions when Fénelon is mentioned in Mozart biography, it is usually in relation to his Télémaque and Wolfgang’s opera, Idomeneo. Julian Rushton has pointed out that in a letter to his sister on 8 September 1770, Wolfgang tells Nannerl that he has reached the second part of Fénelon’s seminal work. Furthermore, Rushton highlights enough similarities between it and Idomeneo to suggest that Télémaque was an influential source for the libretto. See Rushton, W. A. Mozart: Idomeneo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 70.
undertaking, saw no difference between the sexes; it was for both, Fénelon believed, that Christ had sacrificed his blood. Leopold too, as far as can be gathered, did not differentiate in his education of Wolfgang and Nannerl. Wolfgang’s eventual succession as the dominant child prodigy should perhaps be attributed to a superior natural ability, rather than paternal favouritism, although of course, the social freedoms granted to German females during the mid to late eighteenth century were still very limited.

The philosophy contained in Fénelon’s *Traité de l’education des filles* (1687) permeated the entire eighteenth century. His groundbreaking claim was that the intellectual development of girls was just as important as their male counterparts. Fénelon explained the common argument against educating girls:

As for daughters, it is pleaded, that there is no need that they should be learned, that curiosity will make them vain and affected; that it is enough that they will one day be able to govern as they should their families, and obey their husbands with due submission. This seems confirmed by the experience we have of many women, whom learning, instead of making more useful, has made them ridiculous.

Fénelon’s instruction – similar in its proposition to that of Erasmus – was to educate the daughter as early as possible. ‘It must always be remembered,’ Fénelon warned, ‘that at this age you must not instil into their minds anything, but what you desire to last there for their whole life’.

As well as teaching a daughter to read, write and speak eloquently, Fénelon suggests that the father divulge his past experiences and allow the girl to learn from the experiences of others:

---

43 Despite never gaining the same public recognition as her brother, Nannerl Mozart did continue to perform on the keyboard. Leopold wrote to his son on 17 November 1777: ‘We are alone every day and if we go on practising during the winter, Nannerl will be able to accompany everything, figured or unfigured, in the easiest or the most difficult keys, and, what is more, with the most unexpected changes of key’. *Letters, 377; Briefe, II, 128.*
Give her an account of your past observations; and be not at all afraid of telling her of faults which, like hers, you committed yourself in your youth. For hereby you will instil confidence in her; without which education is but turned into a heap of formalities.  

Writers who explored the possibilities of an enlightened world placed an enormous amount of importance on education and its role in cleansing the prejudices inherent in eighteenth century society. According to Wolfgang, one of Leopold’s greatest maxims was ‘Learning comes before doing’ (lernts was, so könnts was). The significance of this comment cannot be overestimated. Wolfgang revealed his father’s pedagogical philosophy in no uncertain terms: that all of one’s achievement in the world would be the direct result of a fastidious education. The ‘courage’ and daring that Immanuel Kant would later speak of in relation to discovering personal enlightenment could, similarly, only be attained after a thorough process of instruction. Johann Gottfried Herder’s proposal not to ‘educate the philosopher until you have educated the human being’ is also similar to Leopold’s tuition methodology. ‘It takes time,’ Leopold had to remind his son repeatedly, ‘for a young man, even one of extraordinary gifts that he surpasses all other masters’.  

Although both Erasmus and Fénelon belonged to an earlier age than that of Leopold, their influence lived on well into the eighteenth century. Their nationality, too, seemed not to have worried the elder Mozart. This particular point is a significant difference between Leopold and Wolfgang. Leopold was certainly not reluctant to include non-German influences in his children’s education, hence the continental Grand Tour he orchestrated for them. Furthermore, when Leopold reminded Wolfgang of the benefits of ‘training your reason by reading good books in several languages’, he revealed his belief that the Enlightenment – a movement he had been so keen to embrace during his youth – was fundamentally a universal progression that was not limited by national boundaries or differences.

* * *

46 Fénelon, Instructions 185.
47 Letters, 506; Briefe, II, 318.
48 KPW, 54.
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50 Letters, 423; Briefe, II, 190.
51 Letters, 423; Briefe, II, 190. The contrast between Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s patriotic attitudes is further examined in Chapter 6.
For someone as routinely and indelibly associated with south German Catholicism as Leopold Mozart, it is difficult to comprehend that his devotion was not always so firm. The general depiction of Leopold as a God-fearing Christian derives from his latter years, when he regularly expressed his Catholicism in letters to his son. Wolfgang’s religious negligence caused his father to declare: ‘Live like a good Catholic. Love and fear God. Pray most ardently to Him in true devotion and put your trust in him; and lead so Christian a life that, if I should see you no more, the hour of my death may be free from anxiety’. Leopold’s spirituality had not always been so clear-cut however. His constant curiosity at the mannerisms and characteristics of other denominations during the family’s Grand Tour illustrates his level of open-mindedness. Furthermore, the false promise to his religious leaders that he would enter the Church also demonstrates his youthful attitude to clerical and Catholic matters.

Leopold’s most public act opposing church authority and dogma occurred in Salzburg in 1753. The scandal relates to Leopold’s circulating of an anticlerical pamphlet. The content derided the power belonging to one of the counts of Thurn und Taxis, and a local priest by the name of Egglstainer. Consequently summoned before officials of the Salzburg cathedral, Leopold had his pamphlet ‘torn to bits and scattered at his feet’. He was told to apologise to his victims, ‘failing which the author of the invidious pamphlet will be remanded to prison for well-merited punishment’. Leopold’s apparent contempt towards the count and priest is consistent with many of his other actions prior to becoming a father. Furthermore, as will be explained, his pronounced interest in Gellert, Gottsched and Günther expounds his willingness to transcend contemporary cultural and religious standards.

It is evident from Leopold’s early activities that the Aufklärer and members of the broader Enlightenment greatly impressed him. Leopold’s early studies and his

54 See Chapter 5 for more on Leopold’s attitude to religions other than his own.
55 See Letters, 307; Briefe, II, 48.
57 The brief report of this from 27 February 1753, is to be found in the Salzburg Landesarchiv (SLA), Domkapitel Protokoll, fos. 636–637. See Halliwell, The Mozart Family, 20.
58 One of particular note was the American statesman and inventor Benjamin Franklin (1706–1790). Being a collector of scientific instruments himself, Leopold thought of Franklin as the embodiment of
subsequent instructions to his children further illustrate his desire to be regarded as one of the literati or Men of Letters. Beginning in the seventeenth century and carrying on into the eighteenth century, many intellectuals used their talents as ‘poets, novelists, editors, and polemicists’ to redesign the style of written works and, in the words of historian Peter Gay, to ‘enjoy a recovery of nerve’. They considered themselves educators: furthering the knowledge of mankind through written and recorded documents. Moses Mendelssohn, writing in 1783, defined the motivation behind those who considered themselves Men of Letters:

We no longer need the man of experience; we only need his writings. In one word: we are literati, men of letters (in the literal sense of the word). Our whole being depends on the printed word, and we can no longer comprehend how mortal man can educate and perfect himself without books.

One of the finest and most respected of these Men of Letters was the Leipzig professor, Christian Fürchtegott Gellert (1715–1769). As well as being a professor of moral philosophy, Gellert was a staunch Protestant. Leopold Mozart, oddly enough, was one of his greatest admirers. Leopold’s anticlericalism may have proved to be the avenue by which he first discovered the gentle Protestant poetry of Gellert. Ultimately, he viewed Gellert as a true example of the German literati, or Men of Letters.

The social and philosophical teachings – contained predominantly within his *Moralische Briefe* (*Moral Letters*, 1751) – describe many of Gellert’s fundamental the new age: studious, inventive, original and cosmopolitan. Franklin arrived in Paris in 1776 and would have been in the city at the same time as Wolfgang. Whether they ever met is unknown. Franklin’s diplomatic sojourn in Paris was fused with friendly encounters with French *philosophes* such as Beaumarchais and Voltaire. See Walter Isaacson, *Benjamin Franklin: An American Life* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2003) 325–435. While Wolfgang was in Paris, Leopold instructed his son on recent trans-Atlantic political developments: ‘Write and tell me whether France has really declared war on England. You will now see the American Minister, Dr. Franklin. France recognises the independence of the thirteen American provinces and has concluded treaties with them’. *Letters*, 525; *Briefe*, II, 337.

60 Mendelssohn, *Jerusalem*, 75. Mendelssohn goes on to explain how this was one area that separated his age from antiquity: ‘Maybe we cannot say that they were better, but they certainly were different. People drew upon different resources, collected and preserved knowledge in different vessels, and transmitted it to the individual by completely different means. Man was more urgently in need of man; theory was more intimately connected with practice, contemplation more closely associated with action. The inexperienced person had to follow in the footsteps of the experienced, the student in those of his teacher; he had to seek his company, observe and seek him out, as it were, if he wanted to satisfy his thirst for knowledge’.
principles, particularly in relation to social behaviour and expectations. Leopold’s aspiration to be considered a Man of Letters can be traced to one of the morals described by the Professor. Gellert wrote: ‘Being prudent will make you the friend of letters and of men’.61 This statement concisely summarises Leopold’s staunch character once he became a father and the entrepreneur for his two musical Wunderkinder.

Leopold Mozart wrote to Gellert sometime around the middle of the eighteenth century. The precise date cannot be known because the letter is lost. Gellert’s reply – which, typically, was preserved by the ever–efficient Leopold Mozart – dates from sometime between 1754 and 1766. Gellert was flattered by Leopold’s letter, and returned the gesture with a note of satisfaction and thanks. The interesting part of this letter, however, is Gellert’s postscript. In it, he stated that:

Professor Formey in Berlin has a small novel of mine, The Life of the Swedish Countess, which has been beautifully translated into French, if you perhaps would like to read it.62

This is an important statement on many fronts. The Professor whom Gellert mentions is Johann Heinrich Samuel Formey (1711–1797), who gained prominence as a lecturer in rhetoric and philosophy. He adhered to the standard of most north German schools by publishing in French and even contributed some articles to the French Encyclopédie. His most famous work was La Belle Wolfienne (Beautiful Wolfian, 1741), which appeared a year after its namesake’s celebrated return from exile in 1740.63 As the permanent secretary to the Berlin Academy, he oversaw the contributions made by prominent writers such as Kant, Mendelssohn, as well as Sulzer, for whom he wrote a eulogy in 1779.64 Gellert’s offhand mentioning of Formey would not have gone unnoticed by Leopold, who maintained a lifelong interest in networking.

Das Leben der schwedischen Gräfin von G*** (The Life of the Swedish Countess of G***, 1747/8) was published in two volumes and became Gellert’s most
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61 Gellert, Christian Fürchtegott, Instructions from a Father to his Son on Entering University (Boston, 1823) 11.
62 Briefe, I, 237.
famous work. It is often considered the first substantial German novel of the eighteenth century, although historian John A. McCarthy has pointed to a long line of predecessors.\footnote{See John A. McCarthy, ‘The Gallant Novel and the German Enlightenment, 1670–1750’ in Anticipations of the Enlightenment in England, France and Germany (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987) Alan Charles Kors & Paul J. Korshin, eds., 185–217.} Nonetheless, Gellert’s work was important in establishing a moral tone which fellow Germans could follow. The narrative, as told by the Countess of G***, follows her unfortunate life as she attempts to refrain from temptation and passion. In this the novel is indicative of Gellert’s morals and would have, in turn, appealed to Leopold’s principles. It shows similarities with Wieland’s *Sympathien* through its portrayal of Platonic friendship and love.\footnote{Leopold’s affection for this work by Wieland is discussed in Chapter 3.}

Believing her husband to have died, the Countess of G*** marries his friend, Herr R***. When the Count reappears, R*** steps aside and allows the Count and Countess to reunite. Following the Count’s actual death in the second volume, the Countess does not reunite with R*** out of respect for her late husband. The Countess then addresses the reader by stating that although a reunion with R*** may have seemed the natural course, it would only ever be ‘the just reward of friendship, [rather] than the partial preference of love’.\footnote{Christian Fürchtegott Gellert, *Sämmtliche Schriften* (Karlsruhe: Schmieder, 1774) 449–450; and Christian Fürchtegott Gellert, The History of the Swedish Countess of G*, in two parts (Dublin: A. Reilly, 1755) 234–235.} Such a relationship existed between Leopold and the Baroness Waldstädten, which is further discussed in Chapter 3.

It is not known whether Leopold Mozart ever read *Das Leben der schwedischen Gräfin von G****. Gellert’s suggestion in his postscript to Leopold that he look at it is the closest assurance that he did. Owing to the latter’s admiration for the Leipzig professor’s morals and standards, it remains difficult to believe that Leopold did not at least pursue the novel at some stage. Furthermore, Wolfgang’s sarcastic remark concerning the poet in 1770,\footnote{Letters, 110; Briefe, I, 309. In a letter to Leopold on 26 January 1770 Wolfgang unsympathetically mentions ‘Herr Gelehrt’ which means ‘learned’, and how since his death the poet had not written any more poetry.} suggests that Gellert’s work may have been forced upon the Mozart children from an early age.

While not as fervent as his admiration for Gellert, Leopold’s interest in the writings of Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700–1766) was nonetheless prominent around the same period. The importance Leopold saw in Gottsched, however was not for his morals but for his use of grammar and style. What made his linguistic
technique fashionable during the eighteenth century was his correlation between correct grammar and reason, a model for any prospective Man of Letters such as Leopold Mozart.\footnote{C. J. Wells, *German: A Linguistic History to 1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985) 316.}

In letters to his publisher Johann Jakob Lotter in 1755, Leopold had become concerned over the correct use of a number of words contained in his soon to be published *Versuch*. From his letter on 9 June, it appears that Leopold was using Gottsched’s *Grundlegung einer deutschen Sprachkunst* (*A Foundation for the Art of German Language*, 1748) as a guide. He refers to ‘Gottsch: Sprachkunst p. 201’\footnote{Briefe, I, 4–5.} when discussing the use of *Stand* versus *Stande* (position), and similarly to page 285 when contrasting his use of *erforderet* against *fordern* (to demand).\footnote{Further editions of Gottsched’s *Sprachkunst* were published in 1749, 1752, 1757, and 1762, thus suggesting that Leopold was using one of the first three editions. The earliest edition made available for this dissertation was the sixth, published in 1776. For Leopold’s reference to Gottsched’s use of *Stand*, see Johann Christoph Gottsched, *Vollständigere und neuerläuterte deutsche Sprachkunst* (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1776) 230.} As well as the *Sprachkunst*, Leopold seems to have been aware of two other famous works by Gottsched, namely his *Ausführliche Redekunst* (*Detailed Rhetoric*, 1728) and his magnum opus, *Versuch einer Critischen Dichtkunst* (*An Essay on Critical Poetics*, 1730).\footnote{Briefe, I, 14.} Interestingly, the second part of the latter work contains a section entitled ‘Von Opern oder Singspielen’, which contains Gottsched’s ruthless attack on all forms of German opera. His main criticism levelled at operatic works was that they contained and promoted bad morals.\footnote{J. Birke, ‘Gottsched’s Opera Criticism and Its Literary Sources’ in *Acta Musicologica*, Vol. 32 (Basel: Bärenreiter, 1960) 194–200.}

Another scenario when we consider Leopold Mozart and the early eighteenth century north German poets is the correlation between him and Johann Christian Günther (1695–1723). Although Leopold was only an infant when the poet died from alcohol abuse, he grew attached to the works of the man who has been described as ‘a Goethe born before his time’.\footnote{Nicholas Boyle, *Goethe: The Poet and the Age, Vol. 1, The Poetry of Desire* (1749–1790) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) 12.} Leopold may very well have been drawn to a comparison of their respective lives and may have believed they shared some sort of affinity. Günther’s poetry encompasses the suffering he endured following his rejection by his father, and his failed search for a successful bourgeois existence.\footnote{Gerald Gillespie, ‘Suffering in Günther’s Poetry’ in *The German Quarterly*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (January 1968) 23–38.}
Günther, who attempted to heal the relationship with his father through poetry, only damaged the situation further because of the latter’s distrust of poetic jargon.\textsuperscript{76} Having lost his own father and left the artisan family in Augsburg in search of a better life, it could be deduced that Leopold found genuine comfort in Günther’s melancholic poetry.

All of this is validated by the fact that modern research has proven that \textit{Lieder} set to the words of Günther have mistakenly been ascribed to Wolfgang Mozart. It was actually Leopold, the research suggests, who composed the works in Salzburg in 1772.\textsuperscript{77} The \textit{Lieder}, \textit{Die grossmütige Gelassenheit} (Noble Calm) and \textit{Geheime Liebe} (Secret Love), were listed in the original Köchel catalogue as K. 149 and K. 150 respectively. David Moris Carlson suggests that Leopold may have composed even more.\textsuperscript{78} The two that appeared in Köchel’s original catalogue, however, have been definitely identified as Leopold’s creations.

Günther’s texts evoke the mournfulness for which the poet is best remembered. These two works are no exception; and perhaps shed light on why Leopold may have found some affinity with them. \textit{Die grossmütige Gelassenheit} brings to mind the image of Leopold Mozart split between his Christian belief and Enlightened liberalism. It very much conjures up the mental strength that Leopold must have possessed:

\begin{quote}
I have long maintained:
Much as everything tortures me,
My spirit is not cowed by troubles;
Hope is my shield,
And when disfavour clamours,
I seek comfort in myself and remain the man I am.\textsuperscript{79}
\end{quote}

As well as this, *Geheime Liebe* further helps to illustrate the general mentality of Leopold, particularly when contrasted with that of his son. Wolfgang did not possess the humility that his father had, nor the contentment in what he had achieved:

> What I kiss in my thoughts  
> Makes my life sweet  
> And make sorrow and time pass.  
> Nor shall anyone learn of it,  
> I shall divulge it to no one  
> But mute solitude.  

This poem is particularly relevant to Leopold Mozart and his generation. As will be shown throughout this dissertation, especially in Chapters 4 and 6, one of the greatest resentments Wolfgang felt towards his father was evoked by Leopold’s sense of contentment in relation to their social standing. Wolfgang often challenged Leopold to break the social norms to which the middle-classes had long adhered. ‘All I insist on and nothing else’, he wrote to Leopold on 4 July 1781:

> is that you should show the whole world that you are not afraid. Be silent, if you choose; but when necessary, speak – and speak in such a way that people will remember it.”

The disparity in social attitudes and the willingness to remain silent, as exemplified in Günther’s poem, was one of the defining differences between Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s respective generations.

Another *Lied* which modern scholarship has uncovered as having been composed by Leopold rather than his son is *Die Zufriedenheit im niedrigen Stande* (*The satisfaction of lowly status*). The text was written by Friedrich Rudolf Ludwig von Canitz (1654–1699). When grouped with the two from Günther, it becomes more plausible to suggest that they were composed by Leopold. The feelings of humility and modesty that underlie these *Lieder* are traits more aligned to Leopold’s generation than to Wolfgang’s. Indeed, Günther admired Canitz’s poetry, even though the latter’s work was very much a product of his student days rather than from his years as a diplomat under the Elector of Brandenburg, Friedrich Wilhelm (1620–1688). The
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reason for Günther’s, and for that matter Leopold Mozart’s, interest in Canitz’s poetry is described by scholar Robert M. Browning, who attributes it to a lack of substance in other German poetry of the time:

Between 1700 and 1719 ten printings [of Canitz’s collected poems] were necessary. Günther said he ‘found gold’ in Canitz, but it is very hard for us to do so. Flat, sober, prosaic, the antithesis of all that is truly poetic, this is likely to be our reaction. But fresh water tastes good when one has had nothing to drink but julep for a long time, and the enthusiasm for Canitz after the oversweet exuberances of the late Silesians can be accounted for on such grounds. 82

*Die Zufriedenheit* describes the poet’s satisfaction with his place in the world, and does not contain the revolutionary sentiments which can be discovered in any number of works from members of the succeeding generations. Wolfgang’s *Lieder* are a perfect example of this dichotomy. 83 His admission in his letter to Leopold dated 9 May 1781 – when he was furious at how the Prince-Archbishop had embarrassed and abused him – is the perfect example of how shifting temperaments accompanied different generations: ‘And I – endured it all,’ Wolfgang explained to his father, ‘although I felt that not only my honour but yours also was being attacked. But, as you would have it so, I was silent’ (*ich schwieg*). 84

Leopold did possess something of a revolutionary spirit, however he also knew his place in the world and would have never acted upon it. This, Wolfgang realised, was one of their greatest differences. Canitz’s text, therefore, helps to confirm Leopold’s disposition:

I do not aspire to things
That are lofty and too perilous.
My spirit never seeks to force its way
Except where it encounters easy paths.
I rest peacefully until morning,
While many a man who, full of cares,
Anxiously struggles for a vain hope,
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83 Wolfgang’s *Lieder* are given as examples of this revolutionary spirit in Chapters 5 and 6.
84 *Letters*, 727; *Briefe*, III, 110.
The purpose of discussing these poems by Günther and Canitz is twofold. Firstly, it is to reiterate that these Lieder were in fact written by Leopold rather than Wolfgang Mozart. Secondly, it further contributes to the understanding of the ideology and mentality that had consumed Leopold during his younger days. The sense of solitude, confinement, and contentment that are conveyed in these works by Günther and Canitz, are wholly more relatable to Leopold’s generation than Wolfgang’s. This is further examined in Chapters 4 and 6, when Wolfgang begins to question his social standing and becomes frustrated with his father’s compliant nature.

* * *

As it was for every Man of Letters, Leopold Mozart’s avenue to intellectual recognition was through the written word. His treatise on the principles of violin playing is testament to his ability as a violinist, teacher, and prospective philosopher. While the family correspondence contains much of his private and personal beliefs, the Versuch should be seen as the total expression of Leopold’s ideology. The eighteenth century man’s desire to publish his word was because it had become the primary method of instruction. ‘We are literati, men of letters’, declared Moses Mendelssohn, as mentioned above. ‘Our whole being depends on the printed word’.

Leopold’s lifelong dedication to the study and application of education is epitomised in his dedication of the Versuch. The work’s dedicatee, Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg, Sigismund von Schrattenbach (1698–1771), was a great benefactor and lover of music – much more so, it would appear, than his successor, the Prince-Archbishop Colloredo. Within the dedication, Leopold set out the aims and objectives of his Versuch. By doing so, Leopold set out one of his first expressions of an educational ideal. His burning desire to instruct – which was eventually fulfilled with his methodical education of his own children – can be seen here. Although Leopold’s
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86 Leopold’s reputation in the years following his death in 1787, was somewhat restricted by the enormous success of his Versuch, in that his other interests and pursuits were forgotten: ‘Leopold Mozart, in fact, only shone as a violin-player’. Rudolph Ackermann & Frederic Shoberl, Repository of Arts, Literature, Fashions (Simpkin & Marshall, 1823) 366.
87 Mendelssohn, Jerusalem, 75.
writing is unashamedly intended to appease Schrattenbach in the hope of gaining his patronage, his words were written as truth. In the fullness of time, the veracity and prophesy of Leopold’s message becomes clear. Even though Nannerl was just an infant and Wolfgang had not yet been born at the completion of the first edition of the Versuch in late 1755, Leopold wrote with great authority and cogency on the nature and necessity of education. Various passages from his dedication reflect the power of his words:

An instruction-book can, in the eyes of a great Prince, be no important work; that I know only too well; but I know also that Your Grace is in the highest degree kindly disposed towards all that contributes in the very least to the instruction of youth in the Fine Arts.

Furthermore, Leopold praised his employer’s dedication to and promotion of music, hoping it would advance the chances of his Versuch:

I may, therefore, surely venture to present to Your Grace in deepest loyalty, a book in which I have endeavoured, according to my poor powers, to pave a way for music-loving youth which shall guide them with certainty to good taste in music. Yea, I am confident that Your Grace will not refuse to extend to this, my humble effort, which I have made for the sake of beginners in music, that same gracious protection with which you have to this hour so surpassingly favoured the sciences generally, but in particular the Art of Music.

Most important, however, is Leopold’s reason for writing such a treatise, in which he notes the importance of a good education and its subsequent effect on posterity. The sign of a good pedagogue, which Leopold whole-heartedly believed himself to be, was the influence his teaching had across numerous generations. It is important to note in this following passage that Leopold strongly believed in the necessity for nurturing natural ability. The birth of his prodigiously-gifted son was imminent; but Leopold could not have foreseen the power of such pertinent words. ‘How many young people,’ he began,

often endowed with the fairest gifts of Nature, would have grown to maturity, untended as the seedlings run wild in the forest, if your right fatherly help had not in good time brought them under the supervision of judicious persons for their upbringing. And how many would have had, in the increase of their years, to famish in want and poverty and to be a burden on the community as useless citizens of the world, if Your Grace had not graciously provided
instruction for such, according to their talent and ability, in this or that path of knowledge? Young people of both sexes and of all ranks can boast of this kindness; a kindness which perishes not with the death of the recipient, but lives on in the memory of whole generations and remains unforgettable to the descendants, who can count an array of people who have remained, if not complete nonentities, at any rate unknown to fame and would have bequeathed to their descendants an inglorious name, had not the kindest of Princes grasped their grandfather by the arm and raised him to a position whereby through his knowledge he, while living, was able to help his fellow citizens and after his death still to be useful to his descendants.

Giving further credibility to Leopold’s ability as a theorist is his thorough understanding of music history. Leopold, as is evident from his correspondence alone, was no dilettante. In a letter dated 6 November 1755 written to Johann Jakob Lotter (1726–1804), the Augsburg music publisher, Leopold mentioned music theorists with whose work he was familiar. The eclectic range of names in the letter proves that Leopold did not limit his knowledge to strictly south German sources. Nor was his music theory knowledge limited to contemporaneous work. He mentioned the Swiss theorist Heinrich Glareanus (1488–1563), the Venetian Gioseffo Zarlino (1517–1590), and the more local Johannes Kepler (1571–1630), who resided in Adelberg and Tübingen. Belonging to an age closer to Leopold’s were the Bohemian Joannes Georgius Vogt (1669–1730), the Swiss acoustics expert Leonhard Euler (1707–1783), and the Leipzig theorist Lorenz Christoph Mizler (1711–1778), who counted amongst his friends Gellert, Gottsched and Christian Wolff. Leopold also referred to Johann Joachim Quantz (1697–1773), the flute composer and teacher to Frederick the Great, and author of Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen (Essay on Instruction for Playing the Transverse Flute, 1752). 88 The fact that Leopold mentioned these men suggests that he was, at the very least, familiar with their importance to music theory. It should also be noted that these music theorists were all from different parts of Europe. Leopold’s knowledge and interest in them clearly arose from their artistic merit, rather than any national or regional significance.

88 There is a fascinating story told by Quantz in the introduction to his Versuch. It relates to two father/son relationships and their respective musical destinies. The second son in the story is believed to be Quantz himself. Had Leopold read Quantz’s Versuch, which, having mentioned Quantz in relation to music theorists, was quite possible, he may have found the story relevant to his own life. See Johann Joachim Quantz, On Flute Playing (Hanover: University Press of New England, 2004) Edward R. Reilly, ed., 11–12, and P. Nettl, ‘The Life of Herr Johann Joachim Quantz as Sketched by Himself’ in Forgotten Musicians (New York: Philosophical Library, 1951) 280–281.
Another occasion on which Leopold demonstrated his knowledge of music theory and practice came when he wrote a letter to Wolfgang on 11 June 1778. Like his correspondence to Lotter from 1755, this letter details Leopold’s profound understanding when it came to music. He wrote:

There must be some good material in it [Vogler’s *Kurpfälzische Tonschule*], since he could copy out the *Clavier Methode* from [C. P. E.] Bach’s book, follow the instructions of the *Singmethode* of Tosi and Agricola, and the instructions for composition and harmony from Fux, Riepel, Marpurg, Mattheson, Spiess, Scheibe, d’Alembert, Rameau, and a lot of others, and offer them as a shorter system, which I have long had in mind.

Leopold maintained a lifelong interest in the theory of music. As well as reworking his own Versuch on numerous occasions for further editions, he continually asked Wolfgang to obtain translated versions whilst travelling. Furthermore, he read the works of others, and was always keen to obtain new music theories. For example,

89 Georg Joseph Vogler (1749–1814) first published his *Kurpfälzische Tonschule* (Palatinate School of Tones, 1778) in Mannheim.
90 Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach (1714–1788), second son of Johann Sebastian, and author of *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen* (Essay on the Correct Method of Playing the Clavier, 1753).
91 Pier Francesco Tosi’s (1653–1732) treatise *Opinioni de’cantori antichi e moderni* (1723) was translated into German by Johann Friedrich Agricola (1720–1774) as *Anleitung zur Singkunst* (Instruction in the Art of Singing) in 1757.
92 Johann Joseph Fux (1660–1741) wrote one of the most influential treatises on musical counterpoint in *Gradus Ad Parnassum* (Ascent to Mount Parnassus, 1725).
93 Joseph Riepel (1709–1782) studied in Linz and Graz. He wrote *Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst* (Elements of Musical Settings in Art, 1752–1768).
94 Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg (1718–1795) wrote *Anleitung zur Singcomposition* (Instruction in Composing for Voice, 1758). His entry on Leopold Mozart in his *Nachricht von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande der Musik Sr. Hochfürstlichen Gnaden des Erzbischoff zu Salzburg im Jahr 1757* (Report on the Present State of the Musical Establishment at the Court of His Serene Highness the Archbishop of Salzburg in the Year 1757) may have been written by Leopold himself. See beginning of this chapter for more on Marpurg and Leopold.
95 Johann Mattheson (1681–1764) wrote *Der vollkommene Capellmeister* (The Complete Music Director, 1739). See Chapter 2 of this dissertation for more on Mattheson’s aesthetics.
96 Matthäus Spiell (1683–1761) first published his *Tractatus Musicus Compositorio–Practicus* (1745) in Augsburg.
97 Johann Adolph Scheibe (1708–1776). Danish music critic and theorist who attacked Johann Sebastian Bach’s music in *Der criticus Musikus* (1737). The work Leopold referred to, however, was most likely *Über die musikalische Komposition* (1773).
99 Letters, 548–549; Briefe, II, 374.
Georg Joseph Vogler, the Mannheim Vice–Kapellmeister, whom Wolfgang considered ‘a dreary musical jester, and exceedingly conceited and rather incompetent fellow’, was a man of great interest to Leopold because of his work on music theory and as a pedagogue. Despite his son’s first-hand account of the man while in Mannheim, Leopold gave him the benefit of the doubt because of his credentials. Leopold wrote to his wife on 6 November 1777:

Herr Vogler is the person who, as far as I know, has published a treatise on musical composition. He is very well versed in counterpoint and in algebra and he has under his control the school of music or academy for young people . . . Vice–Kapellmeister Vogler must be a very clever man, for the Elector thinks very highly of him.\(^\text{100}\)

More than six months later, Wolfgang wrote to his father and detailed how he was sending him a double treat:

On the first possible occasion I shall send you this symphony and also the [French edition of Leopold’s] Violinschule, some pieces for the clavier, and Vogler’s book *Tonwissenschaft und Tonsetzkunst*;\(^\text{101}\) I shall then want to hear what you think of them.\(^\text{102}\)

Leopold did not care about his son’s opinions of Vogler’s compositions or conducting abilities; his interest lay in Vogler’s capacity as a music theorist and pedagogue.

The purpose of writing the *Versuch* – as Leopold himself would state – was to right the wrongs done by poor teachers who were ‘making failures of their pupils’.\(^\text{103}\) He had been inspired after reading the preface to Marpurg’s *Historisch–Kritische Beyträe zur Aufnahme der Musik* (*Historical-Critical Contributions to the Appreciation of Music*, 1756–1778), which stated that no adequate treatise on violin playing had been written. Seeing this void in the literature as the avenue by which to make a name for himself, Leopold set forth his knowledge on violin performance. ‘I have here laid the foundation of good style’, wrote Leopold, ‘This alone was my intention’.\(^\text{104}\)

\(^{100}\) *Letters*, 360; *Briefe*, II, 107.

\(^{101}\) Vogler’s *Tonwissenschaft und Tonsetzkunst* (*Science and Art of Tones*, 1778).

\(^{102}\) *Letters*, 565; *Briefe*, II, 398.


\(^{104}\) *Versuch*, 8.
Following its publication, the work was received favourably. Marpurg himself, who had originally requested such a treatise to be written, presented the most glowing report:

A work of this kind has long been wished for, but one had hardly dared to expect it. Those who are most adept at wielding the bow are not always in control of the pen, and the few who possess equal facility in both often lack the will to write . . . How much the greater, then, is our obligation towards the author of the present work. The thorough and accomplished virtuoso, the reasonable and methodical teacher, the learned musician – these characteristic, each of which alone makes a man of merit, are all here revealed in one . . . [Leopold Mozart] never fails to support his precepts with the most convincing reasons, and all rules are duly exemplified. What the famous Geminiam [sic] was able to do for the English nation, the excellent Mozart has done for us Germans, and in providing us with a work of this nature has proved himself worthy of general approbation.  

In addition, Leopold was asked by Marpurg, on behalf of his *Kritische Briefe über die Tonkunst* (*Critical Letters on Tonal Art*, 1759–1763), whether he would participate in a musical periodical based in Berlin. ‘The society is minded to publish its periodical articles in the form of letters’, wrote Marpurg, ‘and it proposes to take the liberty of addressing its letters to persons of merit, insight and taste. Could the aforesaid, in the endeavour, sir, make a more auspicious beginning than with you?’  

Leopold’s subsequent non-participation in this periodical is perplexing considering his desire to be included amongst other Men of Letters. Nannerl Mozart’s claim that following Wolfgang’s birth in 1756 her father ‘entirely gave up his violin–instruction and his composing so as to devote all the time remaining to him after his princely duties, to the education of his two children’, is known not to be entirely accurate. In the wake of his children’s births, Leopold’s fatherly duty may have decided his immediate future. Leopold’s moral compass, however, remained heavily guided by Gellert, whom he greatly admired. For it was Gellert, in his *Moralische Briefe*, who declared that the ultimate concern for a father was to take care of his children’s welfare and their education:

---

105 Francesco Geminiani (1687–1762) was born in Lucca, Italy. He spent the greater part of his working life in London, however. It was there that his *Art of Playing the Violin* was published in 1751.  
106 *MDB*, 10.  
107 *MDB*, 11.  
108 Leopold continued to instruct other pupils right up until shortly before his death. See *Letters*, 803.
Let us esteem ourselves happy if we have received a good education; but let us remember at the same time, we shall be highly culpable if we do not impart it to those who derive their excellence from us, or who are confined to our care. If education is the essential duty of parents, let them humbly implore the blessing of heaven, not trusting to their own understandings.  

1756 was, therefore, an ultimately defining year for Leopold Mozart. Not only was his *Versuch* published, but his second surviving and final child, Wolfgang, was born. These two events marked the beginning and the end for the aspiring Man of Letters and pedagogue. On the one hand, his highly acclaimed treatise on violin playing was the culmination of his desire to be recognised amongst men of the *Aufklärung*, such as Gellert and Gottsched. On the other hand, his fatherly duties limited his multifarious interests, and consequently redirected his focus to the education of his children. Leopold’s inclination to produce a musical theory treatise to supplement his *Versuch* was never far from his mind. One of the defining reasons why this never materialised, however, it must be concluded, was that following Wolfgang’s birth in 1756, the pedagogical requirements of his children superseded any lingering aspiration to be a recognised Man of Letters.

---


110 *Letters*, 548–549; *Briefe*, II, 374, and *Versuch*, 225.
2. The Mozarts’ Taste: Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s aesthetic perception of their world.

In order to comprehend the social environment in which Leopold and Wolfgang found themselves during the second half of the eighteenth century, it is imperative to examine external influences. In particular, the aesthetic and artistic interpretations of the Aufklärer will demonstrate how similarly receptive the two Mozarts had become. For not only were they professional artists who were required to adhere to stylistic and aesthetic norms, they were also, as their correspondence attests, avid chroniclers of the political and social situation which surrounded them. How, therefore, did the aesthetic principles of Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart conform to or differ from those of the Aufklärung?

The first area of study in this chapter will be Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s general aesthetic appreciation of the world around them. Specifically, this will include their opinions on cities, architecture, paintings, sculpture, and other forms of art. Leopold, in particular, was an avid admirer of other arts, and would only discuss his thoughts on them when he could dedicate the time and energy he believed they deserved: ‘I refuse to say anything about the churches, the paintings, the fine architecture (schöne Baukunst) and the furnishings of the various places, for indeed I can hardly write for drowsiness, as it is past one o’clock’.¹

By comparing the aesthetics of Leopold and Wolfgang to those espoused by the commentators of the Aufklärung, the extent to which they were emblematic of their age becomes clear. Through the correspondence, it similarly becomes apparent just how Wolfgang’s views on art differed from those of his father.

To continue the examination from Chapter 1, this chapter will look further into Leopold’s Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule. Specifically related to this chapter will be the aesthetic embedded in Leopold’s treatise, and how this impacted on his son. Leopold’s self-assured pedagogy leaves the Versuch as the greatest example of his philosophical and practical instruction. By using examples from his Versuch, Leopold’s place within the Aufklärung can be understood and appreciated.

The Mozarts’ theories relating to music form the third and fourth sections of the present chapter. Given that their gainful employment depended on their musical

¹ Letters, 124; Briefe, I, 328.
output, it was only natural that the Mozart men, through their lively correspondence, detailed their thoughts and ideas on music. Wolfgang’s letters to his father, in particular, were used as a sounding board for suggestions and ideas relating to his compositions. Leopold, in turn, offered his own opinion on the matter. These exchanges of musical ideas were particularly fruitful during Wolfgang’s relocation to Vienna in the early 1780s. Although his employment situation was disappointing, Wolfgang’s musical creations did not suffer. His correspondence with Leopold displays a young composer with a plethora of musical and idealistic thoughts. Additionally, it was specifically during the composition of operas that lively discussions between father and son ensued. Wolfgang’s deeply rooted passion for opera – ‘my greatest desire is to write operas’ –2 led him constantly to seek and perfect this craft. The discussion of opera aesthetics, therefore, was a perennial topic in his correspondence.

With Leopold’s desire to be considered a Man of Letters, and his son, Wolfgang, flourishing as a musical composer at the very heart of the Josephinian Aufklärung, their short and generally unambiguous correspondence clearly reflected the age in which they lived.

* * *

In the first of his two-volume interpretation of the Enlightenment, historian Peter Gay observed that the eighteenth century collectively looked to the ancient world for intellectual, political, and spiritual guidance.3 According to Gay, it was antiquity’s preoccupation with matters of taste that particularly gratified the minds of eighteenth century intellectuals. Considering this, it is interesting to note the opinion of Wolfgang’s near contemporary, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832). He went to great lengths to justify works of art from the ancient world, declaring that there is much to be learnt from that monumental period in western culture:

The clarity of the view, the serenity of the perception, the ease of communication – that is what delights us! And if we now say that we find all that in genuine Greek works which

---

2 Letters, 462; Briefe, II, 254.
represent the noblest subjects, have the most worthy content and are executed to utmost perfection – then it will be understood why we always begin with them and end with them.

Let everyone be a Greek in his own way, but let him be a Greek!"4

Goethe’s proposition – that contemporary society imitate the supposedly flawless and idyllic system of life in antiquity– was embraced by many artists of the eighteenth century. But even earlier, the pessimistic Johann Gottfried Herder acknowledged a correlation in art between the ancient and modern worlds, noting the effectiveness of ancient Greek drama, song, and dance. ‘Reason often puts an end to the role of feeling’, he declared, ‘[but] do not the loftiest thunders of oratory, the mightiest strikes of poetry, and the magical moments of accompanying gesture still often come close to this language of nature, through imitation’?5

The Aufklärer were for the most part united in their admiration for the civilisations of ancient Greek and Rome. Frederick II declared in 1775 that ‘taste will only spread in Germany after careful study of the classic writers, Greek as well as Roman and French’.6 Christoph Martin Wieland, the writer with whom the Mozarts felt a strong affinity and who placed many of his treatises in ancient settings, thought that those contemporaries drawing direct parallels between modern and ancient worlds were greatly mistaken. He believed that gentle imitation rather than a blatant reconstruction of antiquity was what was required:

But we must confess, the ages of Platos, Xenophons, and Plutarchs are past, and the time is vanished, when, instead of pedantry, they selected those sublime spirits for matters, who drew their wisdom from the purest sources, proclaimed and inspired the love of truth, and of great actions, which have become almost foreign among us. Yes, those happy days are vanished. And to complete our misfortune, our modern sophists – our self-opinionated witlings, are dazzled to such a degree, as only to converse about enlightened times, and look upon the great geniuses of antiquity, from the summit of their towering collections, with a stupid disdain – They are not aware, that those of their cast would scarcely have been serviceable, as copyists, in the time of Plato.7

The above passage comes from Sympathien, a philosophical work that Wieland completed in 1756 – the year Wolfgang Mozart was born. Leopold Mozart

4 GCW, III, 93.
5 HPW, 73.
6 Documents, 176.
7 Christoph Martin Wieland, Sympathien (London: Byfield and Hawksworth, 1795) 143–44.
commented on it in a letter written on 13 September 1782 to the Baroness von Waldstädten (1744–1811); he fleetingly disclosed his own literary and philosophical attitude:

It is impossible for me to describe to your Ladyship my heartfelt pleasure on reading your charming and flattering letter. It reminded me, as I read it, of Wieland’s Sympathies. It is undoubtedly true that many people are blessed with a higher plane of thought and unconsciously dwell together in a secret spiritual union before they have ever seen or spoken to one another. Good books and music are your Ladyship’s occupation and entertainment. They are also mine.  

Despite their many differences in literary and artistic taste, Leopold and Wolfgang shared an admiration for Wieland and an appreciation of his writings. Amongst the books in Wolfgang’s personal library at the time of his death were two of Wieland’s works: the enormous poem *Oberon* (1780) and the Greek setting *Die Dialogen des Diogenes von Sinope* (1770).

In addition, Wolfgang’s library contained a few publications which suggest the reverence the Aufklärer had for antiquity had not escaped his own attention: a German translation of Ovid’s *Tristia* (1758), Heinrich Braun’s 1776 treatise on mythology, and *Opere* by Pietro Metastasio (1698–1782), whose libretti on ancient themes Wolfgang set to music numerous times, including *Il sogno di Scipione*, *Il rè pastore*, and *La clemenza di Tito*. This apparent symmetry between the Enlightened times in which the Mozarts lived and the idyllic age of antiquity was noted by the composer Robert Schumann. In 1833 he wrote: ‘Clarity, repose, grace, the distinguishing mark of the artworks of antiquity, are also those of the Mozartian school’.

For Leopold and his son the interpretation of artistic ideals was a constant struggle, one that is played out in their correspondence. Just as antiquity was a model

---

9 A detailed analysis of the Wieland–Mozart relationship is provided in Chapter 3.
10 As was his style, Wolfgang mocked ancient civilisation in one of his youthful and jocular letters to his cousin, the ‘Bäisle’. In it, he refers to Codrus (c.1089–1068 B.C.), the last of the legendary kings of Athens, as a ‘wise philosopher’ who ate ‘soot instead of porridge’; he described the ancient Romans as the ‘props of my arse’ who ‘have always been and ever will be half-castes’. Not only do these sentences demonstrate his determination to make light of any subject, but that he had some historical awareness. Letters, 372; Briefe, II, 122.
source of inspiration and influence for many of the Aufklärer, so too did the Mozarts seek a guiding light in establishing principled theories in art, literature, and music. Their references to aesthetics – from Roman literature to the social commentary of Wieland – entirely reflect not only what they considered tasteful and important, but what the Aufklärer at large were exploring and writing about.

Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s aesthetic opinions of the world around them appear sporadically throughout their correspondence. It was their thoughts on architectural design, however, that produced the most fervent discussions. This was a common and popular debate amongst some of the leading commentators of the age. In his treatise Über die Hauprprinzipien der Schönen Kunst und Wissenschaft (On the main principles of the fine arts and sciences), included in his Philosophische Schriften (Philosophical Writings, 1761), for example, Moses Mendelssohn described the objective of an architect:

> Splendid buildings show the wealth, the dignity, and the comfort of their proprietors. Everything must have the look of splendour, comfort, and solidity since this actually is the ultimate purpose of a building.\(^ {12}\)

Comparably, Johann Joachim Winckelmann’s (1717–1768) comment the following year in his Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten (Observations on the Architecture of the Ancients, 1762) revealed the mentality of neo-Classicists, who considered architecture as an important and often innovative art form:

> A building without decoration is like health in a state of poverty, which nobody regards as being fortunate; and sameness or monotony can be a defect in architecture as in writing and other works of art.\(^ {13}\)

While the definitions made by the Aufklärer may appear quite straightforward, they are summations that facilitate a greater insight into Mozartian aesthetics. Throughout their extensive travels, Leopold and his son commented quite regularly on the appearance of various towns and cities. Although their commentary is fleeting, it can help us determine what they actually considered tasteful. For instance, a letter written

\(^{12}\) MPW, 180.

by Wolfgang to his mother and sister in 1770 demonstrates the fourteen-year-old’s ability to recognise style and taste: ‘I only wish that my sister were in Rome,’ he wrote, ‘for this town would certainly please her, as St. Peter’s church and many other things in Rome are regular’.\textsuperscript{14} By ‘regular’ (Regulair) Wolfgang was alluding to the similarity in architectural style between Rome and his hometown of Salzburg.\textsuperscript{15}

Leopold appears to have had a strong distaste for architecture of the age immediately preceding that of the Baroque, noting the unappealing appearance of a number of towns. During the family’s Grand Tour of 1763–66, for example, he hastened to write of his distaste for Gothic buildings and the towns surrounding them. After leaving Ulm on 6 July 1763, he wrote to his Salzburg confidante Lorenz Hagenauer of the ‘dreadful, old fashioned place’ that had been built in ‘bad taste’. Again, only a month later, he lamented how Worms was so ‘old fashioned’. As the historian Robert W. Gutman suggests, as ‘a son of Augsburg and resident of Salzburg, cities transformed by the Renaissance and the Baroque, he loathed Ulm’s crooked streets and half-timbered houses: the mystery and capricious fantasy of the Gothic offended this modern man with his Enlightened yearning for order, balance, and a vocabulary of ornament speaking the architectural language of ancient Rome’.\textsuperscript{16} On reaching the Eternal City in 1770, Leopold gleefully reported on Rome’s abundance of beautiful architecture: ‘we shall certainly not neglect anything that should be seen in Rome’.\textsuperscript{17}

Leopold’s dislike for Gothic architecture is confirmed when he left the enormous – albeit unfinished – Cologne Cathedral with nothing to say other than that it was a ‘dirty Cathedral’. Incidentally, writing many years later, Goethe recalls how the fragmentary exterior of the Cathedral left him feeling similarly disconcerted:

\begin{quote}
I must admit that seeing the exterior of the Cologne Cathedral aroused a certain apprehension in me that I could not explain. A significant ruin has a venerable quality, and we sense and actually see in it the conflict between a noble work of man, and time that with silent force spares nothing. Here, on the other hand, we are confronted with an edifice which is unfinished
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{14} Letters, 128; Briefe, I, 336. The following sentence of this letter further exposes Wolfgang’s early sensory ability: ‘The most beautiful flowers are now being carried past in the street’.


\textsuperscript{16} Gutman, Mozart: A Cultural Biography, 93–94.

\textsuperscript{17} Letters, 127; Briefe, I, 335.
and prodigious, and precisely its incompleteness reminds us of man’s insufficiency when he attempts the colossal.

Unlike Leopold’s impression concerning the cathedral, however, Goethe’s anxiety was fleeting. Once he had forgotten the harsh exterior, he embraced a particular component of the interior because of its balance and clarity:

Even the interior of the cathedral, although impressive, frankly strikes us as inharmonious. Only when we enter the completed choir do we encounter a surprising harmony. Then we are happily amazed, then we are joyously startled and experience a sense of complete fulfilment.  

Wolfgang inherited his father’s habit of detailing the architectural splendour that he witnessed. Just as Leopold had done during the family’s early travels, Wolfgang voiced his topographical or architectural opinion of the town which he was visiting. Whilst in Kaisheim  in the winter of 1778, Wolfgang sent a letter to his father that demonstrates his aesthetic judgment. He wrote:

Now for my cloistered life. The monastery itself has made no great impression on me, for once you have seen the Abbey of Kremsminster, well . . . ! – But of course I am only speaking about the exterior and what they call here the court – for I have yet to see the most famous part.

The difference in architectural design between these two sacred buildings once again demonstrates the Mozarts’ preference for Baroque rather than Gothic construction. In 1790, more than a decade later, Wolfgang’s attitude to these differences had not wavered. Writing to Constanze in a precise but descriptive manner from Frankfurt am Main where he was attending the coronation of Leopold II, he again referred to his architectural taste: ‘We breakfasted at Nuremberg, a hideous town. At Würzburg, a fine, magnificent town, we fortified our precious stomachs with coffee’. Nuremberg and Würzburg are perfect examples of the Gothic and Baroque styles respectively.

---

18 GCW: III, 12.
19 Kaisheim is approximately 30 miles north-west from Augsburg.
20 Letters, 641; Briefe, II, 522. The ‘famous’ part to which Wolfgang refers may be the observatory that was built by Abbot Alexander Fixmüllner (1731–1759). It would have been of great interest to Leopold who had a particular Enlightenment fascination for scientific instruments.
21 Letters, 942; Briefe, IV, 113.
Writing as a young, impressionable man in 1772, Wolfgang’s contemporary Goethe recalled how his distaste for Gothic architecture evolved and, eventually, dissolved. On viewing Strasbourg Cathedral: ‘I listed all the synonymous misconceptions that I had ever encountered, such as indefinite, disorganised, unnatural, patched-together, tacked-on, overlaid. No wiser than a nation which calls the world it does not know barbaric, I called everything which did not fit into my system Gothic’. However unlike the Mozarts who appear to have had an established and clear-cut definition of architectural magnificence, Goethe’s appreciation was subject to change:

But what unexpected emotions seized me when I finally stood before the edifice! My soul was suffused with a feeling of immense grandeur which, because it consisted of thousands of harmonising details, I was able to savour and enjoy, but by no means understand and explain . . . How fresh was its radiance in the misty shimmer of morning light, how happily I stretched out my arms toward it and looked at the vast, harmonious masses animated by countless components! As in the works of eternal nature, down to the smallest fibre, all is form, all serves the whole. How lightly the immense firmly-grounded edifice soars in the air, how like filigree everything is, yet made for eternity! I owe it to your instruction, noble genius, that I no longer reel when confronting your profundities, that my soul is touched by the blissful calm of a spirit who can look down on such a creation and say, as did God, ‘It is good!’

Although neither of the Mozarts ever recorded a similar stimulation of the mind, Goethe’s epiphany in Strasbourg embodies the spirit of an Aufklärung ‘awakening’. The Mozarts held the more common of enlightened attitudes in matters of architectural design, preferring modern elegance and splendour to the archaic and gothic. It was a case of aesthetics reflecting common sense and reason, according to Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700–1766), who stated that ‘Taste (Geschmack) must conform to the rules of reason, otherwise it is nonsensical. If this were not so, then even Gothic architecture would have just as much beauty as the ancient Greek and Roman (die alte Griechische und Römische)’.

22 GCW: III, 5.
23 Goethe is referring to Erwin von Steinbach (c.1244–1318), whom he believed to have been the sole architect of the cathedral. The above passage comes from Goethe’s Von deutscher Baukunst (On German Architecture, 1772), which he wrote in honour of Steinbach’s work.
24 GCW, III, 6.
25 Johann Christoph Gottsched, Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit, III, 12 (Leipzig, 1735) 614.
In contrast to their references to city and building design, the Mozarts did not comment as frequently on the visual arts. Leopold methodically reported images or objects that were of interest to him during the family’s early journeys, whereas Wolfgang’s opinion concerning visual art is almost entirely unknown. One of Wolfgang’s brief references to a painting comes from a letter written to Leopold on 23 September 1777. When a carrier came to the lodge in which he and his mother were staying, he answered the door with ‘my most serious air, looking just as I do in my portrait’. The portrait to which he refers was by an unknown artist and was completed only months before in Salzburg. In it, Wolfgang is wearing the insignia of the Order of the Golden Spur that Pope Clement XIV had presented to him in Rome on 5 July 1770. This brief comment is Wolfgang’s solitary reference to any form of painting and his interest was presumably only because he was the subject.

The elder Mozart, on the other hand, wrote more than his son about the visual arts. Leopold was only too aware of the importance that the Aufklärung attached to artistic judgement. One such example of Leopold’s perspective came during the final months of their Grand Tour from 1763–66. Whilst in Belgium, Leopold took particular interest in the collections on display:

A great deal could be said here about the best of the pictures. Antwerp especially is the place for these. We have been to all the churches and I have never seen more black and white marble and such a wealth of excellent paintings, especially by Rubens, as I have seen here and in Brussels; above all, his ‘Descent from the Cross’ in the great church in Antwerp surpasses everything one can imagine.

Insights such as these are particularly useful in examining not only Leopold’s aesthetic appreciation but his religious philosophy as well. His affection for the work of the early seventeenth century Flemish painter Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640) is clear; the magnificence of the ‘Descent from the Cross’ made a lasting impression. The painting (see Plate 2) is typically Rubens-esque in its energetic and flamboyant depiction of the Biblical scene, characterised by the subtlety of light and application of bright colours. Leopold saw in it the majestic Catholicity of which he was so proud. Historian Richard Avermaete asserts that the seemingly Catholic nature of

26 Letters, 272; Briefe, II, 7.
27 Letters, 58–59; Briefe, I, 202–03.
Rubens’ work was simply an artistic structure that Rubens had obeyed. Leopold, who often saw himself as a Catholic crusader, embraced Rubens’ ostentatious style and imagery. Unlike architecture, he granted art more liberties: the permission to pass beyond the realm of reason.

Whilst in Brussels during the first part of their Grand Tour, the Mozart family stayed with Prince Charles of Lorraine (1712–1780), younger brother of Emperor Francis I, in the ‘Hôtel D’Angleterre’. During their stay in the city Leopold was delighted to find an eclectic collection of science and artwork, including more Rubens:

Quantities of white and black marble and brass and the paintings of the most famous artists are to be found here in the churches in great numbers. Day and night I have before my eyes that picture of Rubens, in the big church, in which Christ in the presence of the other apostles hands the keys to Peter. The figures are life-size. In Prince Karl’s rooms I found not only beautiful Dutch tapestries and paintings, but also a room with original Chinese statues, porcelain, figures and various rare pieces; above all there was a room filled with an indescribable quantity of all kinds of natural history specimens. I have seen many such collections; but it would be difficult to find such a quantity and so many species.

Leopold’s appreciation for the many forms of art that were on display in Brussels reveals his propensity to be open-minded in relation to fine art. His fastidiousness vis-à-vis correct architecture appears to have no correlation with any of the other artistic genres. The common and well-worn argument that Leopold was narrow-

28 Roger Avermaete, Rubens and his Times (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1968) Christine Trollope, trans., 208. Avermaete concluded that Rubens ‘has been called a religious painter, which he is if we confine ourselves to externals, but not if we take the word in its deepest sense. He was often a Catholic painter, giving strict obedience to the rules laid down by the Council of Trent, which insisted on works lofty in style, capable of inspiring noble sentiments in those who saw them, and refuting, by means of eye-catching images, certain affirmations of the Protestants’.
29 Letters, 65; Briefe, I, 221. Leopold wrote on 16 May 1766: ‘My dear Hagenauer, we met in Amsterdam a native of Salzburg who owing to certain circumstances had become a Calvinist. My most urgent desire was to lead him back to the right path. I made every effort’.
30 Letters, 30; Briefe, I, 106–07.
31 Leopold’s interest in Chinese culture was not atypical of an Enlightened individual. The end of the seventeenth century witnessed an explosion in curiosity about China and the East in general. In particular, Leibniz and Wolff were interested in such exotic ideas. Leibniz wrote On the Civil Cult of Confucius (1700) and Discourse on the Natural Theology of the Chinese: Letter to Nicolas Rémond (1716); Wolff wrote Discourse on the Practical Philosophy of the Chinese (1721). Confucius’ philosophy, especially, was viewed ‘as a moral and political system which had positively shaped China for millennia and was potentially a model for all mankind. Such a perspective remained highly problematic, though, a from a Christian and moderate Enlightenment viewpoint, owing to its obvious and many worrying implications for morality, social theory, revealed religion, and education’. Jonathan I. Israel, Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670–1752 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) 642.
minded and naïve can surely be dispelled if one considers his artistic interests overall. Grouping them with his fascination for literature, science and philosophy, it becomes clear that Leopold’s aesthetic appreciation was as fervent as any Enlightened individual of his generation.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, Leopold’s treatise on the art of playing the violin was published in the year of Wolfgang’s birth and became his greatest contribution to his art. Although the *Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule* is primarily concerned with the violin – which was Leopold’s instrument of choice – it is a fine contribution to musical knowledge in general, and is a lasting testament to Leopold’s own aesthetic judgement and understanding. The *Versuch*, according to historian Hermann Abert, must be held in great esteem because it provides an indelible link between father and son: ‘These are also the principles according to which Leopold brought up his own son. We have every reason to be grateful to him for this, too, for it was to this upbringing that Wolfgang owed his lofty and pure conception of art’.33

In tune with the admiration the Aufklärer held for ancient civilisation, Leopold acknowledged antiquity’s musical understanding. However, he scoffed at its level of consistency and annotation. ‘In ancient music’, he wrote,

> there were conflicting methods of notation, so that everything was in great confusion. They signified time by whole circles and half circles which were sometimes cut through, sometimes turned around, and sometimes distinguished by a dot inside or outside. As, however, it no longer serves any purpose to scribble down their poor, obsolete stuff, amateurs are referred to the ancient writings themselves.34

Leopold provided his readers with a brief yet adequate introduction to the history of notation. His willingness to highlight some of antiquity’s failings – or in other words,

---

33 Abert, *W. A. Mozart*, 17.
34 *Versuch*, 31.
their incomplete musical system – is again consistent with the opinion of his idol, Wieland.\(^3^5\)

Furthermore, he stressed the importance of timing, phrasing and the comprehension of musical theory. The distinct labelling of ‘teacher’ and ‘beginner’ evokes imagery of Leopold educating Wolfgang (and Nannerl) a few years later during their early musical training.\(^3^6\) Leopold’s belief was that education from the earliest possible age had lifelong benefits. He wrote:

> Many a time the parents or other guardians wish to hear that sort of untimely little dance at an early stage and then think miracles have happened, and how well the money for the lessons has been spent. But alas! How greatly they deceive themselves. He who does not, right from the beginning, become thoroughly familiar with the position of the notes through frequent playing of the A B C, and who does not by diligent practice of the musical scale arrive at that point where the stretching and contracting of the finger, as each note demands, becomes so to speak second nature, will always be in danger of playing out of tune and with uncertainty.\(^3^7\)

Even in 1756 Leopold demanded a strict routine of practice and theory from his students, a combination that was evidently inherited by his children. He similarly enforced this education process on his grandchild, ‘Leopoldl’, only months before his own death in 1787.\(^3^8\)

Leopold’s aesthetics as articulated in the *Versuch* are of most importance here. From a visual point of view, the author considered it important to appear in control of the instrument rather than the other way around. Performers, he lamented, were in the dreadful habit of trembling ‘consistently on each note as if they had the palsy’.\(^3^9\) The *tremolo* – or *vibrato* – was for Leopold an ethereal quality of the violin because it represented for him God’s creation:

> The Tremolo is an ornamentation which arises from Nature herself and which can be used charmingly on a long note, not only by good instrumentalists but also by clever singers. Nature herself is the instructress thereof ... The tremolo must only be used at places where nature herself would produce it.\(^4^0\)

\(^{35}\) See Chapter 3 for Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s admiration for Christoph Martin Wieland.  
\(^{36}\) *Versuch*, 31. See also Chapter 1.  
\(^{37}\) *Versuch*, 61.  
\(^{38}\) See Chapter 6 for the education Leopold began with his grandson.  
\(^{39}\) *Versuch*, 203.  
\(^{40}\) *Versuch*, 203–04.
Leopold’s proposition concerning the correlation between art and nature was reinforced many years later by his contemporary Johann Georg Sulzer (1720–1779). In his Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste (General Theory of the Fine Arts, 1771–1774), the Swiss–born German aesthetician stated that the fine arts could awaken ‘indistinct knowledge and feelings’. He wrote that ‘Aesthetics is the philosophy or science of fine arts in which the general theory as well as the rules of the fine arts are drawn from the nature of taste’. Thus, as Leopold claimed, the performer’s ability to correctly execute a tremolo would replicate a sound faithfully akin to nature and one that pre-existing within the human spirit.

Similarly, Leopold considered the physical appearance of the violin to be one of tremendous beauty. However, it must not, according to the author, replace the importance of the instrument’s sonority. The following passage from the Versuch emphasises Leopold’s dislike of society’s fascination with external beauty. By using a clever analogy, he urged his readers not to judge one another on their appearance:

The violin – who would believe it! – is a victim of the universal deception of external show. He who values a bird for its feathers, and a horse for its blanket, will also inevitably judge a violin by its polish and the colour of its varnish, without examining carefully its principal parts. This course is taken by all those who judge with their eyes and not with their brains. The beautifully ‘curled’ lion’s head can improve the tone of the violin just as little as a fancifully curled wig can improve the intelligence of its living wig-stand. Yet in spite of this, many a violin is valued simply for its appearance, and how often does it happen that clothes, money, pomp, and especially the curled wig, is that which turns a man into a scientist, counsellor, or doctor? But where have I got to? My zeal against this common habit of judging by superficial appearance has wellnigh led me astray.

42 Versuch, 13. Incidentally, Leopold’s ‘zeal’ against frivolous ostentatiousness did not affect his son who was a great lover of fashion in his general outward appearance. In his Reminiscences from 1826, Wolfgang’s English friend Michael Kelly noted that the composer possessed a ‘profusion of fine fair hair, of which he was rather vain’ (MDB, 530). Discovered in Wolfgang’s closet at the time of his death was an extraordinary collection of clothing items, including nearly a dozen suits or jackets, nine pairs of silk stockings, and eighteen pocket handkerchiefs. Only eight pairs of underpants were found (MDB, 585). Conversely, Leopold was not a fashion-oriented individual. In a letter to his son dated 29 December 1780, he discussed the imminent premiere of Wolfgang’s Idomeneo: ‘It was a good thing to have your suit turned. Now that we are discussing clothes, I suppose I can save myself the trouble of bringing my braided suit. You know that I do not care about dressing up’ (Letters, 700; Briefe, III, 75).
Concerning the technique required for violin performance, Leopold provided reasons for the ‘earnestness and manliness’ with which the instrument should be played. The sonority that resonates is consequently a result of this approach and, in Leopold’s opinion, aesthetically pleasing:

For what can be more insipid than the playing of one who has not confidence to attack the violin boldly, but scarce touches the strings with the bow (which is often held by two fingers only); and makes so artificial and whispering a sound right up against the bridge of the violin that only the hissing of a note here and there is heard and the listener knows not what is meant thereby; for everything is merely like unto a dream?43

He was an instructor who believed in music’s extraordinary capabilities. ‘Every effort’, he philosophised, ‘must be made to put the player in the mood which reigns in the piece itself; in order thereby to penetrate the souls of the listeners and to excite their emotions’.44 However he was a tough and meticulous judge. To him, music aesthetics were a difficult subject to define and an even harder one to perfect. ‘The good performance of a composition according to modern taste’, he concluded, ‘is not as easy as many imagine, who believe themselves to be doing well if they embellish and befrill a piece right foolishly out of their own heads, and who have no sensitiveness whatever for the affect which is to be expressed in the piece’.45 His suggestion that ‘modern taste’ is as much hard work and dedication as it is inspiration was also championed by Sulzer: ‘The artist’s reason and genius ensure that his work possesses all parts necessary to its inner perfection. But taste is what makes it a work of fine art’.46

Before concluding his Versuch, Leopold reminded the reader of not only his expertise in taste, but also his ability to influence and instruct individuals. The following conclusion – in which Leopold hinted at the possibility of another Versuch – clearly illustrates his desire to educate and teach:

. . . the pains which I have bestowed on the writing of this book have for their aim: to bring beginners on to the right road and to prepare them for knowledge of, and feeling for, musical good taste. I will therefore close here, although there is still more that I could have said for the

43 Versuch, 96–97.
44 Versuch, 53.
45 Versuch, 215.
46 Sulzer, 49.
benefit of our worthy platform artists. Who knows? Perchance, I may again venture to bestow upon the musical world another book – if I see that my zeal to serve beginners has not been entirely without avail. 47

As discussed in Chapter 1, Leopold’s Versuch was a calculated and meticulous attempt to become a recognised Man of Letters. These Men, whom he idolised immensely during the first half of his life, had all written successful dissertations on their particular field of expertise. His own preface displays how aware he was of his contemporaries’ pre-eminence, and how hesitant and ‘bashful’ he was to ‘venture into the daylight with my modest work in such enlightened times’. 48 His underlying desire to teach ‘truth and purity’, however, convinced him of the worthiness of his treatise. The Versuch, therefore, exists as the greatest testament of his ambition to be an accepted and reputed man of the Aufklärung.

*   *   *

As was the case with many facets of his life, Leopold attempted to bequeath his aesthetic opinions on music to Wolfgang. Although the discrepancy between their generations in style and articulation was profound, Wolfgang upheld many of his father’s thoughts on the way music should sound and its subsequent effect on the audience. 49 In particular the two Mozarts considered music’s compliance to the ear and music’s affinity to nature as the most essential aspects of a fine composition. In other areas – such as the employment of instruments to replicate specific sounds or the choice of popular versus traditional music styles – Leopold and Wolfgang did not concur.

47 Versuch, 225. That was Leopold’s conclusion to the first edition. He reconstructed this ending thirty years later for the 1787 edition. It is evident from this edited conclusion that Leopold – in the shadow of his own mortality – was still keen to publish a new instruction manual and that his enthusiasm for education had not waned. This 1787 conclusion reads thus: ‘I will therefore close here, but will repeat that which I said at the end of the first edition of this “Violinschule”, namely, that much remains which might be said for the benefit of our worthy platform artists, and that I shall perhaps venture to bestow upon the musical world another book. I should unfailingly have so ventured, had not my travels hindered me. The Preface to this edition contains my formal apology. I still hope to redeem my word, as I see that my zeal to serve beginners has not been in vain, and that the learned Musicians have judged my modest effort with much kindness’.

48 Versuch, 7.

A key example of this comes from Wolfgang’s early years in Vienna. During this initial period he was a favourite of the musical aristocracy of Vienna and his compositions were particularly popular. The temptation to revel in his success in letters back to Leopold must have been strong, and indeed aspects of such a tendency are evident. The letter from 28 December 1782 is one of the most insightful in understanding the young composer’s musical mentality. He wrote to his father with great excitement concerning his subscription concerts at which his newly completed piano concertos were premiered:

These concertos are a happy medium between what is too easy and too difficult; they are very brilliant, pleasing to the ear, and natural, without being vapid. There are passages here and there from which the connoisseurs alone can derive satisfaction; but these passages are written in such a way that the less learned cannot fail to be pleased, though without knowing why.\(^{50}\)

In these works Wolfgang attempted to establish a compromise between the easy and the difficult. Leopold, too, was well aware of the difference between these extremes, referring in his *Versuch* to the difficulties of accompaniment, and how a middle-ground between ‘dilettanti’ and ‘masters’ should be aimed for.\(^{51}\) Wolfgang stressed the need to write for his audience and that what they actually heard was of the utmost importance. This being said, he often struggled to find the balance between composing for his audience and composing for art’s sake. Although he acknowledged the importance of the audience’s interests, he often felt he was forced to compromise:

I am engaged in a very difficult task, the music for a bard’s song by Denis about Gibraltar. But this is a secret, for a Hungarian lady wishes to pay this compliment to Denis. The ode is sublime, beautiful, anything you like, but too exaggerated and pompous for my fastidious ears. But what is to be done? The golden mean of truth in all things is no longer either known or appreciated. In order to win applause one must write stuff which is so inane that a coachman could sing it, or so unintelligible that it pleases precisely because no sensible man can understand it.\(^{52}\)

Wolfgang’s acknowledgement of the sublimity in the ode of Michael Denis (1729–1800) and subsequent disdain for the work’s ostentation demonstrates that the

---

\(^{50}\) *Letters*, 833; *Briefe*, III, 245–46.

\(^{51}\) *Versuch*, 223–24.

\(^{52}\) *Letters*, 833; *Briefe*, III, 246.
composer put a great deal of thought into setting texts to music. Moses Mendelssohn thought the task should be an easy one: ‘The sublime in literary composition is accompanied by the enormous in music’. What Wolfgang found frustrating was that there was too large a contrast between the simple and the effortless and, on the other hand, the grandiose and the difficult. The need to abolish these extremes in the fine arts was also voiced by Sulzer who thought ‘moderation’ would benefit authors such as Denis:

But he must not forget the common–sense rule that one not overstep the bounds of sensibility. Just as it is a great imperfection to lack a reasonable amount of sensibility, since it causes one to be stiff and dormant, so is an excess of sensibility very harmful, as it is effeminate, weakening, and unmanly. This important admonition for moderation seems especially appropriate for several of our German poets, who are otherwise considered to be among the best. They seem to hold the illusion that emotions can never be stimulated too much.

This theory can similarly be applied to the debate on whether poetry or music holds superiority. As will be demonstrated later in this chapter, both Mozarts had much to say on this subject via their lively correspondence.

Before rounding off his letter from 28 December 1782, Wolfgang admitted to Leopold his own desire to become an author. The continental fame that his father’s Versuch had brought kindled something within him. ‘I should like’, he concluded, ‘to write a book, a short introduction to music, illustrated by examples, but, I need hardly add, not under my own name’. Although the book never materialised, Wolfgang appeared earnest in his proposal. The introduction and illustrations would have made it similar to his father’s, but the reason for anonymity is more puzzling. Either the notion of writing a treatise must have felt too alien to the customarily confident youth, or perhaps he desired to further his independence from Leopold and the Versuch that ‘made his name famous’.

53 Any quick survey of the opening and closing stanzas of the ode will explain the pomposity that may have intimidated Wolfgang: ‘Oh Calpe! There’s thunder at your feet, but your ancient peak calmly looks upon the world around her./ Look! Clouds are forming across the western waves, growing wider and full of promise./ . . . Hold on, oh song! These feelings sing I, the bard, not out in mortal strings!/ But I, the man, want to take the joy in my strings so that the big tree of humanity, which shades the earth, in my day too, with such shimmering eternities of valued fruit glows’. See NMA, X, 968–972.
54 MPW, 196.
55 Sulzer, 30.
56 Letters, 833; Briefe, III, 246.
57 MDB, 186.
argue for clarity in musical aesthetics. This came to a head in his preferred musical genre: opera.

* * *

The voluminous rhetoric from the Aufklärer concerning opera indicates how important it had become in eighteenth century German society. It also demonstrates how varied the opinions were concerning music and poetry and their relationship to each other. As early as 1708, the Hamburg opera theorist Barthold Feind (1678–1721) declared that ‘an opera is a [. . .] poem, set to music, and the music is used because of the verse, not the other way around’. Following this, in 1728, Gottsched considered opera to be a regrettable battle between the two arts, rather than a harmonic amalgamation. Opera was ‘a non-sensical hotchpotch (Misch-masch) of poetry and music where the poet and the composer violate each other and take exceedingly great pains to bring about a very miserable work’. Ultimately, Gottsched was a proponent of poetry’s superiority over music. This theory was inevitably and repeatedly attacked by Friedrich Nicolai (1733–1811) in his publication Briefe über den itzigen Zustand der Schönen Wissenschaften in Deutschland (Letters on the Current State of the Fine Arts in Germany, 1755). The success of opera in Berlin and other northern centres convinced Nicolai that music had an additional ability over poetry to transfix an audience: ‘The listener stands amazed, he forgets he has come for pleasure (Vergnügen) and voluntarily shares the awesome astonishment visible in the face of each player. Who makes more of an impression here, the poet or the composer?’

In his treatise Laokoön, oder Über die Grenzen der Malerei und Poesie (Laokoön, or the Limits Concerning Painting and Poetry, 1766), Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781) briefly touched on this debate with the intention of discussing it further in a later – albeit unwritten – publication. He unequivocally stated that the union of music and poetry ‘is the most perfect of all’ and that ‘Nature herself seems to have intended not so much a union of two arts, but rather one and the same art’.

60 Friedrich Nicolai, Briefe über den itzigen Zustand der Schönen Wissenschaften in Deutschland (J. C. Kleyb, 1755) 18–19.
Being a notable wordsmith himself, Lessing naturally placed poetic or literary creation ahead of all amalgamated art forms. Opera, he believed, was the exception. Words and music, he wrote, were originally created as one and were subsequently separated into individual genres. Despite music drama’s best efforts, a true equilibrium of art forms had not yet been created, according to Lessing:

There has indeed been a time when both together made but one art. I will not deny that their separation has been natural, still less I will blame the use of the one without the other: but I will lament that on account of this separation the former union is no more remembered, or, if it be remembered, it is only for the purpose of making one art an accessory help to the other, and that no one knows how so to employ them equally as to produce a common effect. Moreover, it is to be recollected that there is practically only one kind of union in which Poetry is the auxiliary art, namely, in the opera; but the union in which Music is the auxiliary art is yet to be invented: or shall I say that in the operas the union of both has to be considered: namely, the union in which Poetry is the auxiliary art, by the Air; and the union in which Music is the auxiliary art, by the Recitative?  

Lessing, who acknowledged both the inventiveness and flaws of ancient collaborations in music and poetry, was under no illusion as to the difficulty in modern unions as well. He was, in effect, agreeing with the music theorist Johann Mattheson (1681–1764), who in his treatise Der vollkommene Capellmeister (The Complete Music Director, 1739) classified opera as containing ‘as it were a confluence of all other beauties of the theatre in such a measure that it occasionally becomes too much’.

For Leopold and Wolfgang, the taste and aesthetics of opera constituted a serious matter. The correspondence that survives from the period surrounding the composition of Die Entführung aus dem Serail is a testament to the Mozarts’ passion for music drama. Unlike the work of Christoph Willibald Gluck (1714–1787), which attempted to establish an equilibrium between words and music, Wolfgang adamantly viewed music as the superior form. Writing to his father on 13 October 1781 he
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62 Lessing, Laokoön, 329.
63 Lessing, Laokoön, 331.
65 In a letter from February 1773, Gluck declared ‘Whatever talent the composer may have, he will only produce mediocre music if the poet does not waken in him that enthusiasm without which all the arts are weak and sickly. The imitation of nature is the acknowledged end to which they must all address themselves. It is this that I strive for; my music is consistently as natural and simple as I can
described poetry as the ‘obedient daughter of the music’. In addition, this letter explains the manner in which he wrote his music and his comprehension of the text. ‘Now as to the libretto of the opera’, he began,

You are quite right so far as Stephanie’s work is concerned. Still, the poetry is perfectly in keeping with the character of stupid, surly, malicious Osmin. I am well aware that the verse is not the best, but it fitted in and it agreed so well with the musical ideas which already were buzzing in my head, that it could not fail to please me; and I would like to wager that when it is performed, no deficiencies will be found. As for the poetry which was there originally, I really have nothing to say against it. Belmonte’s aria ‘O wie ängstlich’ could hardly be better written for music. Except for ‘Hui’ and ‘Kummer ruht in meinem Schoss’, the aria too is not bad, particularly the first part. Besides, I should say that in an opera the poetry must be the obedient daughter of the music. Why do Italian comic operas please everywhere – in spite of their miserable libretti – even in Paris, where I myself witnessed their success? Just because there the music reigns supreme and when one listens to it all else is forgotten. Why, an opera is sure of success when the plot is well worked out, the words written solely for the music and not shoved in here and there to suit some miserable rhyme (which, God knows, never enhances the value of any theatrical performance, be it what it may, but rather detracts from it) – I mean, words or even entire verses which ruin the composer’s whole idea. Verses are indeed the most indispensable element for music – but rhymes – solely for the sake of rhyming – the most detrimental. Those high and mighty people who set to work in this pedantic fashion will always come to grief, both they and their music. The best thing of all is when a good composer, who understands the stage and is talented enough to make sound suggestions meets an able poet, that true phoenix; in that case no fears need be entertained as to the applause even of the ignorant. Poets almost remind me of trumpeters with their professional tricks! If we composers were always to stick faithfully to our rules (which were very good at a time when no one knew better), we should be concocting music as unpalatable as their libretti.

Despite Wolfgang’s conclusion describing these thoughts as trifling ‘nonsense’ they contain passages that are crucial to understanding his aesthetic philosophy. Firstly, he maintains on numerous occasions that the music is of higher importance than the words. The fact that he had premeditated the music before viewing the text confirms
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66 Letters, 773; Briefe, III, 167.
this and suggests he assumed the liberty of changing the text to assist his own composition. He did this on another occasion in 1785 when setting Goethe’s *Das Veilchen* to music. He added the final line ‘The poor violet! It was a charming violet’ (*Das arme Veilchen! Es war ein herzigs Veilchen*), and subsequently incorporated it into the music.  

Furthermore, Wolfgang appears to have disliked rhyming libretti, and the manner in which poets distort the essence of their subject to beautify its resonance. Moses Mendelssohn agreed, declaring in his *Über die Hauptprinzipien der Schönen Künste und Wissenschaft*, that poets and composers have a duty to preserve the aesthetics of their art:

> The poet who overdoes the imitation of sounds is in danger of giving his poem a trivial appearance that can only please children. And those who dabble in music have often made themselves ridiculous when they wanted to express concepts the likes of which stand in no natural connection to the sounds.

In an earlier letter to Leopold concerning the composition of *Die Entführung aus dem Serail*, Wolfgang described his ability to make the ‘natural connection’ between concept and sound to which Mendelssohn alluded. It demonstrates his affinity to music, the text, and his natural understanding of the theatre:

> I have explained to Stephanie the words I require for the aria – indeed I had finished composing most of the music for it before Stephanie knew anything whatever about it. I am enclosing only the beginning and the end, which is bound to have a good effect. Osmin’s rage is rendered comical by the use of the Turkish music. In working out the aria I have (in spite of our Salzburg Midas) allowed Fischer’s beautiful deep notes to glow. The passage ‘Drum beim Barte des Propheten’ is indeed in the same tempo, but with quick notes; and as Osmin’s rage gradually increases, there comes (just when the aria seems to be at an end) the allegro assai, which is in a totally different metre and in a different key; this is bound to be very effective. For just as a man in such a towering rage oversteps all the bounds of order, moderation and propriety and completely forgets himself, so must the music too forget itself. But since passions, whether violent or not, must never be expressed to the point of exciting disgust, and as music, even in the most terrible situations, must never offend the ear, but must please the listener, or in other words must never cease to be music, so I have not chosen a key
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69 NMA, X, 923.
70 MPW, 181.
71 Johann Ignaz Ludwig Fischer (1745–1825).
foreign to F (in which the aria is written) but one related to it – not the nearest, D minor, but the more remote A minor.

This passage demonstrates Wolfgang’s opinion on music as a whole. Aesthetically, he thought music should always be appealing and kind to the listener’s ear. He believed that no matter how talented the artist was, or how industriously one worked, true musical expression cannot be achieved without invention, imagination and a consideration for public taste. Written within a few years of Leopold and Wolfgang’s discussion concerning Entführung was Heinrich Christoph Koch’s (1749–1816) Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition (Introductory Essay on Composition, 1787). Wolfgang’s notion that melody should never be sacrificed for the sake of a drama was similar to Koch’s thought on composition skills:

Even if the beginning composer is endowed with the greatest genius and has cultivated his taste to the most refined degree, even if he possess a very lively imagination combined with the ability to raise it easily to inspiration, he will not be able to apply these gifts if he yet lacks the skill to think melodically and harmonically.\(^2\)

Still, in the context of the eighteenth century, this was the limit of any correlation between Wolfgang’s aesthetics and those of the Aufklärer generally. Sulzer, Mattheson, Koch, and Mendelssohn, for example, all believed order was paramount in composition. Order ensures the composition maintains a sense of structure and reason, and is a further tribute to the symmetry and uniformity of classical antiquity. Without it chaos reigns, as Sulzer explained:

One says that something is orderly when rules can be found that account for how its parts are put together or follow one another. The word ‘order’ can be used in a more general, metaphysical sense, in which one or more rules govern the specific way all parts are positioned or ordered in relation to the whole . . . The artist can thus employ order in a number of ways. In some works, it is the only aesthetic means by which they may become truly tasteful . . . In music, there are many short but pleasant melodies that have no real aesthetic other than a pleasing order of notes.\(^3\)


\(^3\) Koch, Versuch, 37–39.
Similarly, Mattheson – with whose work Leopold Mozart was familiar\textsuperscript{74} – compared musical order or disposition to architectural design, believing it to be the first and most natural step in composition. ‘Disposition’, he argued,

\begin{quote}
\textit{is a neat ordering of all the parts and details in the melody, or in an entire melodic composition, about the manner in which one contrives or delineates a building and makes a plan or design in order to show where a room, a parlour, a chamber, etc., should be placed.} \textsuperscript{75}
\end{quote}

By contrast and as a representative of a later generation, Wolfgang considered musical disposition secondary to expression in importance. When he wrote ‘just as a man in such a towering rage oversteps all the bounds of order, moderation and propriety and completely forgets himself, so must the music too forget itself’, he was in effect distancing himself from the old musical establishment. This should be viewed essentially as an aesthetic step away from Leopold. Wolfgang’s father relentlessly insisted that his son write in pre-existing styles rather than experimental ones.\textsuperscript{76} Ever the entrepreneur, Leopold regarded the audience’s enjoyment as the fundamental factor in composition. Writing to his son in 1777, he said: ‘you know that I need not urge you to imitate the natural and popular style, which everyone easily understands. The grand and sublime style is suited to grand subjects. Everything in its place’.\textsuperscript{77} For Leopold and his generation, with their preoccupation with structure and order, having Wolfgang propose that the music ‘forget itself’ and allow chaos to guide the music’s direction would have been wholly disconcerting.

Father and son also disagreed on instrumental deployment and the imagery that it could evoke. For instance, during their discussions over \textit{Die Entführung aus dem Serail}, Wolfgang proudly explained the manner with which he had reproduced human emotion through the music:

\begin{quote}
Let me now turn to Belmonte’s aria in A major, ‘O wie ängstlich, o wie feurig’. Would you like to know how I have expressed it – and even indicated his throbbing heart? By the two violins playing octaves. This is the favourite aria of all those who have heard it, and it is mine also. I wrote it expressly to suit Adamberger’s\textsuperscript{78} voice. You see the trembling – the faltering –
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{74} See \textit{Briefe}, I, 19.
\textsuperscript{75} Mattheson, \textit{Der vollkommene Capellmeister}, 469–70.
\textsuperscript{76} Solomon, \textit{Mozart: A Life}, 234.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Letters}, 354; \textit{Briefe}, II, 99.
\textsuperscript{78} Johann Valentin Adamberger (c. 1743–1804). Tenor who was the original Belmonte in \textit{Die Entführung aus dem Serail} and Herr Vogelsang in \textit{Der Schauspieldirektor}. 
you see how his throbbing breast begins to swell; this I have expressed by a crescendo. You
hear the whispering and the sighing – which I have indicated by the first violins with mutes
and a flute playing in unison.79

During the composition of Idomeneo, Leopold became so involved in its development
that he offered suggestions to his son. Enthusiastically he suggested:

I assume that you will choose very deep wind–instruments to accompany the subterranean
voice. How would it be if after the slight subterranean rumble the instruments sustained, or
rather began to sustain, the notes piano and then made a crescendo such as might almost
inspire terror, while after this and during the decrescendo the voice would begin to sing? And
there might be a terrifying crescendo at every phrase uttered by the voice. Owing to the
rumble, which might be short, and rather like the shock of a thunderbolt, which sends up the
figure of Neptune, the attention of the audience is aroused; and this attention is intensified by
the introduction of a quiet, prolonged and then swelling and very alarming wind–instrument
passage, and finally becomes strained to the utmost when, behold! – a voice is heard. Why, I
seem to see and hear it.80

That the moment involving the subterranean voice (Act III, scene 10) ultimately
contains an assemblage of brass instruments (horns I & II, alto trombone, tenor
trombone, and bass trombone) rather than Leopold’s idea of a wind ensemble, further
attests to the conflicting aesthetics between father and son.81

The eighteenth century generated much material concerning the power of
aesthetics. The sheer volume related to the nature of music suggests how important
many contributing Aufklärer considered music to be. As has been demonstrated
above, both Mozarts offered their opinion to the other in terms of aesthetics.
However, as Sulzer explained in relation to music, the composer must be aware of his
own capabilities and limitations before attempting to convey the deepest of emotions:

It is important that the artist know himself,82 and whenever possible decline undertaking
anything contrary to his character . . . The composer must undertake special study of the
character of all passions, and view all men from only this perspective. Every passion must be

79 Letters, 768–69; Briefe, III, 162–63.
80 Letters, 700; Briefe, III, 74–75.
81 NMA, VI, 682.
82 Here Sulzer echoes Alexander Pope’s (1688–1744) An Essay on Man in which he wrote ‘Know then
thyself, presume not God to scan./ The proper study of mankind is Man’. In other words, the need for
self-evaluation is a crucial and ongoing process.
seen not simply in respect to its idea, but in respect to its particular character: voice, register, tempo, and rhetorical accent. Whoever notices these things can correctly understand a speech even if he cannot understand the words. The tone betrays joy or pain. In the individual notes one can even distinguish intense or moderate pain, deep-rooted tenderness; strong or mitigated joy. The musician must apply the greatest care in studying natural expression, for however much song may differ from speech, it has much that it can learn from it . . . Music is perfectly suited to portraying all kinds of these movements and making them sensible to the soul via the ear. But this can only be done if the composer is sufficiently accomplished and possesses enough knowledge to imitate these movements in harmony and melody.\textsuperscript{83}

Leopold and Wolfgang took the science and aesthetics of music very seriously. They considered it an elevated art form, one that was superior to all other genres. Furthermore, both Leopold and Wolfgang were interested in other forms of artistic expression, predominately architecture. Across their many travels and throughout each of their lives, they consistently commented on the appearance, style, structure, and ambience of particular objects. Wolfgang was neither a ‘timeless genius’ nor an ‘uninspired musical drudge’.\textsuperscript{84} He was, like his father, a composer who was completely aware of the musical and broader artistic fashion of the time. In this, neither man wrote his music in an artistic vacuum and, thus, the necessity for scholars to take into account the aesthetic parameters of the eighteenth century.

\textsuperscript{83} Sulzer, \textit{Allgemeine Theorie}, 51–52.


In examining the formative years of Wolfgang Mozart there are a number of issues that arise. Particularly relevant to this dissertation are four specific areas that will help elucidate his multifaceted relationship with Leopold. This particular chapter will examine their lives in conjunction with the Aufklärung, but also other chapters of the Enlightenment, namely the British, French, Dutch, and Italian schools. As Wolfgang matured and began to display an independent streak of his own, his relationship with Leopold was severely tested. By demonstrating how Leopold and Wolfgang interpreted the same social situations through different eyes and contrasting perspectives, the gulf that separated their generations becomes clearer. The generation gap that polarised the two in later years – explained in detail in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 – becomes perceptible towards the end of this period.

The first section of this chapter is devoted to the Mozart family’s Grand Tour from 1763-1766. This was a rite of passage for many middle-class individuals of the eighteenth century. During this tour, Leopold and Wolfgang experienced the vibrancy of large metropolitan centres including Paris, London, and The Hague. It was also during this period that Leopold began to display an aversion to many Enlightenment pursuits. The social liberties he witnessed in London and Paris, for example, evoked the conservatism which best characterises his last years. Although more detailed analysis of this is reserved for later chapters, namely Chapter 4 and Chapter 6, the effect the Grand Tour had on Wolfgang reverberated throughout his adult life, and he often recalled these early experiences.

Although less extensive than the Grand Tour, Leopold and Wolfgang’s journey to Vienna in 1767 is nonetheless important in establishing the social environment in which they lived and worked. Not only was the city an important musical nucleus, but it was also the Imperial capital of the Holy Roman Empire. The full implication of the fact that Maria Theresa was Empress during their stay will be realised when contrasting her reign with that of her son, Joseph, who was Emperor from 1780-1790.\(^1\) The contrast in political and philosophical attitudes between mother

\(^1\) The difference between Maria Theresa’s reign and Joseph II’s, will be explored in greater detail in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6; Wolfgang lived in Vienna virtually throughout the latter’s reign.
and son directly influenced the way in which Leopold and Wolfgang viewed their stay in Vienna in the 1760s and 1780s respectively.

Another tour forms the basis for the third section of this chapter. The three separate journeys Leopold and Wolfgang made to Italy in the early part of the 1770s form an illuminating case study of religion within the Enlightenment. It is here that Leopold’s Catholicism and Enlightened liberalism come head to head. Although the journeys were intended by Leopold to gain patronage and financial reward, visiting Italy unexpectedly assisted the senior Mozart in reaffirming his Catholic faith. While Leopold’s ‘pilgrimage’ helped ground his Catholicism, Italy revealed to Wolfgang its aesthetic and musical splendour. It was also where he experienced a great deal of external education, something that Leopold rarely allowed.

Finally, and most intriguingly related to this chapter, will be the Mozart men’s joint fascination with the life and work of Christoph Martin Wieland, a leading German literary stylist of the eighteenth century. Despite their emerging differences at this point in time, Leopold and Wolfgang shared their thoughts and joint admiration for Wieland and his writings. This interest was sparked by Wolfgang’s chance meeting with him in Mannheim in 1777, which, in turn, prompted Leopold to discuss his preference for Wieland’s work. The fact that Wolfgang had two of Wieland’s more famous works in his possession at the time of his death in 1791 further illuminates this interest in him. Of particular interest is Leopold’s correspondence with the Baroness Waldstädten, in which he evokes scenes from Wieland’s *Sympathien* to her, in an attempt to establish a Platonic relationship between them.

This chapter, which spans the years from Wolfgang’s birth to his departure for Paris without Leopold in 1777, is an important prelude to Chapter 4, which will consider the volatile period the Mozarts experienced while Wolfgang was in Paris. Wolfgang’s emergence as an individual leading up to the Paris journey was always going to test his relationship with his father. Their commentary during this period provides clear insight into the dynamics of their relationship and their differing perceptions of the world around them.

* * *

The Grand Tour undertaken by the Mozarts between 1763–1766 was part of an extensive educational process that Leopold Mozart presented to his children. As
we have seen, education, for Leopold, was always of the highest importance and, even before the Grand Tour, he took it upon himself to teach his son and daughter. Having been bred and taught in a Jesuit environment, it appears that Leopold was eager to choose a different path for his own children. As much as the position of scholarly pedagogue enthralled Leopold, it was his duty as fatherly educator that engrossed him. It was, according to Moses Mendelssohn — a figure whose writing was familiar to the Mozarts\(^2\) — a necessary responsibility of parenthood, and something that Leopold embraced both passionately and uncompromisingly.\(^3\)

The absence of a father figure was something Leopold always resented. Not only did it place an unwanted amount of pressure and responsibility upon him at sixteen years of age, but he also felt that it left him without guidance. He became resolved, therefore, not to let this happen to his own son. In a letter from 6 April 1778 Leopold described to his son the importance of allowing someone to guide and assist with one’s education, a valuable asset of which he had been robbed:

> As you know, it has ever been my habit to reflect and consider; and but for this I should not have got on as well as I have, for I never had anyone to advise me; and, as you are aware, from my youth up I have never confided in anyone until I had definite proofs of his sincerity.\(^4\)

Even four decades after he had left his home in Augsburg, Leopold felt aggrieved regarding his early personal circumstances. The manner in which he chose to raise his own children was his way of rectifying the damage.

Unlike the matter of his own education, Leopold took on the responsibility of instructing his children in music and all other matters pertaining to life. He believed that he could mould his children into the direct product of his own tuition. This, according to Mendelssohn, was Leopold’s right as a parent and no other external force could legitimately interfere:

\(^2\) *MDB*, 602.


\(^4\) *Letters*, 524; *Briebe*, II, 335.
Nevertheless, it seems to me that the right of parents to educate their children is by nature theirs alone. It belongs to either parent vis-à-vis the other but to no third party that might wish to take charge of the children and wrest the right to bring them up from their parents.\(^5\)

The ability and desire to educate one’s offspring is, as Mendelssohn explained, not an innate component of the individual, but is ‘de facto inherent in their [marital] agreement, even though it may not explicitly state this right in so many words’.\(^6\)

Realising the extraordinary musical ability of his two children, Nannerl (1751–1829) and Wolfgang, Leopold quickly set about presenting them before various factions of the aristocracy, including a highly successful trip to Vienna in 1762. Following this, Leopold believed his two Wunderkinder ready for a longer, more demanding journey. The two major centres where he really wished to excel were Paris and London. This should be viewed as Leopold’s deliberate attempt to establish himself as an Enlightened individual and pedagogue.

In order better to understand the social acceptance of the Mozarts in this period, a brief description of the family’s status should be given. By the middle of the eighteenth century, there existed two variations of a German bourgeoisie. The first group consisted of businessmen, merchants and independent craftsmen, all of whom enjoyed citizenship rights and privileges. They were known as the Stadtbürger (city citizen).\(^7\) The second group were those who had been educated and worked as government officials, academics, or artists. Although still socially restricted, the members of this group were defined by their preference for travel, hence historian Friedrich Meinecke’s coining of the term Weltbürgertum (world citizenship).\(^8\)

Leaving a long-line of artisans in Augsburg for education and employment in Salzburg, Leopold Mozart effectively gave himself and his new family Weltbürgertum. This was substantiated by his predilection for education and travel. The latter was exemplified with the Mozarts’ Grand Tour of 1763–1766.

Towards the middle of the eighteenth century it became common for middle to upper class individuals to undertake a culturally educational journey to one or more foreign destinations. The venture, commonly referred to as a ‘Grand Tour’, was often

\(^5\) Mendelssohn, Jerusalem, 27.
\(^6\) Mendelssohn, Jerusalem, 27.
considered as a rite of passage for young men following the completion of their education. Furthermore, it was not, as historian Geoffrey Trease reminds us, ‘an exclusively British phenomenon’. However, the fact that Continental travellers had no sea to cross accentuated the ‘Grand’ of the British travellers’ journey.\(^9\) That Leopold Mozart incorporated an extensive tour of England into his plan should, therefore, confirm his family’s undertaking as genuinely ‘Grand’.

During his own tour, Thomas Nugent (c.1700–1772) wrote in 1756 that:

\[
\text{Travelling, even in the remotest ages, was reckoned so useful a custom, as to be judged the only means of improving the understanding, and of acquiring a high degree of reputation . . . }
\]

\[
\text{The first civilised nations had so exalted an idea of those who had been in foreign countries, }
\]

\[
\text{that they honoured even such as made but short voyages, with the title of philosophers and conquerors.}\(^{10}\)
\]

The purpose of a Grand Tour, as Johann Kaspar Riesbeck (1754–1786) noted, was to understand other customs and attempt to appreciate them. The natural inclination of foreigners, according to Riesbeck’s \textit{Briefe eines reisenden Franzosen über Deutschland} (\textit{Letters from a travelling Frenchman throughout Germany}, 1783),\(^{11}\) was to retreat into a comfortable position and avoid confrontation with anything avant-garde or novel:

\[
\text{A man who would know all orders of people, should mix with them all; but this is what a common traveller seldom either can or will do; on the contrary, they are generally compelled to live in a narrow circle, where they hear of nothing but the pleasures and occupations of the company; therefore, again, a man must be a studious traveller by profession, to enter into the peculiarities of a whole people.}\(^{12}\)
\]

Leopold’s emphatic desire to succeed in Paris and London was a result of these cities’ advanced standards in so many areas. As so many travelling Germans discovered,

\(\text{9 Geoffrey Trease, }\textit{The Grand Tour} (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1967) 3.\)

\(\text{10 Thomas Nugent, }\textit{The Grand Tour, or, a journey through the Netherlands, Germany, Italy and France} (London, 1756) 3.\)

\(\text{11 To evade the censors, Riesbeck published his work anonymously and in the guise of a Frenchman. See Klaus Beyrer, ‘The Mail–Coach Revolution: Landmarks in Travels in Germany between the Seventeenth and Nineteenth Centuries’ in }\textit{The German History Society}, \text{Vol. 24, No. 3 (July, 2006)} 375–386.\)

\(\text{12 Johann Kaspar Riesbeck, }\textit{Travels through Germany, in a series of letters} (London, 1787) \text{ Rev. Mr. Maty, trans., 3.}\)
their continental and British counterparts had excelled them in most matters pertaining to civilised life.

According to Leopold, however, music was the art form in which Germans excelled. He made this statement shortly after arriving in France in 1763 at the beginning of his family’s Grand Tour. Amid an ongoing war between the French and Italian music styles, Leopold found both to be inferior to the German school:

There is a perpetual war here between the Italian and the French music. The whole of French music is not worth a sou. But the French are now starting to make drastic changes, for they are beginning to waver very much; and in ten to fifteen years the present French taste, I hope, will have completely disappeared. The Germans are taking the lead in the publications of their compositions. Amongst these Schobert, Eckardt, Honnauer for the clavier, and Hochbrucker and Mayr for the harp are the favourites. Monsieur Le Grand, a French clavier-player, has abandoned his own style completely and his sonatas are now in our style. Schobert, Eckardt, Le Grand, and Hochbrucker have all brought us their engraved sonatas and presented them to my children.

On the whole, Leopold found Paris offensive to his aesthetic and religious standards. The escalating claims of the bourgeoisie and the liberties they were allowed in society was frightening the French aristocracy. Leopold, too, considered Parisian society of the 1760s to be a mixture of liberal secularism and civil impertinence. In a letter back to Salzburg in February 1764 he described an event that demonstrated this social diversity:

I must add, however, that the Archbishop of Paris has been cast out into the wilderness or, to put it mildly, has been exiled. He had a libellous pamphlet printed against the Parliament in

---

13 In his Confessions, Jean-Jacques Rousseau – an avid composer himself – produced a vivid account of the ‘war’ between the French and Italian styles, claiming that the French was buckling under the pressure of Italian talent: ‘Paris was divided into two parties, more violently opposed than if it had been a matter of religion or of an affair of State . . . the wealthy, and the ladies, supported the French music; the other [the Italian style], more lively, more proud, and more enthusiastic, was composed of real connoisseurs, persons of talent, and men of genius’. See Rousseau, Confessions (London: J.M.Dent & Sons, 1931) 35.
14 Johann Schobert (c.1735–1767).
15 Johann Gottfried Eckardt (1735–1809).
16 Leontzi Honnauer (1717–1809).
17 Johann Baptist Hochbrucker (1732–1812).
20 Letters, 37; Briefe, I, 126.
21 Christophe de Beaumont was Archbishop of Paris from 1746–1781.
favour of the Jesuits, which brought this punishment upon him. As far as I hear, everyone blames him, for the King, who was informed that he was going to publish this piece of writing, tried in a friendly manner to dissuade him. However he persisted and thus deliberately dashed his head against the wall. The King hastened to exile him, otherwise the Parliament would have arrested him. The secular arm is a bit too powerful here.\textsuperscript{22} On the other hand the clergy go about the streets singly, lower their cowls below their shoulders, hold their hats in their hands and are absolutely indistinguishable from lay pedestrians.\textsuperscript{23}

The uneasiness that Leopold was feeling towards the way ‘everyone lives as he or she likes’ in Paris was compounded by the constant ambition of the French.\textsuperscript{24} Attempting to maintain his religion in a city marked increasingly by social ambition, Leopold was determined not to expose himself or his children to any experimental or recently developed ideas. The evolution in medicine, for example, was a perennial ethical problem for citizens of the eighteenth century. As Leopold argued, it was often seen as a replacement for religion as a whole:

They are trying to persuade me to let my boy be inoculated with smallpox. But as I have now expressed sufficiently clearly my aversion to this impertinence, they are leaving me in peace. Here inoculation is the general fashion. But, for my part, I leave the matter to the grace of God. It depends on His grace whether He wishes to keep this prodigy of nature in the world in which he has placed it, or to take it to Himself.\textsuperscript{25}

Leopold’s hesitancy vis-à-vis novel medical practices is made all the more perplexing considering his aversion to Parisians and their living conditions. He was physically appalled by the number of crippled individuals he saw in the streets of Paris. This, Leopold believed, was due to the detached manner in which children were brought up:

And in addition to their idiotic ‘mode’ in all things, there is their extreme love of comfort, which has caused this nation to turn a deaf ear to the voice of nature. Hence everyone in Paris sends new-born children to be reared in the country. Persons of both high and low rank do this and pay a bagatelle for it. But you see the wretched consequences of this practice. For you will hardly find any other city with so many miserable and mutilated persons. You have only to spend a minute in a church or walk along a few streets to meet some blind or lame or

\textsuperscript{22} ‘Der weltliche Arm ist hier ein bischen gar zu groß’.
\textsuperscript{23} Letters, 38–39; Briefe, I, 128.
\textsuperscript{24} Letters, 34; Briefe, I, 121.
\textsuperscript{25} Letters, 40; Briefe, I, 130.
limping or half-putrefied beggar, or to find someone lying on the street who has had his hand eaten away as a child by the pigs, or someone else who in childhood fell into the fire and had half an arm burnt off while the foster-father and his family were working in the fields. And there are numbers of such people, whom disgust makes me refrain from looking at when I pass them.\textsuperscript{26}

Leopold did not censor his opinions of the French capital either. ‘You would like to know perhaps how I like Paris?’ he rhetorically asked his Salzburg friend Lorenz Hagenauer. ‘If I were to tell you this in circumstantial detail, neither the hide of a cow nor that of a rhinoceros would suffice’.\textsuperscript{27} When Leopold did explain in detail, Parisian ladies and their role in the Church were primarily responsible for his detestation:

I really cannot tell you whether the women in Paris are fair; for they are painted so unnaturally, like the dolls of Berchtesgaden, that even a naturally beautiful woman on account of this detestable make-up is unbearable to the eyes of an honest German. As for the piety, I can assure you that it is not difficult to get to the bottom of the miracles of the French women saints; the greatest of them are performed by those who are neither virgins nor wives nor widows, and they are all performed during their lifetime.\textsuperscript{28}

The most beneficial aspect of the Mozart family’s time in Paris, however, was their acquaintance with Baron Friedrich Melchior Grimm (1723–1807). Having been born and educated in Regensburg and Leipzig, Grimm moved to Paris in 1748 to become secretary to various French aristocrats. His particular love for Gottsched’s writings and especially French drama may have influenced his decision to settle there.\textsuperscript{29} That he took the Mozart family under his diplomatic and influential wing is particularly noteworthy. Seeking an avenue into the exclusive circle of Men of Letters, Leopold excitedly approved of Grimm’s friendship. He explained this in a letter:

But now you must know who this man is, this great friend of mine, to whom I owe everything here, this M. Grimm. He is secretary to the Duc d’Orléans and he is a man of learning and a great friend of humanity. All my other letters and recommendations brought me nothing; even those from the French Ambassador in Vienna, the Imperial Ambassador in Paris and all the

\textsuperscript{26} Letters, 36–37; Briefe, I, 125.
\textsuperscript{27} Letters, 32; Briefe, I, 114.
\textsuperscript{28} Letters, 33–34; Briefe, I, 121.
\textsuperscript{29} Abert, W. A. Mozart, 35.
letters of introduction from our Minister in Brussels, Count Cobenzl, Prince Conti, Duchesse d’Aiguillon and all others, a whole litany of whom I could write down. M. Grimm alone, to whom I had a letter from a Frankfurt merchant’s wife, has done everything.\textsuperscript{30}

As much as Leopold realised the possibilities of Grimm’s organisational skills, it was primarily the latter’s connections with the social and scholarly intellectuals that appealed to him.

Leopold’s affiliation with the French \textit{philosophes} appears to have been a circumstantial one. Owing to his Catholic beliefs he was naturally opposed to the ideologies of the radical French Enlightenment. Hence, following Voltaire’s death while Wolfgang was in Paris in 1778, Leopold expressed his delight.\textsuperscript{31} Leopold was aware of Voltaire’s political and religious philosophies, which were widely considered controversial and blasphemous. He was universally identified as the chief adversary of the Catholic Church. Voltaire’s writings on the folly of miracles, superstition and the papacy created such controversy that he was exiled to England.\textsuperscript{32}

On the nature of miracles, Leopold Mozart honestly believed that his son’s prodigious musical talent was a gift from God. When he and Wolfgang were touring in Vienna in 1768, he defiantly defended both Wolfgang’s genius and the power of his faith. Speaking of his employer, the Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg,\textsuperscript{33} Leopold wrote:

\begin{quote}
If it is ever to be my duty to convince the world of this miracle [Wolfgang], it is so now, when people are ridiculing whatever is called a miracle and denying all miracles. Therefore they must be convinced. And was it not a great joy and a tremendous victory for me to hear a Voltairean say to me in amazement: ‘Now for once in my life I have seen a miracle; and this is the first!’ But because this miracle is too evident and consequently not to be denied, they want to suppress it. They refuse to let God have the honour. They think that it is only a question of a few years and that thereafter it will become natural and cease to be a Divine miracle. So they want to withdraw it from the eyes of the world . . . What a disgrace! What inhumanity!\textsuperscript{34}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Letters}, 43–44; \textit{Briefe}, I, 141.
\textsuperscript{31} See Chapter 4 for more on the Mozarts’ reactions to Voltaire’s death.
\textsuperscript{32} Voltaire stayed in England from 1726–1728. His \textit{Lettres anglaises} – published in England as \textit{Letters Concerning the English Nation} – was published in 1733.
\textsuperscript{33} Sigismund von Schrattenbach, who was Prince Archbishop from 1753–1771.
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Letters}, 89; \textit{Briefe}, I, 271–272.
Although Leopold was keen to become a Man of Letters, many of the French *philosophes’* ideologies were far too radical and extreme for his liking. Leopold was, in fact, the archetypal embodiment of the moderate Enlightenment. Leopold separated his spiritual life from his business life. The obvious loathing he had for Voltaire and his followers was from a personal, Catholic position. In terms of building a network of important and influential names, however, Leopold was wholly committed. Not only did he forge a friendship with Grimm who was known to socialise with the *philosophes*, but he also urged his son to seek out other such luminaries when staying in Paris in the late 1770s. Leopold compiled a list of men who he believed might be able to promote his son’s celebrity. Of note were Denis Diderot (1713–1784), Jean le Rond d’Alembert (1717–1783), Claude Adrien Helvétius (1715–1771), Louise d’Épinay (1726–1783), and Voltaire. It is not known whether Wolfgang actually met any of these figures. What is important, however, is that Leopold felt it beneficial for his son to come into contact with some of the leading players of the French Enlightenment.

Following their stay in France, the Mozart family crossed water for the first time as they ventured to England. This part of their tour would become their most profitable and revelatory. London had progressed at a similar rate to Paris, yet the advancement of the English capital was far more obvious to the foreign eye. The scientific and artistic progress of the city during the past century had produced a lively environment, far superior to that of any other European capital. The architecture, roads, parks, and carriages were aesthetically pleasing for visitors, who were astounded by London’s unrivalled beauty, diversity, and urbanity. ‘Nothing, indeed, can be more superb’, commented one German traveller, after witnessing the

---

35 D’Alembert, for example, was a noted critic of the Jesuit system of education. His article in Diderot’s *Encyclopédie* (1751 onwards) on ‘Collège’ was highly controversial because of its attack on the Jesuits. It is interesting to note in relation to Leopold Mozart’s Jesuit background that d’Alembert later claimed in his *Sur la destruction des Jésuites en France* that ‘There is hardly an ex-Jesuit who preserves not his connections with his old brethren; and who, even though he has reason to complain of them, does not show himself attached to their interests, and ready to defend them against their enemies’. Jean le Rond d’Alembert, *An Account of the Destruction of the Jesuits in France* (London, 1766) 43.


37 Leopold was more than aware of d’Alembert’s pre-eminence in French music criticism. See Chapter 1 of this dissertation.

38 Briefe, II, 262. Interestingly, when he wrote the list of names, Leopold was oblivious to the fact that Helvétius had died six years earlier.
pleasing sight of London’s street lights. ‘They are lighted at sun-set, both in winter and summer, as well when the moon shines or not. In Oxford-street alone, there are more lamps than in all Paris’. The fashions worn by the English caught the Mozarts’ attention too, with many of the latest trends being described by Leopold as ‘fancy dress’ (Masquera).

Although the Seven Years’ War had been resolved in 1763, great hostility remained between the French and English nations. Having only recently been in France for an extended stay, Leopold realised the necessity of adopting England’s customs and fashions. M. Grosley, a Frenchman who was visiting London at the same time as the Mozarts, could well have used Leopold’s idea: ‘My French air, notwithstanding the simplicity of my dress, drew upon me, at the corner of every street, a volley of abusive litanies, in the midst of which I slipt on, returning thanks to God, that I did not understand English’. Yet although one needed to become acclimatised to the English culture, it was the range and radiance of London life that often impressed the individual, as James Boswell discovered in 1762. His enthusiastic description of the city illustrates the liberalism prevalent amongst the people:

London is undoubtedly a place where men and manners may be seen to the greatest advantage. The liberty and the whim that reigns there occasions a variety of perfect and curious characters. Then the immense crowd and hurry and bustle of business and diversion, the great number of public places of entertainment, the noble churches and the superb buildings of different kinds, agitate, amuse, and elevate the mind . . . Here a young man of curiosity and observation may have a sufficient fund of present entertainment, and may lay up ideas to employ his mind in age.

Boswell’s passage accentuates the possibilities of London for individuals who had ‘imagination and feeling’, and also for those who wished to entrench themselves in social circles of high prestige. Remarkably for the Mozarts, within the first week of reaching English soil they met and performed for the grandest couple in British society. The social environment of London during the 1760s and its relatively

---

40 Letters, 45: Briefe, 1, 146.
advanced liberalism were largely a reflection of the free-thinking George III (1738–1820), the first English-born King of the Hanoverian dynasty. Along with his Queen, George was a strong 'patron and liberal encourager of the polite arts, and anxious to give them a permanent establishment in Great Britain', which explains their eagerness in welcoming the Mozart family to Buckingham Palace on 27 April 1764. Perhaps it was because the Mozarts were German that the royal couple were so hospitable to them, or perhaps it may have been purely for artistic reasons. Both George and Charlotte, his Queen, were keen music enthusiasts, and may have simply been eager to receive and, if Leopold was lucky, give their patronage to the two little ‘prodigies of Nature’.

This grand occasion left a lasting impression on both parties, and the Mozart children would subsequently perform for the royal couple twice more before leaving London. For Leopold, the warm, welcoming and jovial demeanour of the monarchs was something to which he was not accustomed. He found the situation almost indescribable. ‘In short,’ he wrote, ‘their easy manner and friendly ways made us forget that they were the King and Queen of England’. He stated further that all the royal courts had cordially welcomed his family, however it was the British monarchy whose welcome ‘exceeds all others’.

Whilst in London, a residency lasting fifteen months, the Mozarts experienced a wide range of activities and sights, including music and drama. The youngest of Johann Sebastian Bach’s sons, Johann Christian (1735–1782), had settled in London and was forging his career as a freelance composer. The novel and quite unprecedented series of subscription concerts that he and fellow German musician Karl Friedrich Abel (1723–1787) created, ran successfully from 1765 to 1781. Wolfgang and the ‘London’ Bach formed a lifelong friendship that was based on mutual respect for one another’s musical ability. When Wolfgang began his new independent life in Vienna as a freelance composer in 1781, his imitation of the Bach–Abel subscription concerts was initially highly successful. The Mozart family’s friend in Paris, Baron Grimm, heard of the connection between Bach and the

---

44 MDB, 43.
45 Letters, 46; Briefe, I, 149.
46 When Johann Christian Bach died on 1 January 1782, Wolfgang wrote to Leopold: ‘I suppose you have heard that the English Bach is dead? What a loss to the musical world!’ (schade für die Musikalische Welt!) Letters, 800; Briefe, III, 201.
young Wolfgang while they were in London. A few years later he described how ‘In
London Bach took him between his knees and they played alternately on the same
keyboard for two hours together, extempore, before the King and the Queen’. 47

Apart from the musical life of London in the 1760s, which was still very much
influenced by the music of the recently deceased Georg Friedrich Händel (1685–
1759), 48 the cosmopolitanism and tolerance of its inhabitants were what made the
most lasting impact on Leopold and indeed Wolfgang. What distinguished these
English citizens from their European neighbours was their general level of
understanding and education. Anyone visiting London for the first time, the German
Archenholz noted, would have

observed that the common people in England are more intelligent and judicious than in any
other country. The free and unrestrained manner in which they speak and write, on every
subject, is the real cause of this. One is astonished to hear some of the very lowest of the
populace reason concerning the laws, the right of property, [and] privileges. 49

In all probability, the liberal attitudes and behaviour of Londoners frightened
Leopold. Just as the radical strand of the French Enlightenment disturbed him, the
relative lack of social guidance and restrictions in London made him wary. In reply to
a supposed offer to settle permanently with his family in the English capital, he
attacked the city’s irreligious atmosphere and its temptations:

I did not accept a proposal which was made to me. But what is the use of saying much about a
matter upon which I have decided deliberately after mature consideration and several sleepless
nights and which is now done with, as I will not bring up my children in such a dangerous
place (where the majority of the inhabitants have no religion and where one only has evil
examples before one). You would be amazed if you saw the way children are brought up here;
not to mention other matters connected with religion. 50

47 MDB, 57.
48 In his Observations (1762), John Potter declared in relation to Handel: ‘He not only laid the
foundation, but liv’d long enough to complete it. So that the English music may with justness be called
Handel’s music, and every musician the son of Handel; for whatever delicacies, or improvements have
been made by others, they are all owing to, and took their rise from, a perusal of his works’. John
49 Archenholz, Picture of England, 60.
50 Letters, 56; Briefe, 1, 181.
The Act of Toleration of 1689, which for most countries would have sparked a series of religious wars, was largely irrelevant for Britain considering the potpourri of the monarchy’s lineage.\(^{51}\) The diversity of religion and race made London the embodiment of enlightened tolerance. In fact, London’s comparatively lax attitude to religious denominations gave the impression that the city had no religion at all. As Voltaire remarked in his *Lettres anglaises (Letters Concerning the English Nation, 1733)*:

*If one religion only were allowed in England, the government would very possibly become arbitrary; if there were but two, the people would cut one another’s throats; but as there are such a multitude, they all live happily and in peace.*\(^{52}\)

The lasting impression that liberal London had on the Mozarts, and in particular Wolfgang, is seen throughout the family’s correspondence. Wolfgang always harboured intentions to return to England and it appears that his untimely death in December 1791 was the only reason for its non-realisation. ‘[I] have already taken three lessons in English’, he reported to Leopold in 1782. ‘In three months I hope to be able to read and understand English books fairly easily’.\(^{53}\) His friendship and association with English musicians Stephen (1762–1796) and Nancy Storace (1765–1817), Thomas Attwood (1765–1838), and Michael Kelly (1762–1826) during the late 1780s was all part of networking before a return to England. When the entrepreneur Johann Peter Salomon (1745–1815) proposed a musical tour of England to Wolfgang and Joseph Haydn they both showed interest. They agreed that Haydn, being the elder and having only recently been released from his duties at Eisenstadt following the death of Prince Nikolaus Esteránhay I (1714–1790), would travel to England first.\(^{54}\) The subsequent English success of Haydn and the non-realisation of Wolfgang’s own journey is well known.

---


\(^{52}\) *The Portable Enlightenment Reader*, Kramnick, ed., 133.

\(^{53}\) *Letters*, 815; *Briefe*, III, 221. In Wolfgang’s library there was a book published in 1774 entitled *An Attempt to facilitate the learning of the English language by publishing a collection of letters, anecdotes, remarks and verses, wrote by several celebrated English authors, etc.*, by Friedrich Wilhelm Streit. See *MDB*, 602.

\(^{54}\) One of Haydn’s earliest biographers A. C. Dies, described the situation relating to England: ‘Especially Mozart took pains to say, ‘Papa!’ (as he usually called him), ‘You have had no education for the great world, and you speak too few languages’. — ‘Oh!’ replied Haydn, ‘my language is understood all over the world!’ [The travellers fixed their departure] and left on December 15, 1790. . . Mozart, that day, never left his friend Haydn. He dined with him, and at the moment of parting, he
Nonetheless, Wolfgang maintained a fairly consistent impression of the country he visited as a nine-year-old. The general behaviour of its inhabitants or the relative freedom enjoyed by musicians may very well have been deciding factors in this attitude. Following his unproductive venture to Paris in the late 1770s and after the initial wave of prosperity in Vienna in 1781 dwindled, he saw London as the Mecca for his own personal success. Upon hearing the news of Lord Howe and Sir Edward Hughes’ defeat of the French navy off Trincomalee in 1782, Wolfgang gleefully wrote to Leopold: ‘Indeed I have heard about England’s victories and am greatly delighted too, for you know that I am an arch-Englishman’ (*ich ein ErzEngelländer bin*).\(^{55}\) Most likely of all, however, to have reminded him of the individual’s level of independence in London was his *Singspiel* from 1781, *Die Entführung aus dem Serail*. A work heavily soaked in the principles of the Enlightenment – and carefully chosen by Wolfgang to be his first stage work after settling into Josephinian Vienna – *Die Entführung* introduced one of Wolfgang’s most strong-willed characters, Blonde. To defend herself against slavery and social torment she declares at the beginning of Act II: ‘I am an Englishwoman, free-born, and I defy anyone who wants to force me to do anything’.\(^{56}\)

The final leg of the Mozarts’ Grand Tour was Holland, or the Dutch Republic. It was here ‘where radical ideas were most fully formulated philosophically, and where they could be most comprehensively developed, explored, and propagated’.\(^{57}\) The birthplace of the radical and so called ‘fathers’ of the Enlightenment Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677) and Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), the Dutch Republic (along with Switzerland) prided itself on being free from princely and priestly rule. Aesthetically, too, the Republic was appealing, and Leopold was impressed. ‘I should have been very sorry’, he confessed to Hagenauer in a letter,

if I had not seen Holland; for in all the towns of Europe which I have visited, everything for the most part seems to be the same, whereas both the Dutch towns and villages are quite

---

\(^{55}\) Letters, 828; Briefe, III, 239.  
\(^{56}\) MO, 108.  
\(^{57}\) Israel, *Enlightenment Contested*, 27.
different from all others in Europe. It would take too long to describe them, but I must say that I very much appreciate their cleanliness (which to many of us appears excessive).58

It was perhaps the artwork, however, that had the most profound effect on Leopold. Considering that he was not originally planning to travel to the Dutch Republic, but rather return home, the impression he formed seems all the more gratifying.59

As always, Leopold was on the hunt for scholarly men or those who could further his own Enlightened agenda. He was delighted, therefore, to meet the Gessners in Zürich during the journey back to Salzburg. He recalled:

From Lausanne we went to Berne and thence to Zürich. In the former town we only spent eight, in the latter fourteen days. In both places we had an opportunity of getting to know men of learning; and at Zürich the two Gessners, both learned persons, made our stay very pleasant and our departure very sad. We took away a token of their friendship.60

The ‘two Gessners’ were Salomon (1730–1788) and possibly either Johannes (1709–1790) or Hans Jakob Salomon (1711–1787).61 The token that the Mozart family received was a copy of the Salomon’s literary work. Published in Zürich in 1762, Salomon Gessner’s Schriften were in two volumes. They were subsequently discovered in Wolfgang’s library following his death. Gessner was famous throughout Europe due to his two most popular works: his Idyllen (1756), which featured in the Schriften presented to the Mozarts, and his epic tale Der Tod Abels (The Death of Abel, 1758). Leopold’s delight upon meeting the Gessners illustrates the pair’s genuine celebrity at the time.

Written in the front of the publication given to the Mozarts is a dedication from Gessner. Leopold would have cherished the poet’s affectionate words for they praised the father for his masterly education of his children. It reads:

Take, most valued friends, this present with the same friendship with which I give it to you, and may it be worthy of keeping my memory ever alive with you! Continue long to enjoy, honourable parents, the fairest fruits of education in the happiness of your children: may they

58 Letters, 59; Briefe, I, 203.
59 For an example of this see the letter from Chapter 2 in which Leopold expresses his delight at seeing Rubens’ art in Antwerp. Letters, 58–59; Briefe, I, 202–203.
61 Leopold does not elaborate as to which Gessners the family met. Salomon was certainly one. Johannes and Hans Jakob were both respected naturalists, thus the probability of one of them being the other ‘learned’ Gessner.
be as happy as their merits are extraordinary. At the tenderest age they are the pride of the nation and the admiration of the world. Fortunate parents! Fortunate children! Do not, any of you, ever forget the friend whose high regard and love for you will remain as lively all his life as it is today.  

The importance of a fine education, which Gessner recognised in the Mozart children, was something that Gessner’s own sons appreciated. Following his death in 1788, his children reflected on their father’s generosity and believed that providence had provided them with the

best of fathers, and we have enjoyed the greatest advantages with him and by him. A good education, and principles which must, as long as we adhere to them, ensure our happiness: these were his gifts to us, and they are invaluable.  

Once again, an emphasis on solid education is stressed by one of the leading contributors to the Enlightenment and, more important for this dissertation, Gessner demonstrated a genuine admiration for Leopold’s own pedagogical agenda.

In his *Idyllen*, largely pastoral works that earned him the nickname ‘the German Theocritus’, Salomon Gessner included a passage that lauds the German poets from whom he had learnt. One of them was Christoph Martin Wieland whose *Poetische Schriften* were presented to the Mozarts during their meeting with the Gessners, and in whose writing Leopold and Wolfgang would find common ground.  

62 *MDB*, 60.
65 Recalling his reading habits, Gessner described the few German writers who had risen to the same level of quality as those from antiquity; Nonetheless, they were, he lamented, ignored by the general public. Two of these men’s works – those of Wieland and Ewald Christian von Kleist – were found in Wolfgang Mozart’s library. Gessner wrote: ‘Thus would I sit, with all the sages and poets of antiquity ranged around me; those happy geniuses who pursued the track of the truly beautiful and sublime. Alas! how few have dared to tread in their steps! What herds of weak minds have lost themselves in the attempt! Their courage failed, while they rather chose to pursue the flowery paths of novelty, and please themselves with tinsel and empty shew. But, let me name some of the happy few, who, in the arduous task, bore off the prize. O Klopstock! creative genius! And thou, Bodmer, who, with thy favourite Breitinger, did hold aloft the torch of criticism, to prevent the wanderer from being misled by false and deceitful lights; and thou, O Wieland, whose Muse did often visit her sage sister, Philosophy, and in whose compositions, subjects the most abstruse and sublime are treated with all the charms of style; O, how oft have your delightful songs inspired me with sacred transports! And thou, dear Kleist! Whose song is pleasing as the serenity of a summer’s eve, and Gleim, whose lyric lays are full of the charms of innocence and simplicity: Alas! this tasteless age is ignorant of your merit: Only the future will do justice to your fame’. Salomon Gessner, *Idyllen* (London: 1762) 104.
66 *MDB*, 61.
The Grand Tour came to an end following the family’s departure from the Dutch provinces at the beginning of May 1766, with brief and mostly insignificant sojourns in Paris, Munich and Augsburg. They arrived home in Salzburg in late November having spent more than three years touring Europe. As far as ‘Grand Tours’ went, the one undertaken by the Mozart family was an enormous achievement, as well as an expansive one. The liberties that his employer, the Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg, had granted the Mozart family to travel were fully exploited by Leopold. Often, as was the case with his next tour, he was punished by the Prince-Archbishop for his overextended travels and resorted to grovelling in order to gain favour once again. Nonetheless, the Grand Tour was a far-reaching success; not only did it propel the Mozart family name and the reputation of the Wunderkinder into prominence, but the extent to which the family travelled presented Leopold and his children with a truly cosmopolitan education. This, as was evident throughout their travels, was a key factor in the original decision to undertake the Grand Tour. On the journey home towards Salzburg, Leopold noted their previous stay in Cambrai, for it was there that he had visited the resting place of one of his pedagogical idols, François Fénelon (1651–1715). The children’s education that took place during the Grand Tour was more than just observational. Leopold ensured that his children made the most of their time whilst travelling. Languages were on Leopold’s list of subjects for he well knew the importance to the men of the Enlightenment of being multi-lingual.

The significance of their Grand Tour was ultimately threefold, however. First, Leopold, as entrepreneur, displayed his children to the world with tremendous artistic

---

67 Letters, 94–95; Briefe, I, 290–291. Writing to Prince-Archbishop Sigismund von Schrattenbach in 1769 apropos his family’s extended stay in Vienna Leopold asked: ‘When Your Grace was recently pleased to allow me most graciously to remain a few months longer in Vienna, you gave orders, however, that until my return my pay should be withheld . . . I now most humbly beg Your Grace not only to pay me for the past month, but as a special favour to give your most gracious order that the sum which has been withheld should also be paid to me. The greater this favour is, the more shall I endeavour to render myself worthy of it’.

68 This is discussed in Chapter 1. See Letters, 65; Briefe, I, 220.

69 Historian Volkmar Braunbehrens explains: ‘During the more than three years of the great European trip, they spent some seventy days riding in their carriage, but hardly ever more than two or three days at a time. In other words, a great deal of time remained and it was used for the usual lessons by which Wolfgang learned to read, write and do his sums. In addition, he studied languages: Latin, French, and Italian. Other ‘subjects’ were added, prompted by sights, questions, and discussions coming from their travels: geography, for instance, as well as biology, literature, and history. Thus, Wolfgang’s private schooling probably was much more to the point and useful than it would have been with the normal school curriculum of the times’. Volkmar Braunbehrens, ‘Fatherly Friend’, ‘Most obedient Son’: Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart’ Bruce Cooper Clarke. Courtesy of www.aproposmozart.com
and financial success. Second, Leopold presented his children with a wonderfully colourful and diverse experience which, as is clear from its lasting impact on Wolfgang, contributed immensely to their education. Finally, and the most commonly overlooked reason for the Mozarts undertaking a Grand Tour, it was also for Leopold’s own benefit. Having not travelled extensively as a youth, Leopold saw the opportunity of a Continental Tour as an invaluable experience for any man longing to be considered a Man of Letters and a true representative of the Enlightenment. The Grand Tour illustrates Leopold’s willingness to embrace the cross-cultural components of the Enlightenment; he was not tied to the German strand of the movement to the extent that Wolfgang would eventually become. Their different attitude to German identity – further considered in Chapter 6 – first becomes noteworthy in Leopold’s consistently enthusiastic reaction to his Grand Tour experience. It was certainly a far more beneficial journey than the family’s next notable destination: Vienna. As the following section will demonstrate, the Mozarts’ tour of Vienna made contrasting impressions on Leopold and Wolfgang.

* * *

Apart from a four-month stay there at the end of 1762, the Mozart family’s sojourn in Vienna from 1767–1769 was their first genuine experience of the Imperial capital. With his Wunderkinder at the peak of their fame, Leopold planned to reap the benefits of the Viennese nobility’s interest in them. For his middle-class family from the archiepiscopal, non-Habsburg city of Salzburg,70 Leopold was evidently eager to

---

70To present the geographical and social situation around this time, an excellent account of Salzburg’s situation in the eighteenth century was given by the celebrated German geographer Anton Friedrich Büsching (1724–1793), who wrote in his Neue Erdbeschreibung from the 1760s: ‘Though in this archbishopric the Roman-catholic doctrines and worship alone are tolerated, yet at the time of the Reformation Lutheranism was embraced by great numbers . . . The title of the archbishop is By the grace of God Prince of the holy Roman Empire, and Archbishop of Salzburg, legatus natus of the apostolic chair of Rome, and primate of Germany. In the dexter half topaz he bears party per pale, a lion diamond; but the sinister is damasquin’d. His supporters are a sword and a croisier, surmounted as it were behind with a cross . . . The mountain-castle he is very strong, not only on account of its lofty situation, but likewise of its works; and in it is the principal arsenal . . . The streets in the city are narrow, and paved in the old fashion, but it other respects it is a well built place . . . The cathedral of St. Rupert, consecrated in 1628, is built of free-stone and marble; in it are five organs, with a number of embellishments, and it has also a very grand treasury. The church of St. Peter is the oldest in the city, and near it stands a monastery of Benedictine Monks, in which is a fine library. The university church here, which was consecrated in the year 1707, is also a noble building . . . The university of Salzburg was first founded by archbishop Paris in the year 1620. In 1623 it was completed and given to the Benedictines, and in 1625 a bull was also obtained for it. In the colleges of Rupert and Lodron young
organise a meeting with the Habsburg Empress. Maria Theresa’s Vienna – the Imperial capital of the late 1760s had not yet been affected by the firebrand decision-making of the youthful co-Emperor, Joseph II – was progressing cautiously under the watchful eye of its Empress.\footnote{For further reading on the oft-fiery relationship between Maria Theresa and her son, see Derek Beales, ‘Love and Empire: Maria Theresa and her co–regents’ in Royal and Republican Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) Robert Oresko, G. C. Gibbs & H. M. Scott eds., 479–499.} Her policies were conservative rather than progressive; her reforms were implemented ‘step by step’ while the ‘Enlightening’ of society continued around her.\footnote{Eduard Vehse, Memoirs of the Court, Aristocracy, and Diplomacy of Austria, vol. II (Longmans, 1856) Franz Demmler, trans., 181.} Despite this, however, her subjects loved her and considered her their ‘mother’.\footnote{See Wenzel Anton Kaunitz’s posthumous assessment of Joseph’s reputation in Documents, 5–6.} In contrast, Joseph’s reforms and sudden changes left an enormous proportion of the Viennese despising his character and rule.\footnote{One of the most damaging and personal reforms Joseph II implemented was the abolition of pension payments stipulated by Maria Theresa. In December 1780, just one month after her death, Joseph ordered the abolition of the private treasury office and all payments made to this office by the treasury of the state. Those who were affected by this liquidation included Pietro Metastasio (1698–1782), the librettist for many of Wolfgang Mozart’s early operas, and the blind virtuoso pianist Maria Theresa Paradis (1759–1824), for whom Wolfgang composed the piano concerto in B-flat, K. 456. See Hans Wagner, ‘The Pension Payments and Legal Claims of Maria Theresa and Their Withdrawal by Joseph II’ in Intellectual and Social Developments in the Habsburg Empire from Maria Theresa to World War I (New York: East European Quarterly, 1975) 5–29.} Their differing personalities resulted in many of Joseph’s radical social reforms of the 1780s.\footnote{Quoted in J. Alexander Mahan Maria Theresa of Austria (Read Books, 2007) 310–311.} Maria Theresa poignantly noted their private enmity just two months before her death in 1780:

> Unfortunately it is well known that Joseph loves suspicion, and keeps himself thoroughly informed concerning everything of that nature; this makes our lives most unpleasant; we are constantly in an atmosphere of calumny from which there seems to be no escape.\footnote{The financial burden of the Seven Years’ War is clear when the national debt is noted over a number of years. It was 101 million Gulden in 1740, 118 million in 1756, and then catapulted to 263 million in 1763. Franz A. J. Szabo Kaunitz and enlightened absolutism, 1753–1780 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) 132.}

The Vienna that the Mozarts entered during the late 1760s, therefore, was truly a Maria Theresian one. Furthermore, the Viennese economy was on a course of frugality following the extravagant expense of the Seven Years’ War.\footnote{The financial burden of the Seven Years’ War is clear when the national debt is noted over a number of years. It was 101 million Gulden in 1740, 118 million in 1756, and then catapulted to 263 million in 1763. Franz A. J. Szabo Kaunitz and enlightened absolutism, 1753–1780 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) 132.}
Leopold’s early letters from Vienna describe the ease with which the Mozart family moved into the Viennese upper classes:

The latest news which I have to report (apart from the fact that, thank God, we are all well) is that on Tuesday the 19th we were with Her Majesty the Empress from half past two to half past four in the afternoon. His Majesty the Emperor78 came out into the anteroom where we were waiting until Their Majesties had taken coffee, and brought us in himself. In addition to the Emperor and Empress, Prince Albert of Saxony and all the Archduchesses were present; but apart from these royal personages there was not a soul. It would take too long to describe to you all that was said and done there. I shall only say that you cannot possibly conceive with what familiarity Her Majesty the Empress conversed with my wife, talking to her partly of my children’s smallpox and partly of the events of our grand tour; nor can you imagine how she stroked my wife’s cheeks and pressed her hands. Meanwhile His Majesty the Emperor talked to little Wolfgang and to me about music, and many other things too, which often made Nannerl blush. Later on I shall tell you more personally.79

The Empress Maria Theresa and her son Joseph II were initially very fond of the Mozart family.80 However, the frequency with which Leopold proclaimed his family’s talent eventually made the Habsburg hierarchy resent them.81

One concern for the Mozarts, as it was for Vienna as a whole, was the smallpox epidemic that had plagued the region. Wolfgang contracted the illness shortly after the beginning of their journey and this caused Leopold the most genuine heartache:

The only subject of conversation in Vienna was the smallpox. Of ten children whose names were put on the death register, nine had died of this disease. You can easily imagine how I felt. Whole nights were spent without sleep and during the day we had no rest.82

78 Joseph II, co-regent with his mother from 1765.
79 Letters, 79; Briefe, I, 253.
80 During the family’s first trip to Vienna in 1762, Maria Theresa and Joseph had conversed with the Mozarts in a congenial and enthusiastic manner. Letters, 6; Briefe, I, 52.
81 Empress Maria Theresa eventually detested the Mozart family. She regarded them as nothing more than money-seeking vagrants. In reply to her son’s suggestion that he take the Mozarts on as musical servants she wrote: ‘You ask me to take the young Salzburger into your service. I do not know why, not believing that you have need of a composer or of useless people. If however it would give you pleasure, I have no wish to hinder you. What I say is intended only to prevent you burdening yourself with useless people and giving titles to people of that sort. If they are in your service it degrades that service when these people go about the world like beggars’. MDB, 138.
82 Letters, 75; Briefe, I, 244.
Of equal concern to Leopold was the Viennese nobility’s fear of the contagiousness of smallpox. Wenzel Anton Kaunitz (1711–1794), for example, refused all contact with the Mozarts while Wolfgang was infected. But what bad luck!’ Leopold reported, ‘So far we have not been able to speak to Prince Kaunitz, because his weakness is that he is so afraid of smallpox that he even avoids persons whose faces still show red spots’.  

Once the epidemic had passed and the risk of infection lessened, the Mozarts pressed on in Vienna. As he was to declare to Wolfgang a decade later apropos reaching Paris, Leopold wrote: ‘aut Caesar aut nihil’. The Imperial capital, Leopold thought, was a musical and financial goldmine. What eventuated, however, was a series of empty promises and lost opportunities. As Wolfgang’s compositions gained in quality, they were also subjected to interrogation. Many Viennese doubted the authenticity of Wolfgang’s works, suggesting Leopold was in fact the composer. What is more, a proposal for Wolfgang to compose and present the premiere of an opera for the Viennese court did not eventuate due to political bickering and apparent jealousy among the other court composers. The opera, La finta semplice, was eventually premiered in Salzburg following the Mozarts’ return. Leopold’s view of the whole matter suggests that the dominance of Italians at the court was the reason for the opera’s non-realisation:

The opera was fixed for Whitsuntide and then for the return of His Majesty from Hungary. But at this point the mask fell from the face. For in the meantime all the composers, amongst whom Gluck is a leading figure, undermined everything in order to prevent the success of this opera . . . Meanwhile some people spread the report that the music was not worth a fig; others said that it did not fit the words, or was against the metre, thus proving that the boy had not sufficient command of the Italian language . . . So that with extreme annoyance, such as I never elsewhere experienced on our travels, I have to await the result of this hateful affair. All sensible people must with shame agree that it is a disgrace to our nation that we Germans are trying to suppress a German, to whom foreign countries have done justice by their great

---

83 Despite Leopold’s comment on the Viennese population’s cautious approach to smallpox, the virus was a genuine threat to its citizens. Even the Empress was severely affected: ‘In 1767, two years after the death of her husband, she was sadly disfigured by the smallpox, which she caught at the death-bed of her daughter-in-law, Joseph’s first wife’. Vehse, Memoirs, 234.
84 Letters, 81; Briefe, I, 256.
85 Letters, 74; Briefe, I, 241. Aut Caesar aut nihil literally translates as ‘It’s either Caesar or nothing’, or in the Mozarts’ situation ‘It’s either Vienna or nothing’.
86 These accusations are noted by Leopold in his letter to Lorenz Hagenauer dated 30 July 1768. Letters, 87–88; Briefe, I, 270.
admiration and even by public acknowledgements in writing. But by patience and perseverance one must convince people that our adversaries are wicked liars, slanderers and envious creatures, who would laugh up their sleeves if we were to get frightened or tired out and, by going off in a huff, give them the victory.\textsuperscript{87}

It was not exclusively the musical establishment that created Leopold’s dissatisfaction with the Imperial capital. The general public’s appetite for comedic folk dramas was something with which the Mozarts were unfamiliar in Salzburg. Wolfgang’s stage works to that time had been serious philosophical dramas, and those that he produced while in Vienna illustrate the contrast.\textsuperscript{88} A disgruntled Leopold reported:

that the Viennese, generally speaking, do not care to see serious and sensible performances, have little or no idea of them, and only want to see foolish stuff, dances, devils, ghosts, magic, clowns, Lipperl, Bernardon, witches and apparitions is well known; and their theatres prove it every day.\textsuperscript{89}

Ironically, the ‘Bernardon’ that Leopold spoke of was a reference to the popular comic character created by Joseph Felix von Kurz (1717–1784), a member of a Viennese troupe who wrote many libretti during the middle of the eighteenth century. Commonly referred to as ‘Kurz-Bernardon’, he was very much a predecessor of the Schikaneder-Hanswurst combination; and, like Schikaneder, he was the doyen of Viennese \textit{Maschinenkomödie}.\textsuperscript{90} Little did Leopold know that a quarter of a century after his trip to Vienna his son’s \textit{Singspiel, Die Zauberflöte}, would successfully reinforce the ‘Hanswurstian’ comedic role with Papageno. The most influential critic of the Hanswurstian tradition was Joseph von Sonnenfels who, ironically, would eventually become a colleague of Wolfgang.\textsuperscript{91} His disapproval of the Viennese

\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Letters}, 88–91; \textit{Briefe}, I, 270–271.
\textsuperscript{88} Before arriving in Vienna, Wolfgang composed the music to one third of the allegorical drama \textit{Die Schuldigkeit des ersten Gebots}, which was performed at the Prince-Archbishop’s residence in 1769. Also, his first complete \textit{opera seria}, \textit{Apollo et Hyacinthus}, was premiered in the same year at the University of Salzburg. Polar opposites were his Vienna works, \textit{La finta semplice} and \textit{Bastien und Bastienne}, which were styled on the Viennese preference for comedy.
\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Letters}, 80; \textit{Briefe}, I, 254.
\textsuperscript{91} Conversely, a great admirer of the Hanswurst character was Christoph Martin Wieland. His literary influence on the Mozarts – particularly Leopold – should not be underestimated. His work \textit{Geschichte des Agathon} (\textit{The History of Agathon}, 1767), lambasts the trend that had engulfed society, namely the
audiences’ insistence on the Hanswurst character slowly eroded its popularity. At the time of the Mozarts’ stay in the capital, however, these characters were still very much in vogue.\(^{92}\)

Wolfgang’s profoundest contribution to the *Singspiel* form – most famously *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* and *Die Zauberflöte* – overshadows his earliest effort, *Bastien und Bastienne*. Written privately while the family was in Vienna, the circumstances of its creation are far more important than its subject matter. The libretto was patched together by Leopold from various plays that had been adapted by Viennese comedic actors, who appear to have borrowed the pastoral storyline from Jean-Jacques Rousseau, whose work *Le Devin du village* (*The Village Soothsayer, 1752*) was altered and introduced to Vienna in 1764.\(^{93}\)

The first performance of Wolfgang’s one-Act *Singspiel* was supposedly at the house of Franz Anton Mesmer (1734–1815), the physician who famously championed the healing powers of magnetics. Although the theory of a private premiere cannot be substantiated, the manner in which Leopold and Wolfgang talked of Mesmer’s house in later years leaves it as a genuine possibility.\(^{94}\) Having had a very similar Jesuit education to Leopold – he later studied philosophy and jurisprudence at university – Mesmer eventually settled on a career in medicine. Leopold’s medical interests would

---

\(^{92}\) Robert A. Kann explains Sonnenfels’ mentality aptly: ‘He did not drive Hanswurst from the stage merely to replace him with mediocre dramatic production. He did it to open the gates to Lessing and indirectly to Goethe, Schiller, Kleist, and Grillparzer. He did it primarily not for the sake of the Austrian literature of his time but in the expectation that reform would open the way for a greater Austrian literature of the future’. Robert A. Kann, *A Study in Austrian Intellectual History: From Late Baroque to Romanticism* (London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd., 1960) 223–224.


\(^{94}\) In 1773 Leopold talked of Mesmer’s house: ‘Herr von Mesmer, at whose house we lunched on Monday, played to us on Miss Davies’ armonica or glass instrument and played very well. It cost him about fifty ducats and it is very beautifully made. His garden is extremely fine, with views and statues, a theatre, an aviary, a pigeon-loft and, at the top, a belvedere looking right over the Prater’. *Letters, 235; Briefe, I, 484*. Wolfgang, too, wrote of the house after he moved to Vienna in 1781: ‘In regard to our old acquaintances I must tell you that I have only been out once to see Frau von Mesmer. The house is no longer what it was’. *Letters, 786; Briefe, III, 183.*
have certainly helped to consolidate their friendship. Although Mesmer’s most famous research relating to magnetism was conducted after the Mozarts’ stay in Vienna, the family were nonetheless impressed with his medical knowledge. This was ultimately celebrated more than a decade later in Wolfgang’s opera buffa, Così fan tutte, in which there is a reference to Mesmer’s work during the finale to Act I. After having supposedly poisoned Ferrando and Guglielmo, a disguised Despina cures them through the power of magnets:

DESPINA: This is that piece of magnet known as Mesmer’s stone, which they originally found in Germany, and which was then so famous in France.95

Considering that Wolfgang and da Ponte’s opera was written for the Viennese nobility and that Mesmer’s magnetic cures were particularly fashionable among the elite during the 1780s, Despina’s mention of the stone is undoubtedly a parody on how much faith the nobility placed in Mesmer’s theories.96

On 13 September 1768, Leopold wrote in a letter:

It was a year ago the day before yesterday, September 11th, that we left Salzburg. Could I ever have dreamt then that I should stay a year in Vienna? But who can oppose Fate! I am so annoyed that I could foam at the mouth. The only good thing to be said is that we all, thank God, are well. But I only wish that I could let you know the happy day of our departure!97

Leopold’s ultimate disappointment with Vienna was no doubt due to the splendid treatment he and his family had received elsewhere during the Grand Tour. The talent of the Wunderkinder, Leopold wrongfully assumed, would overcome all political and personal quarrelling.

Once the Mozarts returned from Vienna, Leopold quickly organised a tour of Italy thanks to the generosity and ongoing patience of the Prince-Archbishop Schrattenbach. The lack of success in Vienna may have instilled in Leopold a sense of distrust towards the city, something that may have sparked his hostility to his son moving there a decade later. For Wolfgang, however, Vienna only ‘harboured many

95 MO, 438.
intrigues’ for a boy of his age and would gradually grow into his city of desire.\textsuperscript{98} The distress which the capital of the Holy Roman Empire had caused the Mozarts would be easily dissipated – or so Leopold assumed – by a tour of Rome – the music and Catholic capital of the world.

\* * *

In what should be seen as the completion of a truly cosmopolitan education and experience, Leopold and Wolfgang undertook a journey to Italy. Perhaps more than coincidentally, without his mother and sister as aides, it was during this fifteen-month sojourn that Wolfgang showed the first signs of maturity: both physically and intellectually. Leopold reported his son’s anatomical growth in letters to his wife: ‘Wolfgang grew noticeably in Naples’,\textsuperscript{99} ‘If Wolfgang continues to grow as he is doing, he will be quite tall by the time we get home’,\textsuperscript{100} and ‘The [suit] which was made for him in Salzburg is too short by half a foot’.\textsuperscript{101} It was also during this Italian journey that Wolfgang began conversing in letter form, usually as additions or postscripts to his father’s correspondence back to Salzburg. While still technically a child, Wolfgang’s maturation during his travels through Italy illustrates the profound effect of his father’s education. A portrait painter whom the Mozarts befriended during their tour, and who subsequently created a portrait of Wolfgang, wrote to Maria Anna Mozart and congratulated her on the product of her and Leopold’s pedagogical skills:

\begin{quote}
I can only repeat the esteem that I feel for the one as for the other and, in consequence, how much I prize their Parents who with such careful education have cultivated such rare talents, talents which, having given you such lively pleasure, shall yet offer the world cause for universal admiration.\textsuperscript{102}
\end{quote}

Travelling to the heart of Catholicism, Leopold hoped, would restore his faith in his miracle, his prodigy of nature. It is likely that he had not expected the philosophical


\textsuperscript{99} \textit{Letters}, 148; \textit{Briefe}, I, 368.

\textsuperscript{100} \textit{Letters}, 149; \textit{Briefe}, I, 371.

\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Letters}, 176; \textit{Briefe}, I, 411.

and theological threads of the Enlightenment to have penetrated so deeply into Italy as they had. The Italian journey was as much a learning experience for the father as it was for the son.103

For seasoned travellers like the Mozarts, the journey from Salzburg to the cities of Italy would have been a blissful, picturesque change from their usually lengthy expeditions. A fellow eighteenth century German traveller was overwhelmed when he crossed the border into Italy. He found the visual aesthetic alone to be an inspiration:

There appears to me a singular difficulty, my friend, while innumerable beauties of every kind are floating before me, to select and describe them as to give you pleasure. Out of this multitude of objects, which solicit attention in Italy, a traveller can but choose a few. Their number and their worth oppress him and embarrass recollection. How difficult likewise is it to satisfy ourselves, when we would wish to communicate the pleasure we have received, while contemplating the works of nature or of genius.104

Goethe’s opening impressions of the Italian countryside induced a similar spiritual awakening. ‘From Bolzano to Trent’, wrote the thirty-seven year old, ‘the road goes along for nine miles through an increasingly fertile valley. Everything that tries so hard to grow in the higher mountains certainly has more life and strength here, the sun is hot, and I believe in a God again’.105

Leopold and Wolfgang had contrasting experiences of travelling through Italy. As well as the inclement weather that affected many parts of their journey, Leopold battled rheumatism – or ‘Revmatismum’ as he termed it106 – in his right arm, an ailment, he confessed to his wife, that he had contracted before they left Salzburg. Wolfgang, on the other hand, was constantly happy and enjoying the travel. The discrepancy in their attitudes corresponds with their respective ages; Wolfgang’s youthful voice was a noticeable change from his father’s often dry correspondence: ‘I too am still alive and always merry as usual and I simply love travelling. I have now

---

103 It was during this first trip to Italy that Leopold purchased a book by the Venetian publisher and journalist Giambattista Albrizzi (1698–1777) entitled Forestiero Illuminato (The Enlightened Visitor, 1765). MDB, 602.
105 GCW, VI, 26.
106 Letters, 165; Briefe, I, 395.
been on the Mediterranean too. I kiss Mamma’s hand and Nannerl 1000 times and am your son Stefel and your brother Hans’. 107

Italy’s cities, with their innumerable artistic and architectural splendours, were naturally an empowering experience for any foreign visitor. As well as its Catholic heritage, the ancient ruins of past civilisations were a constant source of conversation for the Mozarts as they passed through cities as part of their hectic schedule. Leopold found the difference between metropolitan and country Italy too glaring for his taste. Following a rather tumultuous journey from Florence to Rome that was accompanied by five days of awful weather, Leopold grumbled:

But I will not give you a long description of that dreadful journey. Picture to yourself a more or less uncultivated country and the most horrible, filthy inns, where we got nothing to eat save here and there eggs and broccoli; while on fast-days they sometimes made a fuss about giving us the former. 108

Once in Rome, however, Leopold found himself in a state of constant admiration of its historical foundations. ‘I am sorry you are not seeing all these Italian towns’, he wrote to his wife, ‘and especially Rome. It is useless and quite impossible to describe it in a few words’. 109 Like Leopold, Edward Gibbon – the eighteenth century’s most devoted disciple of antiquity – remarked how his anticipation of Rome was only superseded by his actual arrival. 110 ‘We shall certainly not neglect anything that should be seen in Rome’, Leopold reported. 111

Musically speaking, Wolfgang enjoyed much success as the Wunderkind and his father made sure to promote that image. His virtuosity and advanced talent for composition fascinated the Italians as much as anyone. However, owing to Leopold’s tendency to magnify the truth, Wolfgang’s musical feats in Italy should be considered carefully. Leopold’s legendary claim that his son had memorised and subsequently

108 Letters, 126; Briefe, I, 333.
109 Letters, 127; Briefe, I, 335.
110 In his autobiography, Gibbon wrote of his arrival in Rome: ‘My temper is not very susceptible of enthusiasm; and the enthusiasm which I do not feel, I have ever scorned to affect. But, at the distance of twenty-five years, I can neither forget nor express the strong emotions which agitated my mind as I first approached and entered the eternal city. After a sleepless night, I trod, with a lofty step, the ruins of the Forum; each memorable spot where Romulus stood, or Tully spoke, or Caesar fell, was at once present to my eye; and several days of intoxication were lost or enjoyed before I could descend to a cool and minute investigation’. Edward Gibbon, Autobiography (London: Buckland & Sumner, 1846) 167.
111 Letters, 127; Briefe, I, 335.
written out Gregorio Allegri’s (1582–1652) ‘famous Miserere’ from memory, for example, is most probably a product of Leopold the fabulist rather than Leopold the honest.\footnote{Letters, 127; Briefe, I, 335. According to Leopold, Wolfgang ran the risk of excommunication by transcribing from memory the ethereal sounds of the Miserere. Particularly in view of the fact that Wolfgang’s prized transcription of the work, which Leopold promised to bring back to Salzburg, has never been discovered, it is quite possible that Leopold fabricated the story. What is more, Charles Burney, in his treatise on the state of music in Italy, refuted Leopold’s claim that the Miserere had never been removed from Rome: ‘The Emperor Leopold the First, not only a lover and patron of music, but a good composer himself, ordered his ambassador at Rome to entreat the Pope to permit him to have a copy of the celebrated Miserere of Allegri, for the use of the Imperial chapel at Vienna; which being granted, a copy was made by the Signor Maestro of the Pope’s chapel, and sent to the Emperor’. Charles Burney, The Present State of Music in France and Italy (London, 1771) 279.}

What cannot be doubted, however, is the ease with which Wolfgang passed the examinations at the famed music academy of Bologna. Having been responsible for his son’s education, Leopold must surely have taken pride in the manner with which Wolfgang easily dealt with the examinations. The amazement of the examiners encouraged Leopold to write a proud letter to his wife:

We left Bologna a few days later than we had intended, for by a unanimous vote the Accademia Filarmonica received Wolfgang into their society and awarded him the diploma of Accademico Filarmonico. He won this honour under all the normal conditions and after a previous examination . . . [they] put before him, in the presence of all the members, an antiphon taken out of an antiphoner, which he had to arrange for four parts in an anteroom, into which the Bedellus led him, locking the door behind him . . . All the members were surprised that Wolfgang had finished his task so quickly, seeing that many candidates had spent three hours over an antiphon of three lines . . . Yet he had finished it in less than half an hour . . . This distinction does Wolfgang all the more credit for the Accademia Bonnoniensis is more than a hundred years old and, apart from Padre Martini and other eminent Italians, only the most distinguished citizens of other countries are members of it.\footnote{Letters, 165–166; Briefe, I, 396.}

Martini (1706–1784), who showed an interest in both Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s musical knowledge, wrote of the latter’s examination before the Academy:

I, the undersigned, attest that, having seen some Musical Compositions in various styles, and having several times heard [him play] the Harpsichord, the Violin, and sing, Sig. Cav. Giov. Amadeo Wolfgango Mozart of Salzburg, Master Chamber Musician to His Highness the eminent Prince Archbishop of Salzburg, aged 14 years, to my particular admiration, was found by me most highly versed in all the musical qualities indicated, he having passed every test whatever, above all in playing on the Harpsichord various subjects given him to
improvise, which with great mastery he carried out according to all the conditions demanded
by Art.\footnote{MDB, 127–128.}

It appears that Leopold’s allegiance to the Catholic faith was confirmed by his
experience in Rome. Not only had his and Wolfgang’s musical accomplishments been
satisfying, but being present in Italy, and particularly Rome, was enough to restore
erstwhile fragments of his once fragile faith.\footnote{For Leopold’s abrasiveness towards Catholic clergy, see Chapter 1.} Their numerous audiences with the
Pope, Clement XIV (1705–1774), led Leopold to write enthusiastically and in great
detail of these experiences. On first arriving in Rome, he wrote to Salzburg explaining
how fortunate their initial meeting with Clement XIV had been:

On arriving here on the 11\textsuperscript{th}, we went to St. Peter’s after lunch and then to Mass. On the 12\textsuperscript{th}
we were present at the Functiones, and when the Pope was serving the poor at table we were
quite close to him, as we were standing besides him at the top of the table. This incident was
all the more amazing as we had to pass through two doors guarded by Swiss guards in armour
and make our way through many hundreds of people. And moreover you must note that we
had as yet no acquaintances. But our fine clothes, the German tongue, and my usual freedom
of manner which led me to make my servant order the Swiss guards in German to make way
for us, soon helped us through everywhere. They took Wolfgang for some German courtier,
while some even thought that he was a prince, which my servant allowed them to believe; I
myself was taken for his tutor (Hofmeister).\footnote{Letters, 126; Briefe, I, 334.}

Succeeding performances before the Pope led Wolfgang to be made a Knight of the
Golden Order, and a member of the Order of the Golden Spur.\footnote{MDB, 123–124.} Wolfgang was so
proud of his award that he displayed it often and frequently defended its spiritual –
and monetary – value.\footnote{For a colourful account of how Wolfgang defended his award’s value, see his letter to Leopold
dated 16 October 1777. Letters, 322–326; Briefe, II, 62–67.} It also induced in him a sense of responsibility and
veneration, as he confessed in a letter to his father. As mentioned in Chapter 2, he
wrote how he once spoke to a man ‘with my most serious air, looking just as I do in
my portrait’.\footnote{Letters, 272; Briefe, II, 7.} This portrait, presumably that from 1777 by an unknown artist,
depicts Wolfgang with a sombre look on his face and he is clearly wearing the
insignia of the Golden Spur (see Plate 3). The spiritual grandeur of Rome clearly had a lasting impact on both Mozart men.

Quite noticeable to Leopold, however, was the secularism that had begun to infiltrate into the supposedly spiritual sanctuary of Rome. The continual animosity between Rome and the Jesuits interested Leopold and he anticipated their dissolution three years later. His letter from 29 September 1770 also demonstrates his frustration at the general level of Catholic indifference and even dissidence. This letter is important in understanding Leopold’s current attitude towards many of the pursuits of the Enlightenment. Having shown a significant level of defiance in his youth, Leopold was now more wary. Either the responsibility of being a father and teacher to Wolfgang gave him a greater sense of caution, or the once attractive illuminations of the Enlightenment had dimmed while his Catholicism took renewed hold:

You will have already heard that relations between the Pope and Portugal are again on a friendly footing. But people are very much afraid that the Jesuitical order will be dissolved. For Bishop Palafox, who in his day was so grievously persecuted by the Jesuits, is to be beatified. I could tell you about several disputes of this kind, but they would hardly interest you. It is a great misfortune that now-a-days in Catholic countries, even in Italy, the most disgraceful pamphlets are being published against the authority of the Pope and the immunity of the clergy.

Naturally, the Enlightenment in Italy was greeted with the sternest of religious opposition. As a result, one traveller from 1729 noted that within Italy, ‘the Enlightenment is not generally known’. The Church’s attempts to stave off the radical ideas and sciences that were infiltrating other European countries only strengthened the influence of various branches of Italian dissenters, such as the Jansenists.

120 Jean de Palafox de Mendoza (1600–1659). Spanish theologian who, as a bishop in Mexico, had many spiritual differences with the Jesuits.
121 Letters, 163; Briefe, I, 393.
122 Quoted in David Sorkin, The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews, and Catholics from London to Vienna (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008) 97. Furthermore, Sorkin elaborated on the clerics’ attempts to nullify the Enlightenment in Italy: ‘The obstacles [were] numerous: little contact with other countries; a dearth of books; no encouragement from Princes; and the public’s indifference to, indeed suspicion of, men of letters. Moreover, the Church raised barriers only the most intrepid could negotiate, such as teaching Copernicus as a hypothesis’.
While the emergence of Enlightened thinking came up against very strong opposition from the leaders of the Catholic church, by the middle of the century, there had nevertheless emerged a fairly clear-cut category of Catholicism that had been influenced by the radical principles of the time. These ‘Enlightened Catholics’ argued for the reformation of education so as to incorporate the modern sciences without abandoning the religious framework. The most influential of these ‘Enlightened Catholics’ was Ludovico Muratori (1672–1750), whose writings and teaching methods became the model for many pedagogues across the German Catholic areas, particularly Salzburg. His writings and instructions were even read and quoted by such luminaries as Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Edward Gibbon. Which two books written by Muratori that Leopold Mozart professed to own is unknown; however, when we consider Muratori’s religious and educational influences in the Habsburg domains, plus Leopold’s seeming affinity with the Catholic strand of the Aufklärung, it should not be at all surprising that he laid claim to them. In fact, Muratori’s pedagogical authority in Catholic German cities is enough to surmise that he was another of Leopold’s models in education.

The conglomerate of attractions found in Italy, and particularly Rome, confirmed the city as one of the essential chapters in a Grand Tour. Although many historians limit the Mozarts’ tour to the France–England–Dutch Republic triad, it must be remembered that Leopold saw Italy as an essential ingredient in his son’s cosmopolitan education. While it had the ruins of a fallen Empire as a constant reminder of its former pagan existence, Catholicism was Rome’s strongest and most relevant drawcard. With the ancient and Christian attractions coexisting in the Eternal city, eighteenth century pilgrims saw Rome as generating a profusion of varied

---


128 Briefe, IV, 27.

129 See Chapter 1 for Leopold’s affection for the pedagogical thought of Gellert, Erasmus, and Fénelon.
inspiration and importance. Gibbon and Winckelmann visited Rome because of its preservation of antiquity, Goethe because he enjoyed the visual inspiration and tranquillity that remained from the Renaissance, while many, including Leopold Mozart, found Christian reaffirmation. ‘What makes life in Rome so agreeable is that there are so many people here who spend their whole lives thinking about art and practising it’, remarked Goethe in a letter to a friend. The Italian lifestyle and surroundings had become ‘the fulfilment of all my desires and dreams – how can I leave the one place on the face of this earth that can become paradise to me?’. The seemingly indescribable aspect of Rome, and to a wider extent Italy, left foreign visitors wanting either to prolong their journey or delay their return. Because of various duties and requirements back in Salzburg, Leopold and Wolfgang returned home in March 1771. They would subsequently revisit Italy, however, on two separate occasions over the following twenty-four months. Owing to his operatic commissions and resulting success (Mitridate, Ascanio in Alba, Lucio Silla), these journeys also proved helpful in developing and furthering Wolfgang’s grasp of Italian. To understand, translate and communicate in the language of music was an essential talent for a composer to possess. It is evident from many of his earliest surviving letters that mastering Italian – and Latin – was well within his capability. The many months spent in Italy were a successful and highly rewarding experience for the two Mozarts. Pre-empting Goethe’s reluctance to leave, Leopold wrote to his wife shortly before his own final departure in 1773: ‘Indeed I find it hard to leave Italy’.

* * *

Despite the imminence of the Sturm und Drang movement of the 1770s and its influence in forming many of Wolfgang’s attitudes, Leopold and his son continued to outline a series of common interests through their correspondence. The most significant for this dissertation was their mutual respect and admiration for the writing
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130 Goethe commented on 1 December 1786: ‘Many foreigners are seen here in Rome, not all of whom visit this capital of the world for the sake of higher art. On the contrary, they seek other kinds of entertainment, and the Romans are prepared with a variety of such’. GCW, VI, 118.
132 For an early example of Wolfgang’s multilingual talent, see the postscript to his father’s letter from 14 December 1769. Briefe, I, 293.
133 Letters, 231; Briefe, I, 483.
of Christoph Martin Wieland (1733–1813), who was universally regarded as one of the foremost German literary and prose stylists. Goethe praised him for being ‘indefatigable in his pursuit of excellence’,\textsuperscript{134} while John Quincy Adams (1767–1848), who subsequently became the sixth president of the United States of America, recognised Wieland’s revered status as late as 1800 by describing him as ‘the most popular of the German poets’.\textsuperscript{135} As far as the two Mozarts were concerned, Wieland embodied a gentle and humorous approach that assisted in bridging the generational gap between them.\textsuperscript{136}

Not only were works by Wieland discovered in Wolfgang’s personal library – a 1781 edition of Oberon and a 1770 publication of Die Dialogen des Diogenes von Sinope\textsuperscript{137} – but he spasmodically entered Wolfgang’s life as well. During his lengthy stay in Mannheim en route to Paris in 1777, Wolfgang eagerly awaited Wieland’s arrival for the premiere of Anton Schweitzer’s (1735–1787) opera Rosemunde: ‘Herr Wieland, who wrote the libretto, is also coming here this winter’, Wolfgang reported to Leopold. ‘I should like to meet him’.\textsuperscript{138} After arriving in Mannheim on 21 December 1777, Wieland was quickly sought by Wolfgang who then wrote an uncharacteristically lengthy description of their meeting. For someone who rarely detailed his personal encounters with any precision or specificity, Wolfgang’s description of Wieland is an acknowledgement of the poet’s stature, plus his and Leopold’s mutual interest in him. On 27 December Wolfgang wrote:

\textsuperscript{134} GCW, III, 191.
\textsuperscript{135} Quoted in William Henry Seward, Life and Public Services of John Quincy Adams (New York: Miller, Orton & Mulligan, 1855) 71. Adams’ letter further explains: ‘Although there was in his genius neither the originality nor the deep pathos of Goethe, Klopstock, or Schiller, there was something in the playfulness of his imagination, in the tenderness of his sensibility, in the sunny cheerfulness of his philosophy, and in the harmony of his versification, which delighted me’.
\textsuperscript{136} Wieland lived and worked as the literary landscape of Germany was in transition. His writings had progressed from the moderate style of Gellert yet they were clearly before the emotion-charged approach adopted by the Stürmer und Dränger. In his youthful critique on Wieland in Götter, Helden und Wieland (Gods, Heroes and Wieland, 1773), Goethe took issue with the former’s nonchalant approach to and understanding of death, an idea that was central to the passion evoked by the Sturm und Dräng. Furthermore, Goethe attacks Wieland’s indifferent attitude to antiquity – an issue discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation:

\textbf{WIELAND:} Only cowards (Feige) fear death.
\textbf{ADMETUS:} A hero’s death yes! But common or garden death, everyone fears that, even a hero [. . .]
\textbf{WIELAND:} You speak like people from another world, a language whose words I hear but whose sense I cannot grasp.
\textbf{ADMETUS:} We are speaking Greek. Is that so incomprehensible to you?’ Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Sämtliche Werke: Briefe, Tagebücher und Gespräche in 40 Bänden, IV (Frankfurt: Deutsche Klassiker, 1985) 431.
\textsuperscript{137} MDB, 602.
\textsuperscript{138} Letters, 401; Briefe, II, 162.
I have now added Herr Wieland to the list of my acquaintances. But he doesn’t know as much about me as I know about him, for he has never heard any of my compositions. ¹³⁹ I had imagined him to be quite different from what I found him. He strikes you as slightly affected in his speech. He has a rather childish voice; he keeps on quizzes you over his glasses; he indulges in a sort of pedantic rudeness, combined occasionally with a stupid condescension. But I am not surprised that he permits himself such behaviour here, even though he might be quite different in Weimar and elsewhere, for people stare at him as if he had dropped from Heaven. Everyone seems embarrassed in his presence, no one says a word or moves an inch; all listen intently to every word he utters; and it’s a pity they often have to wait so long, for he has a defect of speech that makes him speak very slowly and he can’t say half a dozen words without stopping. Apart from that, he is what we all know him to be, a most gifted fellow. He has a frightfully ugly face, covered with pock-marks, and he has a rather long nose. In height he is, I should say, a little taller than Papa. ¹⁴⁰

In reply Leopold wrote that ‘The portrait you sketched of Wieland for my benefit I too could almost have given you, although I have never seen him. For M. Grimm and the two Romanzows gave me a most minute description of him during a walk which we all took together over the Mönchsberg. Philosophical birds (Philosophische Köpfe) of his type usually have something odd about them’. ¹⁴¹

Again, on 10 January 1778, Wolfgang reported proudly to his father that Wieland had developed a keen interest in his music. ‘Now that he has heard me twice’, Wolfgang wrote:

Herr Wieland is quite enchanted with me. The last time after showering compliments on me he said: ‘It is a real piece of good fortune that I have found you here’, and he pressed my hand. ¹⁴²

Leopold, too, was an admirer of Wieland; this is evident from the correspondence. Moreover, while Oberon and Diogenes were discovered to be in Wolfgang’s possession at the time of his death, Leopold refers to two more of

¹³⁹ This is not technically true. Unbeknownst to both men, Wieland had heard one of Wolfgang’s compositions in 1774. A mutual friend, Baron Tobias Philipp Gebler (1726–1786), had sent Wieland the music to his and Wolfgang’s Thamos, König in Aegypten, a five-act play. Wieland responded by saying: ‘Receive, . . . dearest friend, my most sincere thanks . . . for the beautiful music for Thamos, which you sent me. Our Schweitzer, [Anton Schweitzer was the theatre composer in Weimar] whom I believe to be incomparable in his kind, has found much that is fine in this music, and in general a great ability in its author, although he guessed immediately that he must still be a beginner’. MDB, 149.
¹⁴⁰ Letters, 435; Briefe, II, 207.
¹⁴¹ Letters, 442; Briefe, II, 220.
¹⁴² Letters, 444; Briefe, II, 222.
Wieland’s works in his letters. On 13 September 1782, Leopold wrote to the Baroness von Waldstädten (1744–1811) declaring his gratitude for her kindness:

> It is impossible for me to describe to your Ladyship my heartfelt pleasure on reading your charming and flattering letter. It reminded me, as I read it, of Wieland’s *Sympathies*. It is undoubtedly true that many people are blessed with a higher plane of thought and unconsciously dwell together in a secret spiritual union before they have ever seen or spoken to one another.\(^\text{143}\)

This letter – containing Leopold’s reference to *Sympathien* – highlights a remarkable connection between Wieland’s work and a quartet comprising Leopold, Wolfgang, the Baroness, and Constanze Weber. Wieland published the work in 1756 after the separation from his cousin Sophie Gutermann (later Sophie La Roche, 1731–1807) a few years earlier. The loss of his love forced Wieland into a philosophical outlook and he ‘did his best to hide his pain by sublimating his very real love into a purely Platonic relationship’.\(^\text{144}\) The idea of a non-sexual relationship was a common theme in many of Wieland’s works. In his *Gespräche im Elysium (Conversations in Elysium, 1801)*, he unapologetically glorifies such a union, stating that a relationship of a Platonic nature benefited the human mind. He wrote:

> I expatiated on the beauties of Platonic love . . . the love which teems with intellectual raptures . . . expands the spiritual qualities of the soul . . . and fills the mind with every sublime and virtuous contemplation.\(^\text{145}\)

Furthermore, *Sympathien* was Wieland’s attempt to combine the theories of Platonic love with the philosophies of antiquity, primarily its emphasis on morality. It championed the notion that two unknown souls could discover tranquil love for each other through mutual suffering. Addressing the reader, Wieland concluded *Sympathien* thus:

> Adieu then, dear congenial souls of sympathy, dispersed upon this sublunary globe, whose sensations are kindred to my own! Although time and distance in human life have separated

\(^{143}\) *Letters*, 820; *Briefe*, III, 228–229.


\(^{145}\) Christoph Martin Wieland, *Gespräche in Elysium* in *Conversations of Elysium* (London: J. Bell, 1804) 158.
us, and prevent our knowledge of each other in this earthly attire; yet a pure and persevering virtue will soon, very soon, release us from a transitory bondage, and re-unite us in the ever blissful realms of the super celestial.\textsuperscript{146}

Leopold, who had been a widower for four years when he struck up a congenial, written friendship with the widow Waldstädten in 1782, believed Wieland’s ideal to be plausible. Having had his heart broken by Gutermann and then by a series of failed relationships, Wieland declared his aversion to the all-encompassing form of love, and attempted thereafter only to engage in Platonic relationships. This may explain his marriage to Dorothea Hillebrand (1745–1801) in 1765. It was an arranged marriage that, despite its apparent lack of emotional attraction, was lasting and fulfilling.\textsuperscript{147} Leopold’s relationship with Waldstädten was – in the elder Mozart’s eyes – an echo of Wieland’s \textit{Sympathien} and of its author’s expertise in human relations.

Wolfgang, conversely, was initially not so fond of Waldstädten, either because he was defensive vis-à-vis any woman filling the void in Leopold’s life following Maria Anna’s death, or because he doubted the intentions and reputation of the Baroness. An indication of this is given in a letter he wrote to Constanze Weber in 1782, three months before their marriage. He was displeased with her seductive behaviour at a party and likened her conduct to that of Baroness Waldstädten:

\begin{quote}
I entreat you, therefore, to ponder and reflect upon the cause of all this unpleasantness, which arose from my being annoyed that you were so impudently inconsiderate as to say to your sisters – and, be it noted, in my presence – that you had let a \textit{chapeau} measure the calves of your legs. No woman who cares for her honour can do such a thing. It is quite a good maxim to do as one’s company does . . . If it be true that the Baroness herself allowed it to be done to her, the case is still quite different, for she is already past her prime and cannot possibly attract any longer – and besides, she is inclined to be promiscuous with her favours. I hope, dearest friend, that, even if you do not wish to become my wife, you will never lead a life like hers.\textsuperscript{148}
\end{quote}

Wolfgang concluded his letter with an implicit illustration of his increasing maturity. It may have also been influenced by his recent arrival in the enlightened atmosphere

\begin{footnotes}
\item[146] Christoph Martin Wieland, \textit{Sympathien} (1756) in \textit{The Sympathy of Souls} (London: Byfield and Hawksworth, 1795) 191.
\item[148] Letters, 802–803; \textit{Briefe}, III, 206.
\end{footnotes}
of Josephinian Vienna: ‘You realise now how much I love you. I do not fly into a passion as you do. I think, I reflect and I feel’.149

Although the Baroness von Waldstädten eventually became a friend and supporter of Wolfgang, the time around his marriage and Leopold’s infatuation with her seemingly caused some heartache for the young composer. Wolfgang probably misconstrued Leopold and Waldstädten’s honestly Platonic association as something more intimate. Perhaps alarmed by the discrepancy in age and, furthermore, unaware of their correspondence, Wolfgang seems to have viewed Waldstädten in an entirely different manner from that of his father. Leopold’s vision of a Sympathien-esque unity eventuated in 1785. He wrote to his daughter informing her of their arrangement. It is unknown whether Wolfgang ever learnt the extent of their relationship:

The Baroness von Waldstädten is sending us her horses on Tuesday and we are to drive out to see her at Klosterneuburg, her present headquarters, lunch with her and return in the evening. I am very anxious to meet this woman of my heart, since I, invisus, have been the man of her heart.150

As far as can be established, Leopold’s and the Baroness’ relationship never went further than their series of amorous letters and solitary meeting in 1785. The elder Mozart’s return from Vienna to Salzburg and eventual death in 1787 meant that their bond remained a Platonic one. Such was Wieland’s influence on Leopold, particularly in relation to Waldstädten, that Leopold assumed a philosophic and introspective nature presumably to encourage their union to remain non-physical. He wrote to her describing how he had assumed an air of reflection following a series of disagreements with Wolfgang. Although he remained disillusioned and probably frustrated, he was content with such an existence:

When I was a young fellow I used to think that philosophers were people who said little, seldom laughed, and turned a sulky face upon the world in general. But my own experiences have completely persuaded me that, without knowing it, I must be a philosopher.151

149 Letters, 803; Briefe, III, 207.
150 Letters, 889; Briefe, III, 388. The Leopold–Waldstädten relationship is strikingly similar to that between Pyotr Ilich Tchaikovsky (1840–1893) and Nadezhda von Meck (1831–1894), his benefactress. Theirs, however, was one that excluded any physical meeting. For more, see David Brown, Tchaikovsky: A Biographical and Critical Study, Vol. II, The Crisis Years (1874–1878) (London: Victor Gollancz, Ltd., 1992) 224.
151 Letters, 815; Briefe, III, 222.
During these latter years of his life, Leopold Mozart had come to the realisation that although he had never been regarded as a Man of Letters – a label he had desperately craved during his earlier years – he had gained enough life experience to assume the role of ‘philosopher’. The trials and tribulations that Wolfgang had placed upon him had, in hindsight, earned him enough experience and worldliness to warrant such a title. This admission to Waldstädten is reminiscent of Wieland’s character Agathon, from his Geschichtede des Agathon (History of Agathon), who experiences a similar realisation. A reflective Agathon discovered that time and experience, rather than intelligence and precociousness, made the philosopher:

He knew, I say, after all the experience he had already had, this difference of men from what they might be, and probably from what they should be, too well to found his plan upon platonic ideas. He was no longer that juvenile enthusiast, who thought it as easy to carry a great design into execution, as to conceive it.  

Leopold Mozart’s admission late in life that he was weary and bewildered with society is not surprising. Like his hero Wieland, whom he referred to as that ‘Philosophical bird’; Leopold retreated from society and maintained the notion that experience provided the greatest lessons in life. During his final years, Leopold believed that he too was a ‘philosopher’ or even a ‘philosophical bird’.

Another marked reference to one of Wieland’s works comes from the beginning of Wolfgang’s journey to Paris. It occurred before he had met the writer or was even aware of their imminent meeting. It fact, it was Leopold who alluded to Wieland in a letter of 18 October 1777 while his son was sojourning in Augsburg. The following comment, as will be explained, was born out of Leopold’s continuing distrust and contempt for his birthplace:

What you tell me about Augsburg and your visit to the Magistrate Longotabarros is precisely what I expected. That letter of yours made me and all of us laugh very heartily, and not least Herr Bullinger. Whenever I thought of your journey to Augsburg, Wieland’s Abderiten occurred to me. How often does one not experience in real life some circumstance of which one has read and which at the time seemed utterly impossible! Herr Longotabarros was

---

153 Letters, 442; Briefe, II, 220.
extraordinarily clever at his studies, but he never got beyond Salzburg and Innsbruck, where he was obliged to continue them and where he became Juris Utriusque Doctor. He was then immediately appointed to the lowest post in the magistracy, served through all the grades in the Augsburg municipality, and finally became Magistrate, which is the highest rung in the ladder. He has therefore seen nothing of the world.\textsuperscript{154}

Wieland’s \textit{Die Geschichte der Abderiten} (The History of the Abderites) appeared between 1774 and 1780 in the author’s own literary review journal, \textit{Der teutsche Merkur} (The German Mercury). It is a satirical look at the stupidity of the citizens inhabiting the Greek city of Abdera. Written in five separate yet loosely connected volumes, Wieland’s work aimed to demonstrate the importance of Enlightened ideals such as reason and tolerance, while simultaneously discrediting the extreme opinions of eminent writers such as Winckelmann, who believed that the ancient Greeks were a far superior and intelligent race.\textsuperscript{155}

The first volume of the \textit{Abderiten} seems to have been the basis for Leopold’s aforementioned allusion. He was clearly comparing the citizens of Augsburg to those from Wieland’s Abdera, believing both to be unintelligent and limited. His final comment – ‘He has therefore seen nothing of the world’ – is particularly relevant to the first volume. The citizens of Abdera concoct a law that prevents their young citizens from travelling and gaining cosmopolitan experience and education – key aspects of Leopold’s pedagogical attitude. The law was created in response to Democritus who, after travelling extensively over many years, returned and surprised the Abderites with his advanced level of tolerance, intelligence and wisdom. It is easy to understand why the Mozarts would have found the following passage from Wieland’s satirical work personally amusing:

\begin{quote}
Letters, 331–332; Briefe, II, 72. ‘Longotabarro’ is a reference to Jakob Wilhelm Benedikt Langenmantel (1719–1790), a former acquaintance of Leopold. Wolfgang’s letter to his father on 14 October 1777 details his meeting with Langenmantel. The description is written in a sarcastic tone which is why Leopold thought of Wieland’s \textit{Abderiten} while reading it. Wolfgang wrote: ‘For just hear how kind and generous these good Augsburg gentleman have been! In no place have I been overwhelmed with so many marks of honour as here. My first visit was to the magistrate, Longotabarro. My uncle [presumably Leopold’s younger brother Franz Aloys (1727–1791), father of Wolfgang’s cousin, Maria Anna Thekla, the ‘Bäsle’], a most excellent and lovable man and an honourable townsman, accompanied me and had the honour of waiting upstairs on the landing like a lackey until I should come out of the Arch-Magistrate’s room. I did not forget to deliver at once my Papa’s most humble respects. He was so good as to remember our whole history and asked me: “How has he fared all this time?” Whereupon I at once replied: “Very well, thanks and praise be to God. And I trust that you too have fared very well?”’ After that he began to unbend, and addressed me in the second person, while I continued to address him as “Your Highness”, as I had done from the very first’. Letters, 315; Briefe, II, 54.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
“That’s the way things go,” they said, “when young men are allowed to travel about in the wide world to learn how to be ashamed of their fatherland and, with their head full of foreign ideas, to return after ten or twenty years as cosmopolitans who know everything better than their grandfathers and have seen everything elsewhere better than at home. The old Egyptians who allowed nobody to travel before he bore fifty years on his back were wise people.”

And the Abderites quickly passed a law to the effect that no son of an Abderite was henceforth to be permitted to travel farther than to the Isthmus of Corinth, longer than one year, and in any other manner than under the supervision of an aged tutor of old Abderite origin, way of thinking, and manners.

“To be sure, young people must see the world,” said the decree, “but precisely for that reason they are not to stop any longer at each place than it takes them to see what is to be seen with their eyes. The tutor is to take especially exact notice of the kinds of inns they visit, how they eat, and how much they spend, so that their fellow citizens can in the future make use of this profitable secret information. Further (as the decree continues), with a view to saving the expenses of an all too long sojourn in one place, the tutor is to see to the young Abderite’s not getting involved in any unnecessary acquaintanceships. At an inn, either the proprietor or a servant, as natives of the place and as ingenuous persons, can best tell him what noteworthy things can be seen there, what the names of the local scholars and artists are, where they live, and at what time one can see them – this the tutor notes in his diary; and so, if one husbands one’s time properly, a lot can be seen.”

Having placed an unyielding emphasis on worldly education, Leopold viewed Wieland’s Abderiten for what it was: an amusing and satirical depiction of bureaucratic absurdities. Furthermore, it emphasized Wieland’s overriding philosophy in relation to the Aufklärung, that education and the pursuit of knowledge were what separated the ideals of his age from those of previous generations. Wieland saw this as the distinction between ‘brightness and obscurity, between light and darkness’. Leopold obviously considered his former friends and colleagues in Augsburg as being an unenlightened crowd, while regarding himself as a German Democritus, having left his home city to further his education and understanding of the world.

Wieland’s influence on eighteenth century German literature was great and, therefore, makes Leopold and Wolfgang’s mutual appreciation of him all the more relevant in the present context. During a period in which Wolfgang was starting to

seek an avenue to evade Leopold’s overbearing presence, Wieland and his writing was one of the few external forces that transcended the relationship’s dynamics. Derek Maurice van Abbé has suggested that during the 1770s, the decade that witnessed the arrival of the Sturm und Drang movement, Wieland’s literary stature sank, only to rise again for the following generation.\textsuperscript{158} That Wolfgang shared his father’s admiration of Wieland demonstrates how literary and philosophical movements do not emerge in any clear cut fashion, but rather grow slowly throughout society over a period of time. The rebelliousness that Wolfgang showed his father while in Paris represents, therefore, his natural inclination to break free from parental control. The emergence of the Sturm und Drang movement – with its celebration of youthful defiance in the face of authority – coincided with the growing strain in the Mozarts’ relationship. A survey of Sturm und Drang sentiment is important therefore not because Wolfgang was an intrinsic part of the movement, but rather because he existed within that age and was subconsciously affected by it.

The following chapter examines the years that saw Wolfgang outgrow dependency on his father and, consequently, pursue his own musical ambitions. Following his unsuccessful journey to Paris, Wolfgang returned to Salzburg only to discover the limited opportunities there. This, in turn, forced him to leave the Prince-Archbishop’s service and move to Vienna. Chapter 4 considers the events that led to this decision.

\textsuperscript{158} Derek Maurice van Abbé, \textit{Christoph Martin Wieland} (London: George G. Harrop & Co. Ltd., 1961) 134. Wieland was not actively involved in the Sturm und Drang movement; however, it was because of his groundbreaking translations of Shakespeare that many of the Stürmer und Dränger came to know and appreciate the English playwright.
4. Leopold and Wolfgang, 1778–1781: *Sturm und Drang* and the rupture of the Mozarts’ relationship.

The purpose of this chapter is to present the lives of Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart from the moment the latter travelled to Paris with his mother in 1777, to his final break from the Prince-Archbishop and Salzburg patronage in 1781. As will be illustrated, four major events occurred during this time that clearly demonstrate the difference in attitude the Mozart men came to hold towards life and the world around them.

The first was Wolfgang’s journey to Paris. This was his first tour without Leopold, who had not been granted leave from his Salzburg employer. Consequently, Maria Anna Mozart accompanied her son on the journey. As will be documented, she did not heap the usual parental pressure on her son to find employment. This, in turn, led to Leopold’s frustration, and he was reduced to dictating orders through his correspondence. The aggressive and disappointed tone that Leopold evidently adopted towards his son was a strong factor in their eventual impasse.

The second event was the sudden and unexpected death of Maria Anna Mozart – who was in Paris with her son – which created an irreparable fracture in Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s relationship. Wolfgang’s inability to explain in detail to his father the measures he took to prevent her death proved to Leopold that his son, at twenty-two years of age, was not mature enough to handle such a situation. From Wolfgang’s point of view, Leopold’s harsh and unsympathetic letters were unwarranted, and demonstrated to him that his father could not relinquish his role as the all-controlling parent. Maria Anna’s death, as will be shown, was Wolfgang’s first personal confrontation with loss of human life. By the time of Leopold’s death ten years later, Wolfgang’s attitude towards mortality had been entirely transformed. It will be demonstrated later in Chapter 6 how this was directly influenced by Enlightened attitudes towards death – a true difference when juxtaposed with traditional, established Catholic beliefs.

The third major event during this period was Wolfgang’s flirtations with the Weber family in Mannheim, and in particular his amorous relationship with the second eldest daughter, Aloysia. His preference to tour Italy with the Webers rather than remain in Paris resulted in Leopold’s agitation at his son’s seemingly random
decision-making. This event in particular, which was played out in their correspondence, is especially important in demonstrating Wolfgang’s desire to move away from both his father and his father’s control. It is also necessary to establish the link with the Webers because it was they who became Wolfgang’s surrogate family during his early days in Vienna. This will be detailed further in Chapter 6.

Finally, it will be demonstrated how Wolfgang’s tour of Vienna in 1781 with the Prince-Archbishop, and their subsequent feud, resulted in the young composer breaking away from not only his immediate Salzburg employer, but from established patronage in general. This chapter will conclude with a discussion of a correlation between Wolfgang’s rejection of the Prince-Archbishop, and the decreasing reliance on patronage amongst German artists. Criticism from the Aufklärer concerning class structure and social prejudice was particularly timely during Wolfgang’s dealings with the Prince-Archbishop. It was, however, as the ultimate conclusion to this chapter will demonstrate, his struggle for freedom from Leopold’s guidance that was the decisive reason for his move to Vienna. In his letters to his father during this time, Wolfgang attempted to explain how such a dramatic relocation was essential for him to mature and ‘draw breath’.¹

During this period of Leopold and Wolfgang’s deteriorating relationship there emerged a radical trend in German literature and philosophy. Known subsequently as the Sturm und Drang, it was a bridge between the style of Gellert and Klopstock, and the eventual rise of a whole group of impassioned nineteenth century German writers. It was the writers of the Sturm und Drang, according to Roy Pascal, who ‘threw down a challenge to the State and its purposes in the name of personal and social culture, a challenge that succeeding generations could not ignore’.² Following Leopold and Wolfgang’s mutual fascination with the life and times of the writer Wieland, as explored in the previous chapter, the influence German literature had on their lives will become further evident. The writings that emerged from the Sturm und Drang period strongly emphasised themes such as suicide, animosity towards parental figures, the process of education, and one’s obligation to the State. That this period in Wolfgang’s life encompassed all of these issues to some degree, as detailed in this chapter, emphasises that the sentiments expressed by the Stürmer und Dränger were to a considerable extent representative of their generation.

¹ Letters, 690; Briefe, III, 60–61.
² Roy Pascal, Storm and Stress, 301.
There is a school of thought which maintains that the *Sturm und Drang* movement was an anachronism.³ The movement was either forgotten or incorrectly described by nineteenth century scholars as being a weak and unfulfilled literary manifestation when compared to similar movements in France and Britain. Following the enormous social and intellectual impact of the French Revolution, ‘the fact that Germany too had been a country of Enlightenment, was then forgotten for a long time’.⁴

Goethe’s reference to the *Sturm und Drang* in *Aus meinem Leben: Dichtung und Wahrheit* (*From my Life: Truth and Poetry*, 1811–1832) is, therefore, not only evidence of the movement’s existence but also proves that the reality of the period still carried weight for him at the time of writing his autobiography well into the nineteenth century. He wrote that the *Sturm und Drang* was a necessary step in German literature despite many – possibly himself included – being cautious or oblivious contributors:

> We drifted about on a highway and byway, and thus, too, in several respects, the ground was prepared for that German literary revolution of which we were witnesses and to which, consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, we relentlessly made our contribution.”⁵

While Hamann and Herder are usually credited with being the instigators of the *Sturm und Drang* movement, it was Johann August Eberhard (1739–1809) who best defined the movement in his treatise *Allgemeine Theorie des Denkens und Empfindens* (*General Theory of Thought and Feeling*, 1776). His explanation of the sentiments associated with the *Sturm und Drang* contained much that was still related to the
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³ For problems associated with *Sturm und Drang* and the works associated with the movement, see Lilian R. Furst’s excellent explanation of the term ‘Sturm und Drang’ in *Counterparts: the dynamics of the Franco–German literary relationships, 1770–1895* (Taylor & Francis, 1977) 49–52. Furthermore, for a detailed analysis of the *Sturm und Drang* and its relevance to everyday Germans, see Benjamin W. Redekop, *Enlightenment and Community: Lessing, Abbt, Herder and the quests for a German public* (Montreal: McGill Queen’s Press, 2000) 41, n. 46.


Aufklärung. The opening passage is strikingly similar to Alexander Pope’s *Essay on Man* from 1734:

The most important study of man is man himself, his inclinations, his passions. The most important observations he can make of himself would be precisely those that he makes of his emotions and passions, of their origins, their relatedness, their transformation, growth and decrease; for mostly on this does our self-knowledge depend, to the extent that it can serve our moral development, the directing of our will.  

The works written during this period dealt with a series of often related issues. Themes such as suicide, infanticide, nationalism, patronage, and family disunity were all subjects relevant to the young German writers of the 1770s. While they maintained many of the fundamental principles that figures of an earlier generation had fought so hard to establish, at the same time they embraced a new, almost irrational approach to society, which emphasised the expression of personal and intimate emotions.

A fine example of the multifaceted components belonging to the *Sturm und Drang* is found in the opening Act of Johann Anton Leisewitz’s (1752–1806) play, *Julius von Tarent* (*Julius of Tarento*, 1776). Talking about his sweetheart to his friend Count Aspermonte, Julius describes the many emotions that had transfixed him the previous night. In doing so, Leisewitz perfectly illustrates the underlying tone of the *Sturm und Drang* movement:

JULIUS: What would you know of it? Name an emotion and I had it. I was whirled without stop from one extreme of human nature to another: at times I leaped from one emotion to its antithesis, at others I was dragged through every emotion that lay between. All possibilities swirled around me; I must have seen my fate in one of them. In one I had already broken into her convent and led her to my room. But as I neared the bridal bed, I saw my father standing there with an expression of such infinite paternal anguish . . . I let her hand fall.

ASPERMONTE: Did you make no use of this? Did not reason come to your aid?

JULIUS: In truth, these dreams seem to have awakened my reason.  

In his biography on the composer, Alfred Einstein claimed that Wolfgang Mozart saw Leisewitz’s play during the initial period of unrest with his father. Although only a

---


7 *FPSD*, 193.
small example of Sturm und Drang sentimentality, Julius of Tarento is an archetypal product of the age in which Wolfgang lived. The struggle between father and son is a common theme in many plays that emerged from the period. Although neither Leopold nor Wolfgang directly contributed to the Sturm und Drang movement in any way, it would be naïve to fundamentally rule out the effect such a passionate and patriotic band of writers had on its audience and society.9

* * *

To understand what contributed to the animosity in the Mozarts’ relationship, Wolfgang’s trip to Paris must be examined. In particular, the letters he exchanged with his father back in Salzburg highlight an agitation between the two over various musical and personal issues. The original scenario for the journey was, as usual, for both Leopold and Wolfgang to travel together. Their employer in Salzburg, the Prince–Archbishop Colloredo (1732–1812), had become annoyed at the number of tours the Mozarts had undertaken, and refused them both. In light of their frustrated request, Leopold decided that Wolfgang would go without him, and take his mother instead. Wolfgang’s petition to Colloredo – which has since been proved as being written by Leopold10 – says much about the elder Mozart’s pedagogical attitude and what he thought he deserved from his son. A small passage from this document explains Leopold’s mindset:

Parents endeavour to place their children in a position to earn their own bread; and in this they follow alike their own interest and that of the State. The greater the talents which children have received from God, the more are they bound to use them for the improvement of their own and their parents’ circumstances, so that they may at the same time assist them and take thought for their own future progress. The Gospel teaches us to use our talents in this way. My conscience tells me that I owe it to God to be grateful to my father, who has spent his time
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10 Letters, 267, n. 1.
unwearyingly upon my education, so that I may lighten his burden, look after myself and later on be able to support my sister.  

This petition demonstrates much about Leopold’s overall perspective in relation to his children’s musical talent. He hoped to be able to live off their success; this he felt he had rightfully earned because of the careful education he had given them. This was as much a statement to his son as it was to Colloredo. Leopold wanted Wolfgang to know how much he expected of him and how indebted Wolfgang should be to his father. Colloredo’s provocative reply was that ‘in the name of the Gospel father and son have my permission to seek their fortune elsewhere’. Leopold thought it wise to remain and grant his son the independence to tour without him.

This was a novel time for the Mozart family. Usually a united family, the Paris expedition allowed the family members to develop new perspectives on each other. During the early stages of the trip Wolfgang and Maria Anna dutifully reported back to Salzburg, and, in turn, Leopold replied with an equal amount of enthusiasm. What is obvious from the earliest letters of the journey is Wolfgang’s eagerness to assume his father’s role. In Leopold’s absence, Wolfgang naturally considered it his responsibility to assume the fatherly mantle. In a letter dated 23 September 1777, Wolfgang wrote from Wasserburg am Inn describing the four towns they had passed through. Interestingly enough, this was Wolfgang’s first full-length letter to his father, as he had never travelled without him before.  

Enthused at the prospects of independence, Wolfgang was quick to reassure Leopold that he would maintain full responsibility:

As I write this letter, Mamma is already half asleep. From Frabertsham to Wasserburg everything went well. Viviamo come i principi.  

Only one person is wanting – and that is Papa. Ah well, it is God’s will. All will yet be well. I hope that Papa is well and happy as I am. I am most attentive to my duty. I am quite a second Papa, for I see to everything. I have begged Mamma to let me pay the postiliions, for I can deal with these fellows better than she can . . . Why, I am sitting here as if I was a prince. Half an hour ago (Mamma happened to be

12 Robert Spaethling, Mozart’s Letters, Mozart’s Life (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 2000) 59. Judging from Leopold’s replies from this time, there may have been an earlier letter that Wolfgang wrote; however, this is presumed lost.
13 ‘We are living like princes’.
in the closet) the porter knocked at the door and asked me about all sorts of things, and I answered him with my most serious air, looking just as I do in my portrait.  

Similarly, Leopold was forced to adjust to his domestic role. His letters in reply to his son and wife reveal him to be lonely and saddened by his family’s separation. As always, he urged his son to bend the truth when dealing with potential employers. Leopold wanted it to appear as though his son was hard done by in Salzburg and, surprisingly, that he wanted to leave his father:

It does our Prince no credit that he gave you such a poor salary, and it does you little honour that you served him so long for that bagatelle. If anyone asks you what pay you received, it would be better for you to say quite frankly that you only stayed in Salzburg to please your father and until you were a little older, because the pay is usually only three or four hundred gulden, except in the case of Italians, whom the Prince now remunerates more handsomely . . . My very life depends on yours. I am your old deserted father and husband.  

The poignancy of Leopold’s suggestion here is made even more so by the fact that over the next few years it appears Wolfgang did stay in Salzburg to please his father.

As Wolfgang and his mother continued to travel towards Paris, they stayed in numerous centres including Munich and Augsburg – Leopold’s birthplace. It is obvious from his writing that Wolfgang was beginning to realise the possibilities of life outside Salzburg. He did not hesitate to let his father know this either. Being offered a position in Munich even led Wolfgang to suggest Leopold follow him too:

It seems perfectly satisfactory to me. I should be near Salzburg, and if you, my dearest Papa, should feel inclined (as I heartily wish that you may) to leave Salzburg and end your days in Munich, the plan would be delightful and quite simple. For if we have had to live in Salzburg on 504 gulden, surely we could manage in Munich on 600 or 800.  

Leopold became irritated by his son’s lack of information concerning his whereabouts and happenings. For the diligent and precise Leopold, Wolfgang’s carelessness was worrying him. He took great pains to remind him that ‘The object of your journey, the very necessary object was and is and must be, to obtain an
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14 Letters, 271–72; Briefe, II, 6–7. See Plate 3.
15 Letters, 278–79; Briefe, II, 15–16.
16 Letters, 284; Briefe, II, 22.
appointment or to make money. So far I see little prospect of the one or the other; unless, of course, it has to be kept a secret from me’. He continued to point out that unless Wolfgang could quickly arrange some employment, serious financial difficulties would confront him:

I do want to arrange things in advance. You, however, make light of everything, you are indifferent, you tie my hands when I want to advise and help, since you do not say a word about where you are going next . . . Did it never occur to you both that at some point on this long route a credit would have to be arranged? . . . If you draw some money now in Mannheim, then, in the name of Heaven, you must not draw any more in Frankfurt, where, to be sure, you cannot make any.

From Wolfgang’s point of view, the initial stages of the journey had provided him with exciting possibilities, and the expectations of his father were far from his mind. Whenever Leopold suggested a likely employer, Wolfgang asked his father not to write to him in a desperate voice, because grovelling or ‘cringing’ to prospective patrons was a characteristic he could not stand. Again, Wolfgang was beginning to show signs of separating himself from his father. Prostrating himself before others was a tactic Leopold was quite happy to endure; Wolfgang, on the other hand, did not believe this to be a viable or reputable approach.

The emergence of the individual in the works of the Sturm und Drang could also be identified in Wolfgang’s own development. Goethe, for example, has Werther acknowledge the importance of class structure in society whilst simultaneously disparaging it for destroying any joy and contentment available to members of lower social classes:

What irritates me most of all is the odious social conditions. To be sure, I am as well aware as anybody of the necessity for class distinctions and of the advantages that I myself receive from them; but they ought not stand in my way when I could enjoy a little pleasure, a gleam of happiness on this earth.

17 Letters, 393; Briefe, II, 148.
18 Letters, 393; Briefe, II, 149.
19 Letters, 415; Briefe, II, 179.
20 The different manner in which Leopold and Wolfgang behaved before patrons is discussed later in this chapter, and also in Chapter 6.
Similarly, and with a greater correlation with Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s disparate views on aristocratic support, Jakob Lenz has the Councillor and the Pastor discuss the debilitating nature of living under constant patronage. In his play Der Hofmeister, oder Vorteile der Privaterziehung (The Tutor, or the Advantages of Private Education, 1774) the Pastor defends his son’s position as a tutor; the Councillor replies: ‘Good God, Pastor, you certainly didn’t raise him to be a servant’.  

Wolfgang and his mother arrived in Mannheim in late October and would stay there for almost five months. Their long stay there was not planned and would consequently frustrate the powerless Leopold. The reason for lingering in Mannheim was because of Aloysia Weber, the sister of his future wife, Constanze, whom Wolfgang met and with whom he subsequently fell in love. According to Wolfgang not only was Aloysia a great beauty but she was a talented soprano of the highest quality as well. He wrote to his father suggesting that he abort the plans to succeed in Paris and tour with the Weber family around Italy. In the letter, Wolfgang made sure to provide his father with an excellent description of the ‘thoroughly honest, good Catholic Christian family’, with whom he had the ‘inexpressible pleasure of making the acquaintance’.  

Wolfgang, as this letter illustrates, did not wish to visit Paris, and was attempting to dissipate his father’s hope of Parisian success:

I have become so fond of this unfortunate family that my dearest wish is to make them happy; and perhaps I may be able to do so. My advice is that they should go to Italy. So now I should like you to write to our good friend Lugiani, and the sooner the better, and enquire what are the highest terms given to a prima donna in Verona – the more the better, one can always climb down . . . I beg you to do your best to get us to Italy. You know my greatest desire is – to write operas.

Naturally, Leopold was irritated by what he read in his son’s letter. Maria Anna Mozart noted Wolfgang’s inclination to be impressionable during the their stay in Paris when she described her son as too enthusiastic in making new acquaintances and how he ‘immediately wants to give his life and property for them’. In desperation, Leopold weighed Wolfgang down with the guilt of years past by writing:
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22 FPSD, 12.
23 Letters, 460; Briefe, II, 252.
25 Letters, 463; Briefe, II, 255.
When you were children, I gave up all my time to you in the hope that not only would you be able to provide later on for yourselves, but also that I might enjoy a comfortable old age, be able to give an account to God of the education of my children, be free from all anxiety, devote myself to the welfare of my soul and thus be enabled to meet my death in peace.  

The belief that he would be summoned by God upon reaching heaven to explain the education he gave his children was a theory also championed by Leopold’s literary hero, Gellert. In his moralistic and instructional Briefe (1751), Gellert outlined this exact heavenly procedure. For men such as Leopold Mozart and Gellert, the importance of a good education and their subsequent role as pedagogues was never underestimated:

The God who has entrusted you to my care, will one day call me to account my instructions to you, and you will be also required to answer as to what use you have made of these instructions.  

The similarity of Leopold’s attitude to that of Gellert’s philosophy is clear, and further demonstrates the reverence he still held in 1778 for the Man of Letters. What is also clear is that his continual employment of Gellertian ideals and the ‘gelehrt’ style was now conflicting with Wolfgang’s burgeoning maturity and the emerging sentiments of the Sturm und Drang.

In direct response to his son’s proposal for the Weber family, Leopold fumed:

My dear son! I have read your letter of the 4th with amazement and horror. For the whole night long I was unable to sleep and am so exhausted . . . your proposal to travel with Herr Weber and, be it noted, his two daughters – it has nearly made me lose my reason! My dearest son! How can you have allowed yourself to be bewitched even for an hour by such a horrible idea? . . . Off with you to Paris! Find your place among great people. Aut Caesar aut nihil.

---

26 Letters, 464; Briefe, II, 256.
27 Gellert, Christian Fürchtegott, Instructions from a Father to his Son on Entering University (Boston, 1823) 11.
28 In a letter to Leopold on 26 January 1770 Wolfgang jokingly mentions ‘Herr Gelehrt’ which means ‘learned’, and how since his death Gellert had not written any more poetry. See Letters, 110; Briefe, I, 309, and Abert, W. A. Mozart, 9 n. 38.
Leopold’s final adage here – ‘Aut Caesar aut nihil’ (It’s either Caesar or nothing) – was indicative of eighteenth century attitudes towards French culture. Leopold considered Paris to be the place where Wolfgang could both mature his craft and financially benefit from it. Although Leopold had not enjoyed his own time in Paris in 1763–64, largely because of the way the city shocked his Catholic constitution, he was able to realise the financial potential of the place. He reminded his son that to succeed in Paris would be to discover universal success. ‘From Paris’, he wrote,

the name and fame of a man of great talent resounds throughout the whole world. There the nobility treat men of genius with the greatest deference, esteem and courtesy; there you will see a refined manner of life, which forms an astonishing contrast to the coarseness of our German courtiers and their ladies; and there you may become proficient in the French tongue.

The discrepancy in attitudes between father and son concerning Wolfgang’s arrival in Paris highlights the generational distance that had grown between the two men. Leopold belonged to an age in which the idea of nationalism for Germans was only a distant thought; Wolfgang’s generation – the Stürmer und Drängen – not only considered it a viable possibility but relentlessly strove for its realisation. For example, Lenz complained that he had no national ‘standpoint’ (Standpunkt) on which to base his writings, while Klinger similarly wanted to capture the elusive national Germanic ‘strength’ (Festigkeit) through his words. Wolfgang’s frustration at not having national foundations and establishments is obvious following his Paris journey.

[30] See M. S. Anderson, Europe in the Eighteenth Century (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1961) 302–304. Before patriotic sentiment spread across the German lands, France had been the beacon for innovation and influence. In particular, French became the dominant language in scholarship. Frederick II of Prussia was a strong enforcer of this issue: ‘Despising German as a barbaric dialect, he used it only when he had to, and ordered in 1743 that the papers read to the Academy of Sciences at Berlin should be published in French’. Architecture and art were particularly French in style and when the rules for the Academies of Art were founded in Berlin and Vienna in 1697 and 1705 respectively they were almost identical to those of the Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture in Paris.

[31] Letters, 478; Briefe, II, 277.


[34] Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s beliefs on nationalism are further explored in Chapter 6.
Leopold continued to urge his son to leave the Weber family in Mannheim and travel to Paris. Aloysia Weber, he believed, could easily follow her singing career in Mannheim. Similarly, success and fame in Paris would then allow Wolfgang to pursue a tour of Italy. In the meantime, Leopold needed the young composer to triumph in Paris:

You really must consider first of all the welfare of your parents, or else your soul will go to the devil. Think of me when you left us, standing beside the carriage in a state of utter wretchedness. Hurt me now, if you can be so cruel!\(^\text{35}\)

The succeeding letters demonstrate Wolfgang to be a repentant and apologetic son. The audacity with which he stood up to his father had subsided. To substantiate his position, Leopold continued to attack his son’s integrity and honesty. His subtle references to Wolfgang’s successful career as a child prodigy and other nostalgic allusions were vain attempts to reignite the devotion to his father. Leopold wrote:

My son! You are hot-tempered and impulsive in all your ways! Since your childhood and boyhood your whole character has changed. As a child and a boy you were serious rather than childish and when you sat at the clavier or were otherwise intent on music, no one dared to have the slightest jest with you. . . . The greatest art of all is to know oneself and then, my dear son, to do as I do, that is, to endeavour to get to know others through and through. This, as you know, has always been my study; and certainly it is a fine, useful and indeed most necessary one.\(^\text{36}\)

What is worth noting from Leopold’s reproach is the admission that his son was not the same as he once was. The *Wunderkind*, who had earned Leopold universal praise and admiration for his teaching methods, was showing worrying amounts of independence.

Wolfgang subsequently cancelled his plans for an Italian journey with the Weber family and hurried along to Paris. Leopold’s persistent criticism destroyed his son’s conviction that he was doing the right thing. Wolfgang relapsed into the son Leopold wanted him to be – compliant. He even appealed to Leopold’s fatherly ego.

\(^{35}\) *Letters*, 480; *Briefe*, II, 279.

\(^{36}\) *Letters*, 483–484; *Briefe*, II, 283–284.
‘Next to God comes Papa was my motto or axiom as a child,’ he devoutly wrote, ‘and I still cling to it’.  

‘Yesterday, Monday the 23rd, at four o’clock in the afternoon we arrived here, thank God, both safe and sound’, Wolfgang reported dutifully to his father. Initially, Wolfgang demonstrated a keenness for genuine success in Paris. He used the many references his father had sent him and immediately found a loyal supporter in Friedrich Melchior von Grimm (1723–1807), a German diplomat who had befriended the Mozarts during their stay in the city in 1764. Another supporter was Joseph Legros (1739–1793), musician and director of the Concert Spirituel in Paris. Wolfgang spent many days at Legros’ house playing his pianoforte. It was Legros, who commissioned Wolfgang to write a symphony for the Concert Spirituel, a work that has subsequently been named the ‘Paris’ symphony.

Despite his activities, Wolfgang quickly became disgruntled with French musical style and the Parisian audiences. Clearly wanting to unsettle his father, Wolfgang’s reports back to Salzburg painted the image of the French as uncouth and largely unappreciative of his work:

I have at this moment returned from the Concert Spirituel. Baron Grimm and I often give vent to our musical rage at the music here, I mean between ourselves, of course . . . What annoys me most of all in this business is that our French gentlemen have only improved their goût [taste] to this extent that they can now listen to good stuff as well. But to expect them to realise that their own music is bad or at least to notice the difference – Heaven preserve us! And their singing! Good Lord! Let me never hear a Frenchwoman singing Italian arias. I can forgive her if she screeches out her French trash, but not if she ruins good music! It’s simply unbearable.

Wolfgang’s musical taste was quite particular and he was always quick to judge or criticise when he did not approve. This occurred regularly in Paris. After his new symphony was not performed one night, Wolfgang accused the French and Italians in Paris of having conspired against him. ‘I think that something is going on behind the scenes,’ he confessed to Leopold, ‘and that doubtless here too I have enemies’.

37 Letters, 506; Briefe, II, 318.
38 Letters, 522; Briefe, II, 332.
39 For Wolfgang’s aesthetics see Chapter 2.
40 Letters, 532; Briefe, II, 345.
led him to attack the whole musical scene, which doubles, so to speak, as an attack on his father’s personal judgement of Paris:

I am surrounded by mere brute beasts. How can it be otherwise? For in all their actions, emotions and passions they are just the same. There is no place in the world like Paris. You must not think that I exaggerate when I talk thus of the music here. Ask anyone you like – provided he is not a Frenchman born – and, if he knows anything at all of the matter, he will say exactly the same. Well, I am here. I must endure it for your sake.  

Wolfgang, as is evident from this letter, began to return the guilt that Leopold had laid on him only months before. He was trying to persuade his father that his true desire was to tour Italy, and that staying in France would only damage his taste and appreciation of music. What is also apparent is that as Wolfgang’s distrust and detestation for the French began to increase, so did his resolute affinity to his homeland: ‘I pray to God daily to give me grace to hold out here with fortitude and to do such honour to myself and to the whole German nation as will redound to His greater honour and glory’.  

An underlying reason for Wolfgang’s relatively minor success was the Parisian preoccupation with opera and the musical battle that was taking place. Desperately keen to make a name for himself in Paris through this medium, Wolfgang’s hopes were largely ignored as audiences concentrated on two other composers and their fight for supremacy. Christoph Willibald von Gluck (1714–1787) and Niccolò Piccinni (1728–1800) were not only the two most popular opera composers of Paris in the 1770s, but also the representatives of two different musical schools. Parisians were either in the ‘Gluckist’ or ‘Piccinnist’ camp depending on their artistic preference. After Piccinni’s arrival in Paris in 1778, the defenders of Italian style opera could enjoy great triumph over French style, which used Gluck as the model. The debate was essentially focussed on such issues as ‘whether Italian music could be adopted to the French language and whether opera was primarily a

---

41 Letters, 533; Briefe, II, 346.
42 Letters, 533; Briefe, II, 346.
melodic or a dramatic genre’. Gluck’s dictum that music and text be regarded equally contributed to this dispute.

The debate on music and text was argued primarily in newspapers by Parisian journalists and critics. Gluck, for example, was uninterested in the supposed operatic war, citing French ignorance as his refusal to get involved. Like Wolfgang, Gluck was disenchanted with the level of Parisian musical knowledge. In a letter from Vienna written on 31 March 1780, Gluck declared:

But as to my going to Paris again, nothing will come of it, so long as the words ‘Piccinnist’ and ‘Gluckist’ remain current, for I am, thank God, in good health at present, and have no wish to spit bile again in Paris . . . I shall hardly allow myself to be persuaded again to become the object of the criticism or the praise of the French nation, for they are as changeable as red cockerels . . . I could wish that someone might come one day to take my place and to please the public with his music, so that I might be left in peace.

Wolfgang could not understand the furore. He decided to stay clear of the entire argument because that would only segregate his own audience even more. ‘The French are and always will be asses’, he wrote to Leopold, ‘and as they can do nothing themselves, they are obliged to have recourse to foreigners’. He continued:

I spoke to Piccinni at the Concert Spirituel. He is most polite to me and I to him when – by chance – we do meet. Otherwise I do not seek acquaintanceship, either with him or with any other composer. I understand my job – and so do they – and that is enough.

Wolfgang’s non-interest in seeking friends was partly due to the initial mistreatment he had received from some Parisian aristocrats. On one occasion he travelled to the house of the Duchesse de Chabot, Élisabeth-Louise de La Rochefoucauld (1740–86)


Interestingly, however, in a letter to Leopold a few months earlier, Wolfgang opined that ‘Writing operas is now my one burning ambition; but they must be French rather than German, and Italian rather than either’. Letters, 468; Briefe; II, 265.

Letters, 564; Briefe, II, 397.
to play the pianoforte for her. What followed was one of his more embarrassing experiences during the entire journey. Unlike during the Grand Tour when Wolfgang’s musical artistry had been treated with amazement and respect, he was now regarded as any other performer. This infuriated him and spurred his growing enmity for the aristocracy:

I had to wait for half an hour in a large ice-cold, unheated room, which hadn’t even a fireplace. At last the Duchesse de Chabot appeared. She was very polite and asked me to make the best of the clavier in the room, as none of her own were in good working condition. Would I perhaps try it? I said that I would be delighted to play something . . . The windows and doors were open and not only my hands but my whole body and my feet were frozen and my head began to ache. There was *altum silentium* and I did not know what to do for the cold, headache and boredom. I kept on thinking: ‘If it were not for M. Grimm, I would leave this house at once’. At last, to cut my story short, I played on that wretched pianoforte. But what vexed me most of all was that Madame and all her gentlemen never interrupted their drawing for a moment, but went on intently, so that I had to play to the chairs, tables and walls. Under these detestable conditions I lost my patience.49

Wolfgang was not used to such conditions. Furthermore, he was not accustomed to dealing with these matters without the aid of his father. Leopold’s distant advice from Salzburg was, as Wolfgang would embarrassingly discover, often misguided. Leopold had reassured him that Grimm’s assistance would be of the highest importance,50 but Wolfgang eventually realised that that was not the case and like all other Parisians, Grimm had changed. ‘Do not imagine that he is the same as he was’, he reported to Leopold. ‘M. Grimm may be able to help children, but not grown-up people’.51 For his part, Grimm worried about Wolfgang, considering him too naïve and indecisive to succeed without Leopold’s help. Grimm wrote to the senior Mozart declaring that Wolfgang was:

  too trusting, too inactive, too easy to catch, too little intent on the means that may lead to fortune. To make an impression here one has to be artful, enterprising, daring. To make his fortune I wish he had but half his talent and twice as much shrewdness, and then I should not worry about him.52

49 *Letters*, 531; *Briefe*, II, 344.
50 *Letters*, 471; *Briefe*, II, 270.
51 *Letters*, 613; *Briefe*, II, 474.
The worry and concern that each Mozart expressed during the first few months of Wolfgang’s stay in Paris would, however, pale in comparison to what was to follow. During the weeks before the beginning of July 1778, Maria Anna Mozart’s health had begun to decline. Initially she complained of various ailments including a ‘toothache, sore throat and earache’. Then, in a letter to her husband a few weeks later, she warned him that she would be unable to write much because she had been bled the day before. Her death on 3 July 1778 was so abrupt and unforeseen that it precipitated an emotional rift in her family. As a result, the relationship between Leopold and his son never recovered. While their personal relations had been severely strained during the initial stages of the Paris journey, the death of Maria Anna caused irrevocable damage. The permanence of its effect was something Wolfgang anticipated, and his letters back to Salzburg reporting the news fully demonstrate his timidity and apprehension in face of such a responsibility.

* * *

In the early hours of 4 July 1778, Wolfgang wrote three letters back to Salzburg. The one he penned to his friend Franz Joseph Johann Nepomuk [Abbé] Bullinger (1744–1810) is written in a sincere and unaffected style. From this letter Wolfgang’s emotional state can be understood:

Most beloved Friend!
For you alone.
Mourn with me, my friend! This has been the saddest day of my life – I am writing this at two o’clock in the morning. I have to tell you that my mother, my dear mother, is no more! God has called her to himself. It was His will to take her, that I saw clearly – so I resigned myself to His will. He gave her to me, so He was able to take her away from me. Only think of all my anxiety, the fears and sorrows I have had to endure for the last fortnight. She was quite unconscious at the time of her death – her life flickered out like a candle. Three days before her death she made her confession, partook of the Sacrament and received Extreme Unction, During the last three days, however, she was constantly delirious, and today at twenty-one minutes past five the death agony began and she at once lost all sensation and consciousness. I

---

53 Letters, 534; Briefe, II, 347.
54 Letters, 550; Briefe, II, 375.
55 One of these letters, written to Fridolin Weber, Aloysia and Constanze’s father, is lost. Spaethling, Mozart’s Letters, Mozart’s Life, 158.
pressed her hand and spoke to her – but she did not see me, she did not hear me, and all feeling was gone. She lay thus until she expired five hours later at twenty-one minutes past ten . . . All I ask of you at present is to act the part of a true friend, by preparing my poor father very gently for this sad news. I have written to him by this post, but only to say that she is seriously ill; and now I shall wait for his answer and be guided by it. May God give him strength and courage! O my friend! Not only am I now comforted, but I have been comforted for some time. By the mercy of God I have borne it all with fortitude and composure . . . I beg you, therefore, most beloved friend, watch over my father for me and try to give him courage so that, when he hears the worst, he may not take it too hardly. I commend my sister to you also with all my heart. Go to them both at once, I implore you – but do not tell them yet that she is dead – just prepare them for it. Do what you think best – use every means to comfort them – but so act that my mind may be relieved – and that I may not have to dread another blow. Watch over my dear father and my dear sister for me. Send me a reply at once, I entreat you. Adieu. I remain your most obedient and grateful servant,

Wolfgang Amadè Mozart.  

The frank and honest tone in which Wolfgang wrote this letter was in stark contrast to the one he wrote simultaneously to his father. As he asked Bullinger to do, Wolfgang decided to prepare Leopold before receiving such news. Although Leopold was aware of his wife’s various ailments, he would not have expected her sudden death. Historian Peter Gay describes Wolfgang’s letter to his father as a ‘curious game of self denial’; while Abert suggests that the letter illustrates Wolfgang’s transformation from youth to manhood, and is ‘further proof of the genuine affection that existed between parents and children in the Mozart household’. In all actuality, however, Maria Anna’s death presented Wolfgang with one of the more challenging experiences of his life. To report such news to his father in Salzburg was going to require the most sensitive diplomacy from the twenty-two year old. Although he had admitted to Bullinger that he was coping with recent events, the letter to Leopold demonstrates the uneasiness the situation was causing him:

I have very sad and distressing news to give you, which is, indeed, the reason why I have been unable to reply sooner to your letter of June 11th. My dear mother is very ill. She has been bled, as in the past, and it was very necessary too. She felt quite well afterwards, but a few days later she complained of shivering and feverishness, accompanied by diarrhoea and

---
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headache. At first we only used home remedies – antispasmodic powders; we would gladly have tried the black powders too, but we had none and could not get it here, where it is not known even by the name of pulvis epilepticus. As she got worse and worse (she could hardly speak and had lost her hearing, so that one had to shout to make one understood), Baron Grimm sent us his doctor. But she is still very weak and is feverish and delirious. They give me hope – but I have not much. For a long time now I have been hovering day and night between hope and fear – but I have resigned myself wholly to the will of God – and trust that you and my dear sister will do the same. How else can we manage to be calm or, I should say, calmer, for we cannot be perfectly calm! Come what may, I am resigned – for I know that God, Who orders all things for our good, however strange they may seem to us, wills it thus. Moreover I believe (and no one will persuade me to the contrary) that no doctor, no man living, no misfortune and no chance can give a man his life or take it away. None can do so but God alone. These are only the instruments which He usually employs, though not always. For we see people around us swoon, fall down and die. Once our hour has come, all means are useless; they rather hasten death than delay it. This we saw in the case of our late friend Heffner. I do not mean to say that my mother will and must die, or that all hope is lost. She may recover health and strength, but only if God wills it. After praying to Him with all my might for health and life for my dear mother, I like to indulge in these consoling thoughts, because they hearten, soothe and comfort me; and you may easily imagine that I need comfort! Now let us turn to something else. Let us banish these sad thoughts; let us hope, but not too much; let us put our trust in God and console ourselves with the thought that all is well, if it is in accordance with the will of the Almighty, as He knows best what is profitable and beneficial to our temporal happiness and our eternal salvation.

A recurring ruse employed by Wolfgang in his letters from Paris was to change topics with nonchalant ease. These were attempts to distract his father from the bad news he was regularly reporting. For example, after writing a passage such as the one above, he would instantly report the success of a symphony, or the prospect of him receiving patronage. Although it may appear that Wolfgang was avoiding confrontation, he was tactfully and discreetly endeavouring to soften the blow for his father. His choice of words ‘Let us hope, but not too much’, should have been enough for Leopold to realise the fabricated optimism that his son was trying to present. Although Maria Anna had died, it took Wolfgang a few days to summon the discretion and consideration required to announce the news to his father. He hoped that by the time his letter of 9 July reached Leopold, his and Bullinger’s letters and words would have

60 Letters, 556–57; Briefe, II, 387–388.
adequately prepared his father to receive such news. As with the previous letter, Wolfgang tried to demonstrate to Leopold his maturity:

I hope that you are now prepared to hear with fortitude one of the saddest and most painful stories; indeed my last letter of the 3rd will have told you that no good news could be hoped for. On that very same day, the 3rd, at twenty-one minutes past ten at night my mother fell asleep peacefully in the Lord; indeed, when I wrote to you, she was already enjoying the blessings of Heaven – for all was then over. I wrote to you during that night and I hope that you and my dear sister will forgive me for this slight but very necessary deception; for as I judged from my very own grief and sorrow what yours would be, I could not indeed bring myself suddenly to shock you with this dreadful news! But I hope that you have now summoned up courage to hear the worst, and that after you have at first given way to natural, and only too well justified tears and anguish, you will eventually resign yourself to the will of God and worship His unsearchable, unfathomable and all-wise providence. You will easily conceive what I have had to bear – what courage and fortitude I have needed to endure calmly as things grew gradually and steadily worse. And yet God in His goodness gave me grace to do so. I have, indeed, suffered and wept enough – but what did it avail? So I have tried to console myself: and please do so too, my dear father, my dear sister! Weep, weep your fill, but take comfort at last. Remember that Almighty God willed it thus – and how can we rebel against Him? . . . My dearest father! Do not give way! Dearest sister! Be firm! You do not yet know your brother’s good heart – for he has not yet been able to prove it. My two loved ones! Take care of your health. Remember that you have a son, a brother, who is doing his utmost to make you happy – knowing well that one day you will not refuse to grant him his desire and his happiness – which certainly does him honour, and that you will also do everything in your power to make him happy. Oh, then we shall live peacefully, honourably and as contentedly as is possible in this world – and in the end, when God wills it, we shall all meet again in Heaven – for which purpose we were destined and created.61

The slow process of communications in this pre-industrial age can be realised in Leopold’s replies.62 Leopold began his letter of 13 July (ten days after his wife’s death) wishing her ‘happiness’ and congratulations on the anniversary of her name-
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62 W. H. Bruford writes: ‘Letters naturally travelled very slowly. They were usually sent by ‘reitende Post’ and paid for on delivery (though they could be prepaid) . . . it took a letter nine days to reach Frankfort-on-Main from Berlin (seven Meilen a day), four days to reach Munich or seven to reach Vienna from Frankfort (thirteen Meilen a day). This indicates incidentally the rates at which one could travel post’. Walter Horace Bruford, *Germany in the Eighteenth Century: the Social Background of the Literary Revival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935) 164, and for a discussion on the system in broader Europe, see Paul Mantoux, *The Industrial Revolution in Eighteenth Century: An Outline of the Beginnings of the Modern Factory System in England* (London: Taylor & Francis, 2006) 119.
day. ‘Would you have thought a year ago’, he unknowingly asked his wife, ‘that you would be spending your next name-day in Paris’? 63

When the news of Maria Anna’s death eventually reached Leopold, Wolfgang’s discretion would have become apparent. Although Wolfgang admitted his deception and pleaded for leniency, the seriousness of the event angered Leopold greatly. He demanded information from Wolfgang regarding her quick deterioration: ‘Tell me everything in detail’. 64 It is evident that reliving the event was a painful experience for Wolfgang who pleaded with his father to show some compassion. ‘You would like to have a short account of her illness and of all its circumstances?’ he asked. ‘You shall have it, but I must ask you to let it be short – and I shall only allude to the main facts, since it is all over now and, unfortunately, cannot be undone – and I need room to write about things which have to do with our present situation’. 65 It was precisely this apparently indifferent attitude that infuriated Leopold. Searching for answers, he could not understand why his son was not forthcoming with a thorough, detailed explanation. Leopold saw Wolfgang’s hesitation as a sign of guilt, an attribute he unrepentantly exploited. Leopold wrote:

Doubtless she did not say much, but just stayed quiet, hoping that things would right themselves. You had your engagements, you were away all day, and as she didn’t make a fuss, you treated her condition lightly. All this time her illness became more serious, in fact mortal – and only then was a doctor called in, when of course it was too late. If she had not had such an excellent constitution, she could not have lasted a fortnight. Well, it is all over. God willed it. The unbreakable chain of Divine Providence preserved your mother’s life when you were born, though indeed she was in very great danger and though we almost thought that she was gone. But she was fated to sacrifice herself for her son in a different way. 66

The ‘unexpected and distressing death’ of his wife led Leopold to question his son’s actions and motives in Paris. 67 As the father and son continued to exchange correspondence detailing their respective confusion over the entire matter, their attitudes towards each other evolved dramatically. Leopold, particularly, did not believe Wolfgang capable of managing his own life. Historian Maynard Solomon
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suggests that Leopold’s attacks on his son’s integrity were part of his plan to remain close to him:

Even the pathological domination, the mercenary exploitation, the endless recriminations, the piling up of guilt, and the insistence that [Wolfgang] was an eternal debtor had one main root: they were a father’s desperate manoeuvres to keep the symbiotic relationship intact, for to lose his son was to lose the integrity of his being, to lose that which gave meaning to his life. He loved [Wolfgang] so profoundly that he needed to swallow him, to keep him within himself, to prevent him from getting out. He tried to keep [Wolfgang] from establishing a separate existence because, he was convinced, he himself had no separate existence without [Wolfgang].

The subject of death had raised its head in the Mozart correspondence a month prior to Maria Anna’s death. Undoubtedly, the most public and frequently read champion of the French Enlightenment or ‘century of light’ (siècle des lumières), was François-Marie Arouet, universally referred to by his pseudonym, Voltaire (1694–1778). He died on 30 May at the age of eighty-three. The most startling connection between this philosophe and Wolfgang is that he died during the composer’s stay in Paris. Both Wolfgang and Leopold heard the news of his death separately and reported it to each other simultaneously. Wolfgang’s announcement was in the same letter he wrote to his father on 3 July reporting the sudden illness (although she was already dead) of his mother:

Now I have a piece of news for you which you may have heard already, namely, that the godless arch-rascal Voltaire has pegged out like a dog, like a beast! That is his reward!

Wolfgang, whose letter from 3 July was characterised by deliberate sensitivity towards his father, appealed to Leopold’s dislike of Voltaire, which stemmed from the philosophe’s well-known criticism of the Catholic Church and particular miracles. Leopold’s own letter to his son reporting the news of his death is similar in tone: Voltaire, as a sworn enemy of the Catholic establishment, died a justifiable and necessary death:

69 Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778) died at Ermenonville, near Paris, on 2 July 1778 – the day before Maria Anna Mozart’s death.
70 Letters, 558; Briefe, II, 389.
71 See Chapter 3 for Leopold’s anger towards Voltairean supporters’ discrediting of miracles.
So Voltaire is dead too! And died just as he lived; he ought to have done something better for
the sake of his reputation with posterity.72

Wolfgang’s apparent disdain of Voltaire may have been a front to appease
Leopold. It has been concluded by historian Nicholas Till that Wolfgang’s incomplete
Singspiel, Zaide,73 written between 1779–80, ‘unquestionably derived from Voltaire’s
play Zaïre’.74 Robert Gutman agrees, while adding that Wolfgang’s version
incorporated more of the German rather than French Enlightenment. ‘The Singspiel’,
he commented, ‘unfolds in the earnest world of Lessing’.75 Zaide remained,
nonetheless, an unfinished work. The reason for this is unsure considering that shortly
after arriving in Vienna in 1781, Wolfgang began Die Entführung which,
interestingly, embodied many similar themes of slavery and Turkish imprisonment.

Another Frenchman whose name is associated with Wolfgang – and
incidentally with Voltaire76 – is Pierre Augustin Caron (1732–1799), who shortly
after his first marriage in 1755 adopted the name ‘Beaumarchais’ from a small
property belonging to his new wife.77 Beaumarchais’ fame as a dramatist was assured
by the time of Wolfgang’s stay in Paris, thanks to the success of his play Le Barbier
de Séville, which, in its completed form, was premiered in 1775. The sequel to this,
Le Folle Journée, ou le Mariage de Figaro, was written in 1778, however due to
several bans placed by Louis XVI (1754–1793) was not performed publicly until
1784. In turn, the work was treated with a similar level of royal disapproval in
Vienna. Emperor Joseph II wrote in early 1785:

I hear that the well-known comedy Le Mariage de Figaro is said to have been proposed for
the Kärntnertor Theatre in a German translation; since this piece contains much that is
objectionable, I therefore expect that the Censor shall either reject it altogether, or at any rate
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73 Having never finished the work, Wolfgang left the Singspiel unnamed. It was often referred to as
Das Serail, however ‘Zaide’ was adopted from the name of the heroine to prevent confusion with
Wolfgang’s later Singspiel, Die Entführung aus dem Serail.

74 Nicholas Till, Mozart and the Enlightenment: Truth, Virtue and Beauty in Mozart’s Operas (New
York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1992) 56. Voltaire’s Zaïre was written in 1732.


76 Beaumarchais idolised Voltaire. He organised a subscription-based publication of Voltaire’s
complete works. It failed miserably, however. See John Rivers, Figaro: The Life of Beaumarchais
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have such alterations made in it that he shall be responsible for the performance of this play and for the impression it may make." 78

According to Lorenzo da Ponte, who altered Beaumarchais’ original work so that it could meet the demands of the censor, it was Wolfgang who suggested Figaro as a worthy libretto. 79 If da Ponte’s claim is presumed to be true, Wolfgang’s interest in the work and his connection with Beaumarchais is intriguing. In Wolfgang’s library there was an anonymously published translation of Figaro from 1785. Following the Emperor’s concern over the play’s attack on the social hierarchy, the censor allowed the work to be ‘printed but not performed’. 80 There is also the probability that Wolfgang saw a Beaumarchais work performed while in Paris, most likely Le Barbier de Séville. The reason for this possibility is that while in Paris in 1778 Wolfgang composed twelve variations for keyboard on the aria ‘Je suis Lindor’, which featured in Antoine Laurent Baudron’s (1742–1834) incidental music to Beaumarchais’ Le Barbier de Séville.

It was the death of Maria Anna Mozart, nonetheless, which caused the greatest problem in Wolfgang’s relations with his father. The independence that he desperately sought had been transformed into an awkward and sporadic series of letters between him and Leopold. The next section – which details his negotiations with the Weber family – demonstrates how unwilling he had become to return to the dire situation of Salzburg patronage and, ultimately, face his father.

* * *

Wolfgang’s inactivity and small output while in Paris led Leopold to suggest he return to Salzburg. 81 On 31 August 1778 Leopold wrote ‘My next letter will tell you that you are to leave . . . We can hardly await the hour and the moment when we

78 MDB, 235.
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81 The reason for Wolfgang’s uncharacteristically limited production is generally unknown. It is often attributed to the emotional suffering he was enduring, most notably his mother’s death. Alan Tyson stated ‘One possibility is that he became deeply depressed and withdrawn as a result of his mother’s death, so that for a while he was virtually unable to compose’. Alan Tyson, Mozart: Studies of the Autograph Scores (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1990) 113.
shall see you. I shall revive when you are here’. As the news of Leopold’s wishes reached Paris, however, Wolfgang thought it would be best and most profitable to stay away from Salzburg. He confessed this in a letter to his friend Bullinger from around the same time. ‘You, most beloved friend, are well aware how I detest Salzburg’, he declared, ‘and not only on account of the injustices which my dear father and I have endured there, which in themselves would be enough to make us wish to forget such a place and blot it out of our memory for ever!’ His reluctance to return, nonetheless, must also be seen as a way of avoiding a confrontation with Leopold. To evade his father’s wrath and the unending fallout from Maria Anna’s death, he concocted a reason to stay abroad. The prospect of returning to Salzburg and in all likelihood resuming his position under the Prince-Archbishop was doubly unappealing:

And yet I am glad to get away from Paris, which I detest, although my affairs here are beginning to improve steadily and I do not doubt that if I could make up my mind to hold out here for a few years, I should certainly get on very well. For I am now fairly well known, or – rather, people know me, even if I don’t know them.

Wolfgang’s real intention, however, was to be reunited with Aloysia Weber. Unbeknown to him, she and her family had relocated from Mannheim to Munich after the court theatre there had lured her. After leaving Paris and staying in Nancy for a few weeks, Wolfgang arrived in Mannheim on 6 November 1778 and immediately turned his thoughts to the Webers. The success that the Weber family members were enjoying was appealing to Wolfgang, who, of course, continued to see Salzburg as an impediment for musicians. ‘What delights me most of all in the Mannheim and Munich story’, Wolfgang wrote to Leopold, ‘is that Weber has feathered his nest so well’.

Leopold fumed. The letter to his son on 19 November is one of the most angry and frustrated in all the Mozart correspondence. His blame-ridden letter proposed that if Wolfgang did not listen then it would prompt the premature death of his father, and even makes the comparison with his mother’s early demise:
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Really, I don’t know what to say to you. I shall go mad or die of a decline. The very recollection of all the projects which since your departure from Salzburg you have formed and communicated to me is enough to drive me crazy . . . You hope to get an appointment there? An appointment? What does that mean? You must not take an appointment at present either in Mannheim or anywhere else in the world. I will not hear the word appointment . . . Your whole intention seems to be to ruin me, simply in order to go on building your castles in the air.  

Defiantly and boldly Wolfgang argued with his father. Wolfgang’s reply illustrates his burgeoning exasperation with his father’s mandates. He wrote from Mannheim:

I must ask your forgiveness for two things – firstly, that I have not written to you for so long – and secondly, that this time also I must be brief. My not having answered you sooner is the fault of no one but yourself, and of your first letter to me in Mannheim. Really I never could have believed – but peace! I will say no more about it. For it is all over now.

Wolfgang’s irritation at his father’s insistence confirmed his determination to reach Aloysia Weber in Munich. During his journey there he stayed in Kaisheim. From there he wrote to his cousin in Augsburg – affectionately referred to by Wolfgang as the ‘Bäisle’ – Maria Anna Thekla Mozart (1758–1841), daughter of Leopold’s brother Franz Alois (1727–1791).

The letter from Kaisheim, written on 23 December, displays Wolfgang’s witty and natural writing style in full flow. Amidst the linguistic nonsense he affectionately asks her to meet him in Munich because ‘I am aching to see you’. The true reason for his request, however, is unknown. With his attention firmly set on being close to Aloysia, he may have thought his cousin could help in persuading her of his intentions: ‘perhaps you will have a great part to play’. He may have also foreseen a use for his cousin in a later situation, namely the approaching reunion with his father:

Dearest cuz, don’t be a fuz. I would gladly have gone to Augsburg, I assure you, but the Imperial Abbot wouldn’t let me go and I can’t blame him, you know, for that would be contrary to God’s and Nature’s law and whoever doubts that is a whore. So if it really gives you pleasure to see me, come to Munich, that fine town. Make a point of being there before
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the New Year, mind, and I shall take a good look at you in front and behind; I shall take you round the town and, if necessary, wash you down. 89

Wolfgang did meet with his cousin in Munich. However, the joy he anticipated did not eventuate. What unfolded was more emotional pain for the young composer. Although it was never stated in so many words, it can be surmised from his letters to Leopold – plus his sudden and dramatic turn in temperament – that Aloysia Weber, the girl who had been the object of his affection for well over a year, rejected him. He expressed his heartache in a letter to Leopold, although his father seems not to have realised that the tears were for a girl rather than him. On 29 December he wrote from Munich:

Thank God, I arrived here safely on the 25th, but until now it has been impossible for me to write to you. I am saving up everything until our happy and joyous meeting, for today I can only weep. I have far too sensitive a heart . . . I have naturally bad handwriting, as you know, for I never learnt to write; but all my life I have never written anything worse than this letter; for I really cannot write – my heart is too full of tears. I hope that you will write to me soon and comfort me. Address your letter, Poste Restante, and then I can fetch it myself. I am staying with the Webers. I think that after all it would be better, far better, to address your letters to our dear friend Becke. 90

Johann Baptist Becke (1743–1817), flautist in Munich, whose confidence and correspondence Leopold sought, wrote to Leopold on the same day compounding the confusion over Wolfgang’s mournful state:

This day I count among my most pleasant. I have the good fortune to see your very dear son at my house almost all day long. He arrived here safely on the 25th, and since the 26th we have been almost constantly together: he burns with desire to embrace his dearest and most cherished father, which will ensue as soon as his circumstances here will permit; but he almost made me dispirited too, since for a whole hour I hardly succeeded in staying his tears: he has so good a heart. Never have I seen a child who carried more feeling and love for his father in his bosom than does your son. He is assailed by some fear lest your reception of him may not be as tender as he wishes. I, however, hope for something very different of your paternal heart. He surely deserves to enjoy all love and happiness at his father’s side: his heart
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is so pure, so childlike, so frank towards me, how much more must it be so towards his father.\(^{91}\)

Leopold, as a result, naturally thought his son’s tears were for him. Although the emotional turmoil of the past eighteen months may indeed have had Wolfgang seeking paternal comfort – particularly since the death of his mother – his sadness was most likely over Aloysia Weber. The fact that he asked his father to address his letters to Becke’s residence rather than the Webers’ is enough to suggest that Wolfgang did not want Aloysia discovering how distraught her rejection had left him.

Leopold replied and acknowledged his son’s heartache. This letter suggests that he may have eventually realised that the reason for Wolfgang’s sadness was due to a force other than himself. ‘I was very much surprised’, he wrote to his son, to read your and Mr. Becke’s letters. If your tears, your sadness and heart-felt anxiety have no other reason but that you doubt my love and tenderness for you, then you may sleep peacefully – eat and drink peacefully and return home still more peacefully. For now I realise that you do not really know your father. From our friend’s letter this seems to be the main cause of your sadness; and oh! I trust there is no other! If this is really so, then you have no reason to fear a cool reception or disagreeable days in the company of your sister and myself. But what plunges me into a state of anxiety and is bound to worry me is your prolonged absence.\(^{92}\)

Nevertheless, Leopold continued to hope that Wolfgang’s melancholy was born from his longing to see his father. Just as Sara’s unhappiness had come from her father’s yearning in Lessing’s Miss Sara Sampson (1755), so too did the elder Mozart like to think his stature was so influential:

SIR WILLIAM SAMPSON: There, Waitwell, take this letter to her! It is the letter of an affectionate father, who complains of nothing but her absence.

..........................................................

SARA: If my father must be unhappy through me, I will myself remain unhappy also.\(^{93}\)

---
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Both Mozarts, nonetheless, had noticed the gulf that had grown between them, as it was the longest period they had ever spent apart. Still, the impending face-to-face encounter in Salzburg worried Wolfgang. As a decoy he persuaded his cousin, the ‘Bäsle’, to return with him as a means to distract Leopold and mollify the anger he was expecting to receive. The letter Wolfgang wrote to his father on 8 January 1779 concludes:

Well, I must make haste, for the post is going. My little cousin is here – and why? Well, to please me, her cousin! That indeed is the ostensible reason. But – well, we shall talk about this in Salzburg – and on this account I should very much like her to come home with me! You will find a few lines in her own handwriting nailed to the fourth page of this letter. She would like to come. So, if it would really give you pleasure to have her in your house, be so kind as to write at once to your brother,94 saying that it is all right. When you see her and get to know her, you will certainly like her, for she is a favourite with everyone.95

After a year and a half of separation Wolfgang and Leopold were reunited in Salzburg sometime in mid-January 1779. Naturally, the correspondence after their reunion dried up. The first meeting after such a series of tempestuous events must have been highly dramatic for both father and son. Wolfgang had left Salzburg with Maria Anna Mozart but returned only with Maria Anna Thekla Mozart.

Leopold did not believe in repose or sheer idleness. Unlike Klinger’s character Wild from his play, Sturm und Drang, who suggests a period of revitalisation following a long journey (‘Rage and then take it easy! Refresh yourself in confusion!’),96 Leopold believed immediate action and activity were the best cure for melancholy and chaos. Before his son’s arrival, he had already finished a new petition to the Prince-Archbishop requesting Wolfgang’s reinstatement within his service.97

This period in the Mozarts’ relationship illustrates the increasing disparity that often occurs between a father and his son. Wolfgang was clearly exploring the world in which he lived, while Leopold, back in Salzburg, was eager to reaffirm the parental control he had long held over his son. Leopold’s misinterpretation of his son’s relationship with Aloysia Weber only added to this generational disparity and state of confusion.

94 Franz Alois Mozart (1727–1791).
95 Letters, 649; Briefe, II, 537.
96 Klinger, Sturm und Drang, 125.
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The musical opportunities presented to Wolfgang between his return from the Paris journey and his relocation to Vienna in 1781 were few and far between. The opera seria, *Idomeneo*, his largest project during this period, was commissioned and written in Munich. His artistic output largely concentrated on the church where, having renewed his employment under the Prince-Archbishop, he produced an assortment of masses, church sonatas and other sacred pieces. His desire, however, as is evident from his immediate acceptance of the *Idomeneo* commission, was to compose large-scale assignments, namely opera. Salzburg, as he had complained in a letter to Bullinger, was not the place where his opera aspirations could be realised. According to Wolfgang, Salzburg was musically bankrupt, mostly because foreigners refused to accept positions there. This resulted in the place being deprived of any artistic diversity or intelligence:

I cannot deny that my joy and delight would be doubled if I could do so elsewhere, for I have far more hope of living pleasantly and happily in any other place . . . Salzburg is no place for my talent. In the first place, professional musicians are not held in much consideration; and, secondly, one hears nothing, there is no theatre, no opera; and even if they really wanted one, who is there to sing? For the last five or six years the Salzburg orchestra has always been rich in what is useless and superfluous, but very poor in what is necessary, and absolutely destitute of what is indispensable; and such is the case at the present moment. 98

Furthermore, in a letter to his father, Wolfgang complained about fellow Salzburgers and their general lack of sophistication. Being as well travelled as he was, Wolfgang believed he had outgrown his hometown. ‘I swear to you on my honour’, he wrote to Leopold, ‘that I cannot bear Salzburg or its inhabitants (I mean, the natives of Salzburg). Their language – their manners are quite intolerable to me’. 99 Amazingly, Leopold failed to realise how Salzburg to Wolfgang was exactly the same as

99 *Letters*, 649; *Briefe*, II, 536. In particular, Wolfgang had a strong dislike for the Robinig family’s Salzburg dialect. Referring to Elizabeth Robinig (1749–1792) he said: ‘But Lisa – *that miserable specimen of humanity* – has such a stupid Salzburg tongue – that she really drives me crazy’. *Letters*, 706; *Briefe*, III, 85.
Augsburg was to him. Wolfgang’s above comments echo Leopold’s own comparison of Augsburg with Wieland’s *Abderiten*.  

Wolfgang’s stay in Munich and subsequent migration to Vienna resulted from the stifling effects that Salzburg, the Prince-Archbishop, and his father were having on him. It underlined his desire to leave those three Salzburg forces that were impeding his maturation and freedom.

Like the parallel evolutions of the *Sturm und Drang* movement and Wolfgang’s break from authority, *Idomeneo* revealed itself at an appropriate and pertinent moment. Fundamentally the opera is the struggle for acceptance by the father, Idomeneo and his son, Idamante. As stated in the introduction to this dissertation, correlations between Wolfgang’s life and work were to be avoided. However, the similarities between this opera and the Mozarts’ relationship should, nonetheless, be duly noted.

What is most evident from the series of letters exchanged between Leopold and Wolfgang while the latter was in Munich composing *Idomeneo*, is that the matter of Maria Anna’s death had not been settled. Leopold still assumed that it was his son’s negligence that had resulted in her demise. When Wolfgang complained of a cold he had contracted, Leopold took the opportunity to recall the Paris tragedy, suggesting that Maria Anna’s death was a result of neglect and ineffective care:

> I hope that your cold will get better soon and have no consequences; perhaps it is gone already . . . But should you fall ill, which God forbid, do not hide it from me, so that I may come at once and look after you. If I had been with our mother during her illness, she might still be alive; but no doubt her hour had come and so I had to be absent.

Leopold’s questions relating to his wife’s death had quickly become insufferable for Wolfgang. Within the letters in which he ridicules Salzburg and the Prince-Archbishop, Wolfgang also began to hint at the prospect of moving away from his father. The happiness he was experiencing in Munich resulted from his need to ‘draw breath’, and this provoked him to think seriously of leaving Salzburg. The Prince-Archbishop had originally granted him only six weeks leave in Munich and when this

---
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time neared its expiration, Wolfgang seriously considered a life away from Leopold and Salzburg. On 16 December 1780 he openly expressed such a desire:

Apropos, what about the Archbishop? Next Monday I shall have been away from Salzburg for six weeks. You know, my dear father, that it is only to please you that I am staying on there, since, by Heaven, if I had followed my inclination, before leaving the other day I would have wiped my behind with my last contract, for I swear to you on my honour that it is not Salzburg itself but the Prince and his conceited nobility who become every day more intolerable to me. Thus I should be delighted, were he to send me word in writing that he no longer required my services; for with the great patronage which I now have here, both my present and future position would be sufficiently safeguarded – save for deaths – which no one can guard against, but which are no great misfortune to a man of talent who is single. But I would do anything in the world to please you. Yet it would be less trying to me, if I could occasionally clear out for a short time, just to draw breath. You know how difficult it was to get away this time: and without some very urgent cause, there would not be the slightest chance of such a thing happening again. To think of it is enough to make one weep.  

Here Wolfgang writes of his burgeoning desire to be free of responsibility and patronage, not the least reason for which was his yearning to leave the service of the Prince-Archbishop.

A further example of his apathy towards the aristocracy came following the death of the Empress, Maria Theresa (1717–1780), which occurred shortly after Wolfgang’s arrival in Munich. His—and in turn, Leopold’s—only concern was how this would affect the staging of *Idomeneo*. He wrote to his father:

The death of the Empress does not affect my opera in the least, for none of the theatres have been closed and plays are being performed as usual. The entire mourning is not to last longer than six weeks and my opera will not be performed before January 20th. I beg you to have my black suit thoroughly brushed, shaken out, done up as well as possible and sent to me by the next mail coach – for next week everyone will be in mourning – and I, who have always to be about, must also weep with the others . . . P.S. – Do not forget about my black suit; I must have it, or I shall be laughed at, which is never very pleasant.  

Leopold and Nannerl travelled to Munich in January 1781 to see Wolfgang’s opera, *Idomeneo*. Scant reports of the initial performances exist; furthermore, because

---
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father and son were together for the premiere, their correspondence was momentarily halted. Following the completion of *Idomeneo*, Wolfgang was summoned to Vienna by the Prince-Archbishop, who was presumably there because of Maria Theresa’s death. At the time, neither Wolfgang nor Leopold would have been aware that Wolfgang’s venture to Vienna would signify the end of his Salzburg residency. Remarkably, the younger Mozart would only return to his hometown on one other occasion, for Vienna would become his place of residence for the remainder of his life. At the time of his departure from Munich, the Mozarts presumed Wolfgang would return in due course with the rest of the Prince-Archbishop’s touring party. The indignation and embarrassment that he would eventually endure, however, finally forced him to seek independence from Salzburg, its patronage, and his father.

The events that unfolded in the course of 1781 can be seen as Wolfgang’s own personal Enlightenment. To recall Immanuel Kant’s immortal adage is also to consider the final split between Wolfgang and his father. Wolfgang believed that he was no longer in need of any spiritual or social guardian, that through courageous emancipation from the Salzburg forces he would be capable of discovering himself and the world:

> Enlightenment is man’s emergence from self-incurred immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one’s own understanding without the guidance of another. This immaturity is self-incurred if its cause is not lack of understanding, but lack of resolution and courage to use it without the guidance of another. The motto of enlightenment is therefore: *Sapere aude!* Have courage to use your own understanding!105

The incidents involving the Prince-Archbishop and his assistants, in which Wolfgang’s ultimate dislike and distrust of the clerical establishment are most evident, were fascinatingly recorded in the correspondence with his father. Not only does the younger Mozart report his dislike of those positioned higher in society than himself, but he also notes a reason for his relocation away from his father. It becomes apparent that Wolfgang’s decision was driven as much by the social injustices he believed himself to be suffering, as by his desire to be free from his father’s control.

---
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In his first letter after arriving in Vienna Wolfgang described to Leopold the conditions in which the Prince-Archbishop expected his servants to live. Being treated as a servant was enough to enrage the young composer:

We lunch about twelve o’clock, unfortunately somewhat too early for me. Our party consists of the two valets, that is, the body and soul attendants of His Worship, the contrôleur, Herr Zetti, the confectioner, the two cooks, and – my insignificant self. By the way, the two valets sit at the top of the table, but at least I have the honour of being placed above the cooks. Well, I almost believe myself back in Salzburg!  

The seating arrangement was completely humiliating for Wolfgang, especially for someone who had sat in the sociable company of European royalty since childhood. That Colloredo was treating him so ordinarily and paying so poorly was damaging his pride, as he reported to his father:

We do not meet for supper, but we each receive three ducats – which goes a long way! The Archbishop is so kind as to add to his lustre by his household, robs them of their chance of earning and pays them nothing. We had a concert yesterday at four o’clock, and at least twenty persons of the highest rank were present . . . Well, I must wait and see whether I shall get anything. If I get nothing, I shall go to the Archbishop and tell him with absolute frankness that if he will not allow me to earn anything, then he must pay me, for I cannot live at my own expense.

The sarcasm inherent in Wolfgang’s letter illustrates an individual who had become increasingly frustrated with his status in relation to the aristocracy. He appeared to be unafraid of the possible consequences generated by either the Prince-Archbishop or his father.

A contemporaneous description of the class struggle in the German states was noted by Friedrich Karl von Moser (1723–1798), who, in 1759, published a treatise describing the ‘blind and unlimited obedience’ that German nobles demanded of their subjects. Moser was part of the same generation as Leopold, yet his desire to uproot the political and social control of the nobility only took firm hold in later generations. Wolfgang was of the generation most affected by Moser’s writings. In his publication, Der Herr und der Diener (The Master and the Servant, 1759), Moser illustrated the
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inequality that existed within the social order. In relation to subjects’ subservience towards their masters, he wrote:

We subjects are too inclined to give our masters the benefit of the doubt; we hasten to cover up and excuse their faults, we value and praise their good qualities to the skies. How easy is it therefore for them to pass as virtuous, just generous and nice people! Provided a prince is not wicked, vicious, greedy and irritable in public, he is praised.  

Furthermore, he noted the ingredients he believed would right this political and social wrong: ‘Right thinking, saying what you think and doing as you say, these are what motivate the world’.  

In spite of his annoyance at the Prince-Archbishop, Wolfgang thoroughly enjoyed the diversity and relative liberty that Vienna provided him. The city itself quickly emerged as Wolfgang’s preferred residence, and he, less than subtly, explained this to Leopold. On 4 April 1781, he wrote:

I assure you that this is a splendid place – and for my métier the best one in the world. Everyone will tell you the same. Moreover, I like being here and therefore I am making all the profit out of it that I can. Believe me, my sole purpose is to make as much money as possible; for after good health it is the best thing to have.  

Wolfgang then concluded the letter with an indication of his desire to reside in Vienna permanently. ‘Think no more of my follies’, he remarked, ‘of which I have repented long ago from the bottom of my heart. Misfortune brings wisdom, and my thoughts now turn in a very different direction’.  

The news that the Prince-Archbishop would soon be returning to Salzburg forced Wolfgang to decide his future. He sought permission from Leopold to stay in Vienna. The desperation is obvious in his writing. ‘It is said that we are to return to Salzburg in a fortnight’, he reported:

I can stay on here, and that too not to my loss, but to my advantage. So I am thinking of asking the Archbishop to allow me to remain in Vienna. Dearest father, I love you dearly; that  
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you must realise from the fact that for your sake I renounce all my wishes and desires . . . As you say, I am still young, True – but to waste one’s youth in inactivity in such a beggarly place is really very sad – and it is such a loss. I should like to have your kind and fatherly advice about this, and very soon – for I must tell him what I am going to do. But do have confidence in me, for I am more prudent now.  

As a general rule, Leopold was far more diligent in preserving the correspondence he received than was Wolfgang. The reason for this, according to David Schroeder, was because Leopold was planning to write a biography of his son – another avenue by which the elder Mozart could enter the circle of Men of Letters. Consequently, most of Leopold’s replies during this period are lost and therefore unknown. It can be calculated from Wolfgang’s letters, however, what Leopold’s sentiments were.

Wolfgang defends his growing agitation with his employer and constantly seeks his father’s approval: Leopold, it can only be assumed, must have been less than impressed with Wolfgang’s rashness.

The decision came in early May 1781 when, after a series of insulting remarks from each party, Wolfgang reported to Leopold that he had left the service of the Prince-Archbishopric. The letter to Leopold is quintessentially Wolfgang’s style: spontaneously forthright. ‘I am still seething with rage!’ he wrote to Leopold:

My patience has been so long tried that at last it has given out. I am no longer so unfortunate as to be in Salzburg service. Today is a happy day for me. Just listen. Twice already that – I don’t know what to call him – has said to my face the greatest sottises and impertinences, which I have not repeated to you, as I wish to spare your feelings, and for which I only refrained from taking my revenge on the spot because you, my most beloved father, were ever before my eyes. He called me a rascal and a dissolute fellow and told me to be off. And I – endured it all, although I felt that not only my honour but yours also was being attacked. But as you would have it so, I was silent . . . When I presented myself today, the valets informed me that the Archbishop wanted to give me a parcel to take charge of . . . well, when I entered the room, his first words were: – Archbishop: ‘Well, young fellow, when are you going off?’ I: ‘I intended to go tonight, but all the seats were already engaged’. Then he rushed full steam ahead, without pausing for breath – I was the most dissolute fellow he knew – no one served him so badly as I – I had better leave today or else he would write home and have my salary stopped. I couldn’t get a word in edgeways, for he blazed away like a fire. I listened to it all
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very calmly. He lied to my face that my salary was five hundred gulden, called me a
scoundrel, a rascal, a vagabond. Oh, I really cannot tell you all he said. At last my blood
began to boil, I could not longer contain myself and I said, ‘So Your Grace is not satisfied
with me?’ ‘What, you dare to threaten me – you scoundrel? There is the door! Look out, for I
will have nothing more to do with such a miserable wretch’. At last I said: ‘Nor I with you!’
‘Well, be off!’ When leaving the room, I said, ‘This is final. You shall have it tomorrow in
writing’. Tell me now, most beloved father, did I not say the word too late rather than too
soon? Just listen for a moment. My honour is more precious to me than anything else and I
know that it is so to you also. Do not be the least bit anxious about me. I am so sure of my
success in Vienna that I would have resigned even without the slightest reason; and now that I
have a very good reason – and that too thrice over – I cannot make a virtue of it. Au contraire,
I had twice played the coward and I could not do so a third time.114

One of the more noteworthy aspects of this letter is Wolfgang’s reference to
Leopold’s attitude to the nobility. The comment ‘But as you would have it so, I was
silent’ – explains where both Leopold and Wolfgang were placed at the time of this
letter. Wolfgang’s boldness is in complete contrast to Leopold’s conservative and
humble nature. Leopold’s insistence that his son remain tolerant – no matter the level
of indignation – was one characteristic that Wolfgang did not inherit. Nonetheless, he
continued to push Leopold for a reply, hoping that his father would approve of his
impromptu display. He even hoped to gain Leopold’s consent by suggesting he too
move to Vienna. The sincerity of the offer, however, appears rather contrived
considering that Wolfgang added: ‘Still, I should prefer it if you could hold out for
another year’.115

The relinquishment of patronage duties was a relief for Wolfgang and a
concern for Leopold. ‘If you call it pleasure to be rid of a prince,’ Wolfgang wrote to
Leopold, ‘who does not pay a fellow and bullies him to death, then it is true that my
pleasure is great. If I were to do nothing but think and work from early morning till
late at night, I would gladly do so, rather than depend upon the favour of such a – I
dare not call him by his right name’.116 Although he was dissatisfied at the Prince-
Archbishop’s inability to pay him what he thought he was worth, it was his
underlying aversion to serving the nobility that is the important factor in this letter.
His desire to be ‘free from laborious and unrewarding ecclesiastical duties was

115 Letters, 729; Briefe, III, 112.
because he essentially did not want to serve. It was these very sentiments that were later reiterated by Leporello in Wolfgang’s opera Don Giovanni from 1787. During the opening scene of the First Act, Don Giovanni’s long-suffering servant becomes impatient with his master’s philandering ways:

LEPORELLO: I wish to play the gentleman, 
And don’t want to serve any longer.117

The final insult for Wolfgang was a private, albeit physical, humiliation from the chief steward of the Prince-Archbishop, Count Karl Joseph Arco (1743–1830), who dismissed the impetuous young composer from their employer’s antechamber following an argument over Wolfgang’s petition to resign. Wolfgang’s furious letter to his father is his grand testament on the inequitable relationship between the aristocracy and the burgeoning middle-class:

Well, Count Arco has made a nice mess of things! So that is the way to persuade people and to attract them! To refuse petitions from innate stupidity, not to say a word to your master from lack of courage and love of toadyism, to keep a fellow dangling about for four weeks, and finally, when he is obliged to present the petition in person, instead of at least granting him admittance, to throw him out of the room and give him a kick on his behind – that is the Count, who, according to your last letter, has my interest so much at heart – and that is the court where I ought to go on serving – the place where whoever wants to make a written application, instead of having its delivery facilitated, is treated in this fashion!118

Wolfgang’s embarrassing kick in the backside from a member of the Prince-Archbishop’s party led him to finally break with Salzburg. As in all his letters to Leopold, he adopted the persona of a loving son: a young man who did not want to hurt his father but who could no longer tolerate the dominant role that Leopold was playing in his life.

Wolfgang’s final appeal to Leopold was for compassion, fatherly assistance, and the acknowledgment that he finally had ‘understanding . . . without the guidance of another’.119 On 16 May Wolfgang wrote:

---

117 MO, 297; NMA, VIII, 29–30.
118 Letters, 740; Briefe, III, 125–126.
119 KPW, 54.
Believe me, most beloved father, I need all my manliness to write to you what common sense dictates. God knows how hard it is for me to leave you; but, even if I had to beg, I could never serve such a master again; for, as long as I should live, I shall never forget what has happened. I implore you, I adjure you, by all you hold dear in this world, to strengthen me in this resolution instead of trying to dissuade me from it, for if you do you will only make me unproductive. My desire and my hope is to gain honour, fame and money, and I have every confidence that I shall be more useful to you in Vienna than if I were to return to Salzburg.  

In Vienna, where he placed all his hopes without a secure employer, he literally became a freelance composer and performer, relying almost entirely on his own earnings. This was an enormous risk, especially considering his essentially disastrous attempt at self-promotion in Paris. Although appreciation in Vienna was more forthcoming, it remained a continual struggle – such was his need to be released from paternal captivity in Salzburg. As Ramiro sings in Wolfgang’s *opera buffa, La finta giardiniera* (The Pretend Garden Girl, 1775):

```
RAMIRO: If one day the little bird
    escapes from its prison,
    it will no longer fly
    playfully around its keeper.  
```

The *Sturm und Drang* movement was the immanent environment surrounding Leopold and Wolfgang’s relationship at this time. At the heart of *Sturm und Drang* mentality was a middle-class objective to unsettle the privileged nobility. As Roy Pascal stated, the *Stürmer und Dränger* ‘threw down a challenge to the State and its purposes in the name of personal and social culture, a challenge that succeeding generations could not ignore’.  

This way of thinking that was so inherent in Wolfgang that it materialised not through his musical compositions but through his daily actions. He challenged his father and the authorities, and discovered his independence.

---

120 *Letters*, 732–33; *Briefe*, III, 116.  
121 *CME*, XXXIII, 76; *NMA*, V, 620–621.  
122 Roy Pascal, *Storm and Stress*, 301.
5. The Mozarts and Tolerance: The Aufklärer and their quest for social and intellectual freedom.

Tolerance within the Aufklärung – and in particular the Habsburg domains – forms the central subject of Chapter 5. In an age when prejudices of all forms continued to create cultural and international animosity, the Aufklärer voiced their concern over the level of religious and humanitarian intolerance within society. For the Mozarts, who had witnessed the practicing of a wide array of faiths during their extensive travels, their commentary on these issues is particularly relevant and insightful. For the German lands in particular, the question of tolerance was a pivotal one. Not only were there geographic-religious differences between the Protestant North and the Catholic South, but the Jewish community was strong throughout these lands too. Tolerance towards German Jews had experienced a long and shifting history. In the eighteenth century, they slowly gained recognition: firstly in the northern German centres, with prominent writers such as Moses Mendelssohn gaining due status; and subsequently in Josephinian Vienna, while Wolfgang Mozart was there. How, therefore, did Leopold and Wolfgang each view these minority groups, and to what extent did this affect their own relationship?

Three specific areas will be discussed within this chapter. The first will be the Mozarts’ opinion and attitude towards other Christian denominations. During their Grand Tour and subsequent smaller tours across Europe, Leopold and Wolfgang were exposed to the practices of Lutheranism, Calvinism, and other strands of the Protestant faith. Despite their respective Catholicity, both Leopold and Wolfgang showed high levels of fascination towards other creeds. These sentiments, which are detailed within their correspondence, display the principle that the Aufklärer routinely espoused – the freedom to inquire.

The second and third areas are intrinsically linked with the reign of Joseph II in the 1780s. The Habsburg attitude towards the neighbouring Turks of the Ottoman Empire, and towards their fellow Jewish citizens, is a historical study in social inconsistencies. Joseph II, for all his progressive Enlightened reforms, carried through many contradictory edicts which only accentuated these prejudices. Wolfgang, much more than Leopold, witnessed these social and religious progressions. First of all, the Viennese animosity towards the Turks was a constant theme in several of his late
operas. He did not, however, discriminate against Jewish people, for many of his closest friends belonged to the Jewish faith. The Jews with whom he interacted also played a vital role in both his personal and professional life.

To begin this chapter, it is once again necessary to highlight specific aspects of the social and philosophical scene in which the Mozarts were living. Such was the pertinence of religious and ethnic tolerance to the eighteenth century that both Leopold and Wolfgang regularly found themselves involved in microcosmic situations regarding this issue.

* * *

On 9 January 1782 Wolfgang wrote to his father in Salzburg about his intention to marry Constanze Weber. Within this letter, however, there was a rather innocuous remark regarding a particularly significant occasion for the imperial capital:

Meanwhile I must inform you that the Pope is supposed to be coming to Vienna. The whole town is talking about it. But I do not believe it, for Count Cobenzl told me that the Emperor will decline his visit.¹

Wolfgang is referring to Pius VI’s (1717–1799) hastily arranged visit to Vienna. He was to stay for a month and a half. His visit was in response to Joseph II’s tendentious religious and ecclesiastical reforms. In an attempt to persuade the Emperor to curb his Catholic reforms before he seriously altered the essence of the Church’s dogma, Pius VI ventured from Rome to Vienna. As Wolfgang remarked in his letter, the Viennese were so excited about a Pope’s presence in their city that two hundred thousand people were on hand to welcome him, and a further thirty thousand flocked to the city during his stay.² It proved to be a futile venture, however. Joseph II upheld his

¹ Letters, 790–91; Briefe, III, 190.
² Volkmar Braunbehrens, Mozart in Vienna: 1781–1791 (New York: Grove, 1991) 177. One foreigner’s memory of the event describes enthusiasm that bordered on hysteria: ‘The eagerness of the common people to receive his benediction mounted to frenzy. The course of the Danube was fairly choked by the crowd of boats which bore the floods of pilgrims, and the great market-place . . . was often found filled with shoes and hats lost in the scuffle by the assembled multitudes; who, by twenty and thirty thousand at a time, passed into streets leading to the Imperial palace, at the balcony of which, repeatedly during the day, its illustrious guest was obliged to show himself and distribute blessings to successive shoals of devotees. Nor was the homage confined to his person alone. The sacred slipper became, to the superstitious Viennese, an object of almost equal devotion. It was placed on a cushion in
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decision to close numerous monasteries, abolish certain church music, and establish the *Toleranzpatent* – all reasons for Pius VI’s initial concern.³

The ten years that Wolfgang spent in Vienna coincided with Joseph II’s decade-long crusade to force the ideals and theories of the *Aufklärung* upon his subjects.⁴ The fact that he mentioned to Leopold the genuine possibility of Joseph II refusing Pius VI’s visit, courtesy of his diplomat friend Johann Philipp Cobenzl (1741–1810), demonstrates Wolfgang’s political awareness. Furthermore, it suggests that from an early period of his residency in Vienna he had connections with the highest and most powerful individuals. Wolfgang had learnt from his father the effectiveness of networking, which led to him achieving a large and diverse group of Viennese colleagues. In particular, his ties with members of the Jewish community demonstrate a distinct reversal of the intolerance shown by the authorities to Jews in his native Salzburg.⁵

On 15 February 1781, as Wolfgang was in Munich preparing for *Idomeneo* and awaiting his imminent journey to Vienna, the foremost playwright of the German stage, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, died. At the time of his death his final and most personal play was complete but had not yet had its premiere.⁶ *Nathan der Weise* would eventually – largely due to the efforts of Schiller and Goethe in Weimar⁷ – be recognised as the greatest dramatic testament to tolerance from a representative of the *Aufklärung*. Contrary to the argument of Nicholas Boyle, the play is not a tribute to Masonic rituals, nor a call for the creation of a ‘secret religion of agnostic humanism’.⁸ Lessing’s death prior to the work being properly celebrated meant that

the audience-chamber, and there kissed by all the clergy and hosts of other visitors (some not expected who from anything but religious motives went to bear their part in a scene, which to their eyes exhibited the lowest depth of human degradation); and it was afterwards, as a special favour, allowed to be borne as a relic into several of the most distinguished mansions of Vienna’. See *Documents*, 154–55.

³ In Chapter 3 of this dissertation, the animosity between Empress Maria Theresa and her co-Emperor, Joseph, is examined. Their different religious ideologies were just one reason for this clash. Maria Theresa’s thrice daily attendance at church and her overtly baroque surroundings is juxtaposed with her eldest son’s Enlightened agenda of a more simplistic devotion. Their respective sarcophagi in the *Kaisergruft* in the Capuchins’ church in Vienna are a lasting testament to their opposing beliefs. Anna Coreth, *Pietas Austriaca* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2004) 25.
⁴ Joseph II was sole Emperor of the Habsburg domains from 1780 to 1790; Wolfgang lived in Vienna from 1781 to 1791.
⁶ This took place in Berlin in 1783.
⁷ *DWL*, I, 227.
he could not further elucidate its message, but it is clear that the message that he wanted to circulate was of universal tolerance. This had been a feature of his writing throughout his career.

_Nathan der Weise_ is a five-act play set in 12th-century Jerusalem that interweaves characters of the Christian, Jewish and Islamic faiths. The central figure, Nathan, is a Jew. Lessing is supposed to have moulded this character on his friend Moses Mendelssohn. Nathan’s adopted daughter, Recha, has been brought up under the Jewish faith; she falls in love, however, with her saviour, a Christian Templar. It is eventually revealed that not only are Recha and the Templar siblings, but that they are the biological children of Assad, who is the brother of the Sultan, Saladin. The union of the three religions was not intended by Lessing to herald a superior faith, but rather to highlight the fact that all religions – and, therefore, all ideologies – originate from the same foundation. Peter Gay suggests that these three particular religions are each the ‘incomplete incarnation of a larger truth’.⁹ Amid the prejudice that exists it should be remembered, according to Lessing, that varying doctrines are not entirely unrelated:

The difference is not much.
Great men, like trees, have ever need of room;
Too many set together only serve
To crush each other’s boughs. The middling sort,
Like us, are found in numbers, they abound;
Only let not one scar and bruise the other,
Let not the gnarl be angry with the stump,
Let not the upper branch alone pretend
Not to have started from the common earth.¹⁰

The final two lines from this stanza (‘Let not the upper branch alone pretend/Not to have started from the common earth’) define Lessing’s stance and that of his fellow _Aufklärer_ on all forms of prejudice. Although in _Nathan der Weise_ it is most applicable to religious tolerance, it can be applied to a broader ideological frame as well. The imbalance between social classes and the injustices to racial minorities were

---

¹⁰ _DWL_, I, 281.
both components which the Aufklärer were striving to address in their crusade for universal tolerance.

Lessing was a key figure in this drive. However, he was not as radical in his thinking as many of his predecessors, such as Spinoza, Leibniz and Christian Wolff. Despite claims to the contrary from his contemporary Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi (1743–1819), Lessing was a Deist who believed in the existence and necessity of organised religion. Without it man would indeed be free, he argued. However he would be lost within an imperfect and complicated world. From his drama Der Freigeist (The Freethinker, 1749) onwards he defended religion as an obligatory ingredient of social and personal wellbeing:

To deprive the multitude of religion would be like turning loose a horse from a rich pasture – as soon as it feels its freedom it prefers to roam in unproductive forests and to suffer want, rather than gain what it requires by an easy service.\footnote{Lessing, \textit{Philosophical and Theological Writings} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) H. B. Nisbet, trans., 243–44.}

Lessing championed this stance on tolerance from a very early stage of his writing career. One drama that invites many parallels with Nathan is his own youthful work Die Juden (The Jews, 1749), which was written at the same time as Der junge Gelehrte. Conceived before he met Mendelssohn, the drama was a call for religious tolerance and the need to implement Jewish civil rights. One of the most telling features of religious intolerance, he argued, was man’s capacity for and habit of generalisation. Christians, in particular, were the most regular and slanderous offenders. Early on in the drama, Lessing portrays a common attitude levelled at the Jewish faith:

KRUMM: All of them, without exception, are cheats, thieves, and robbers. That is why they are a people whom the Lord our God has cursed. If I were king I should not leave a single one of them alive. Oh, may the Lord guard all honest Christians against these people! If the Lord our God did not hate them, why should twice as many Jews as Christians have perished in the accident at Breslau, a short time ago?\footnote{\textit{DWL}, II, 264.}

\footnote{\textit{DWL}, II, 190.}
Eventually the Jewish character known as the Traveller makes a plea to the bigots who had lampooned him because of his religion. Lessing narrows it down to the simple fact that under the archaic and dusty cover of religion lies the commonality of man:

TRAVELLER: For requital I ask but one thing, that you will henceforth judge of my nation in a kinder and less sweeping way. I did not conceal my race from you because I am ashamed of my religion. No! But I saw that you felt friendship for me, and enmity against my religion. And the friendship of a man, whoever he may be, has always been esteemed by me.\(^\text{14}\)

This, in effect, is identical to the message propagated throughout Wolfgang’s *Die Zauberflöte*, namely that the brotherhood of man and mankind’s underlying commonality were more significant than any religion, title, or race:

SPEAKER: He is a prince! –
SARASTRO: Even more, he is a human being!\(^\text{15}\)

Religious and racial segregation had been common in German society before the *Aufklärung*. The issue was deeply rooted within the mentality of the people, largely because of fundamentalist Christian attitudes and hostilities. Abraham a Sancta Clara (1644–1709), for instance, was one of the seventeenth century’s more sanctimonious and moralising prelates. Born just outside Vienna he entered the Catholic priesthood in 1666 and rose to be Habsburg court preacher in the Imperial city eleven years later. Known for his flamboyant style of preaching, he rhetorically castigated minorities who did not fit within the Catholic doctrine. Most violent were his attacks on Turks and Jews. Robert A. Kann’s analysis of the preacher’s mentality is thus:

Abraham a Sancta Clara’s approach to the problem of the inner enemy, the Jew, was of a different nature. Hence he proceeded in a spirit of highly personal animosity, fomented by centuries-old prejudices. The history of the Austrian, in particular the Viennese Jews, from

\(^{14}\) *DWL*, II, 216.
\(^{15}\) *MO*, 614; *NMA*, IX, 193.
their first expulsion in 1421 to the second of 1669–70, and even throughout the eighteenth century to the time of Joseph II, is indeed somber and depressing.  

This attitude is best demonstrated in one of Sancta Clara’s more assertive and unrelenting publications Auf, auf, ihr Christen (Arise, Arise you Christians, 1683), written amid the anti-Turkish atmosphere precipitating the Battle of Vienna. In it the preacher proclaimed his disdain for all Jews and Muslims who, he asserted, were the accredited enemies of Christendom. His doctrine was so successful because he managed to support it with Biblical and historical examples. It begins:

> What is the Turk? You Christians, answer without hesitation: he is a copy of the Antichrist, a vain big-bellied bailiff, an insatiable tiger, Satan incarnate, a damned world-storming aggressor. He is a cruel glutton, a vengeful beast, an unscrupulous pretender to the crown, a murderous falcon, a discontented pile of carrion. He is oriental dragon poison, an unchained hellhound, epicurean riffraff, a tyrannical monster, etc. It is true, my dear Christians. He certainly deserves these fine laudatory epithets.

As for the Jewish community, he accused them of being a disunited faith, which had deservedly been ostracised for their betrayal of Jesus Christ. Sancta Clara showed little pity:

> The Jews had to suffer the constant assaults, the ferocious onsloughts, the unexpected falling upon themselves of the Assyrians, Chaldeans, Egyptians, Romans, etc., because of their falling away from God and their faulting of Jesus.

Rarely was he content in his doctrinal preachings either. He spoke with historical factuality, claiming that Christianity’s downfall in the past had come through its own fault.

---

18 Abraham a Sancta Clara, Auf Auf Ihr Christen, 87.
19 Sancta Clara thought that enemies of Christendom were being sent by God to restore morality and to curb growing complacency: “The Turks call us dogs, to our eternal shame. And they can hardly be blamed, for, like a dog who laps up again what he has thrown up, “Canis redit ad vomitum” (“The dog returns to the vomit”), we eagerly snap after those sins that we had thrown off at the time of the plague and other dangerous uprisings. Why should we be surprised if God takes up his rod again? The Israelites had scarcely sinned when God punished them with the dire war that king Nebuchadnezzar waged against them. Thus through the mouth of Jeroboam God called that king his servant. Although
As much as Sancta Clara’s words were extreme in their content he vividly personified the religious prejudice typical of his age. The Germanic lands had experienced centuries of discrimination towards Jews in particular. In the context of the Mozart story, Augsburg, Salzburg, and Vienna had all – at one time or another – inflicted serious and debilitating restrictions on the social and domestic movements of their Jewish inhabitants. Some centres forbade the settlement of Jews altogether, such as Wolfgang Mozart’s birthplace Salzburg, which ‘cleansed’ itself of Jewry from 1498 to 1867. The history of Jewish ‘liberation’ under the Habsburg dynasty evolved sporadically over a 300-year period. From the Middle Ages to the reign of Joseph II, the liberties and licences that were given to Jews steadily increased. During Wolfgang’s time as a Viennese resident, Jewry witnessed its most permissive period for centuries. Although it was not as tolerant and all-inclusive as some contemporaneous writers would have us believe, Josephinian Vienna was

20 Leeson, ‘Mozart, the Jews, and Late 18th Century Austria’, 155–67. During the latter part of the fifteenth century, it was alleged that some Jewish communities had murdered Christian children to drink their blood for ritualistic purposes. These accusations, which were made in 1475, sparked universal condemnation of Jews. Leeson warns us not to make the assumption that Wolfgang never met a Jew in Salzburg, because of a civic law permitting Jewish peddlers to pass through the city.

21 It would be completely naïve and incorrect to suggest that the social freedom offered to the Jews was comprehensive at any period during this time. As will be shown, the common theory that the Jewish community realised their full emancipation under Joseph II is misleading, for the liberties he decreed, particularly the Edict of Toleration, were still very restrictive. It would also be fallacious to declare that the freedom allowed to Jews was a continuous and steady awakening from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries. Rudolph II encouraged the artistic expression of Jews through his creation of the institution of hofbefreite Juden in 1582, whereas Joseph II’s mother, Maria Theresa, was disgusted by the very presence of Jews in Vienna and did her best to curb their progress. See Walter Pillich, ‘Jewish Artists in the 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries’ in The Jews of Austria: Essays on their Life, History and Destruction (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., Ltd., 1967) Josef Fraenkel, ed., 3–16.

22 The Leipzig-based Serbian Dositej Obradovic saw Joseph II as possessing the potential to create a society entirely free from prejudice. In 1783 he wrote ‘Joseph II, our ruler beloved,/ The world’s sun and bestower of blessings . . . / Proud Minerva, the goddess of wisdom/ Has enlightened thy spirit from childhood . . . / Ah, sweet season! Ah, Golden Age amongst us! Among all men new affection is kindled! . . . / For our nation we shall all implore Him/ And with tears to Him we shall petition . . .’ Quoted in R. J. W. Evans, ‘Joseph II and Nationality in the Habsburg Lands’ in Enlightened Absolutism: Reform and Reformers in Later Eighteenth-Century Europe (London: Macmillan Education, Ltd., 1990) H. M. Scott, ed., 209–19.
considered the genesis of a Jewish utopia, and a centre in which all social and religious minorities could live humanely.

The eighteenth century witnessed many variations of tolerance towards the German Jews. The most famous example of this – and the one most applicable to the Mozart story – involved Moses Mendelssohn and Joseph von Sonnenfels (1733/4–1817). Mendelssohn in the North and Sonnenfels in the South best represent the contrasting attitudes to those of the Jewish faith, particularly at an intellectual level. These two important representatives of the Aufklärung enjoyed individual success through their writings on religious and civil duties; however because of the different ways these two men embraced Judaism their contemporary and posthumous receptions have been dissimilar. In predominantly Lutheran Berlin, which under the rule of the enlightened Frederick II gave shelter to diverse religious persuasions, Mendelssohn thrived and was heralded as the ‘German Plato’. His work *Phädon, oder über die Unsterblichkeit der Seele* was discovered in Wolfgang Mozart’s library following his death and may well have been given to him by one of his many Jewish friends.

Similarly featured in Wolfgang’s collection of literature were the *Gesammelte kleine Schriften* (*Collected Shorter Writings, 1783–1786*) of Joseph von Sonnenfels. Born into relative squalor, Sonnenfels rose to prominence in the imperial court in Vienna under both Maria Theresa and Joseph II. This prominence, however, was only made possible due to his family’s conversion from Judaism to Christianity during Sonnenfels’ childhood. His father was then granted admission into the aristocracy in 1736. Despite this adoption of the Catholic faith, his Jewish ancestry was well known and he battled hard to validate his place in Viennese society. His religious transformation has therefore been criticised from a retrospective Jewish point of view. In contrast to Mendelssohn’s success as a Jewish crusader, Sonnenfels’ achievement has been tainted:

---

23 Scholar Werner Krauss (1900–76) noted that the Aufklärung was more evident in the larger cities rather than the principalities: ‘In Leipzig, and not in Dresden, in Berlin and not in Potsdam’. Quoted in Joachim Whaley, ‘The Protestant Enlightenment in Germany’ in *The Enlightenment in National Context*, 106–117.
24 In a letter from 1769, Mendelssohn in reference to the Jews said that ‘they enjoy a fair amount of freedom in the country in which I live’. Mendelssohn, *Jerusalem*, 120.
25 Braunbehrens suggests that the book was given to Wolfgang by Fanny Arnstein (1758–1818) during the last years of his life. See Braunbehrens, *Mozart in Vienna: 1781–1791*, 67.
26 *MDB*, 588–601.
The problem of assessing Sonnenfels’ role lies on the other side of the chasm, on the Jewish side, where of course as a convert he could in no way be compared to Mendelssohn . . . Whereas German Jews, because of Mendelssohn, would for generations after him embrace Enlightenment virtually without hesitation, making a nigh religious cult of westernising themselves, perhaps one might say that the Habsburg Jews looking at Sonnenfels had to accept great caution. Perhaps for them it could not escape notice that Enlightenment might mean apostasy – the outright abandonment of Jewish tradition.28

The respective success Mendelssohn and Sonnenfels enjoyed was due to the prejudices – or lack thereof – in their respective political environments. Frederick II believed in the natural equality of all men. In his 1777 treatise on the policy of an enlightened government, he declared intolerance was detrimental to the success and contentment of any state:

Tolerance is itself so advantageous, to the people among whom it is established, that it constitutes the happiness of the state. As soon as there is that perfect freedom of opinion, the people are all at peace; whereas persecution has given birth to the most bloody civil wars, and such as have been the most inveterate and most destructive. The least evil that results from persecution is to occasion the persecuted to emigrate.29

The reason Frederick has often been referred as ‘the Great’ is in substantial measure because of such ideas, in which he evidently strongly believed.30 He, as well as Joseph II, are the finest examples of the enlightened despot. The perception of an enlightened sovereign is not a modern-day one either. The Aufklärer were well aware that such rulers existed, and they were keen to see that their ideas prospered. It was through strong and coherent leadership, thought Mendelssohn, that intolerance and prejudice could be laid to rest:

29 Frederick II, Essas sur les Formes de gouvernement et sur les devoirs des souverains (1777) in The Portable Enlightenment, 457.
30 In a testament written in 1752 Frederick declared his concept of a tolerant society: ‘I am in a sense the Pope of the Lutherans and the head of the Reformed Church. The other Christian sects are all tolerated here. We stop the mouth of the first man who wants to speak of a civil war. I am neutral between Rome and Geneva. In this way I can diminish religious animosities by preaching moderation to all parties, and I strive to unite them by showing them that they are all citizens’. Quoted in Enlightened Despotism (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1967) Stuart Andrews, ed., 133.
The spirit of conciliation as well as of love demands that the stronger party should take the first step. He must waive his claim to superiority and make the overture if the weaker party is to gain sufficient confidence to respond. If it be the design of Providence that brethren shall love each other, it is evidently the duty of the stronger to take the first move, open his arms and cry out, like Augustus, “Let us be friends”.31

Until Joseph II gained full control of the Habsburg domains in 1780, Jews and other minorities had little freedom or respect in the southern German territories. Maria Theresa conducted a fervent anti-Semitic vendetta, which was administered publicly and physically. Her enmity vis-à-vis Jews had not been a recent development, but rather one that she inherited from her immediate ancestors. Her grandfather Leopold I (1640–1705) had banished Jews from all Habsburg territory in 1669–70, and only granted them permission to re-enter if they wore yellow badges, yielded enormous taxes to the state, and agreed to live within a ghetto. Her father Charles VI (1685–1740) administered the same principles and legislation.32 Unlike her son, Joseph II, or Frederick II, who saw the benefits of a multicultural and cosmopolitan society for the state, Maria Theresa viewed Jewish freedom as an avenue via which her domains could be bankrupted economically and morally. In 1777 she administered a resolution to prevent such an event:

In future no Jew, as they are called, is to be allowed in Vienna without my written permission. I know no greater pest in the state than this nation for reducing people to beggary by deceit, usury and monetary deals, or for exercising all the lowest trades, which honest people hold in abhorrence. All this can therefore be kept away from here and avoided.33

Thus, despite being born into an age of enlightenment, Joseph II was not born into an enlightened dynasty. Around the same time that Maria Theresa had decried the Jews in her resolution, her eldest son was formulating his future intentions in letters he wrote to her. They illustrate him as a mature individual who wished to grant far-reaching emancipation to those who were socially and religiously oppressed. ‘What your Majesty tells me of open irreligion in Moravia’, he wrote,

---

31 Mendelssohn, Jerusalem, 145.
33 Documents, 152.
makes me surer than ever of the truth of my principles: with freedom of religion, one religion will remain, that of guiding all citizens alike to the welfare of the State. Without this approach, we shall not save any greater number of souls and we shall lose a great many more useful and essential people. To act by half-measures is not part of my principles: one must either allow complete freedom of worship or else be able to deport all who do not share one’s beliefs and do not follow the same modes of worshipping and serving the same God and the same fellow-man.

He concluded this letter by taking issue with his mother’s ruling on the Jews, declaring it to be an unnecessary and backward step: ‘It is for the Holy Spirit to enlighten men’s hearts; your laws will only postpone its effects. This is my opinion, as Your Majesty knows. My firm conviction will prevent me from changing it, I fear, in my lifetime’. Once he gained full control of the empire in 1780, he moved swiftly to stamp his authority on matters pertaining to the correcting of ancient prejudices.

As much as Joseph II wanted history to remember him as an enlightened ruler, the records show that his emancipation of many of the minorities was primarily for the benefit of the state. Unlike his mother whose negativity prevented her from seeing many possibilities, Joseph II’s ‘enlightenment’ of his subjects was – in his eyes – all in the interest of his empire. Catholicism remained the religion whose doctrine he most agreed with – despite his best efforts to abolish many of its archaic institutions and the elaborate ceremonies associated with clerical duties. However, he saw the intolerant attitude towards other religions and denominations as a hindrance to the prosperity of the Habsburg Empire:

God forbid I should think it of no importance whether subjects turn Protestant or remain Catholic, still less whether they do not believe or at any rate do not observe the religion handed down by their fathers. I would give all I have to see all the Protestants in the country become Catholic. For me, tolerance simply means that in purely secular matters, I would, without considering their religion, employ those who were capable of it and who would bring profit or industry to the country, and allow them to own land, join the professions and be enfranchised . . . Certainly, no one would become Lutheran or Calvinist; there would be fewer impieties in all religions and the State would greatly profit; and I cannot believe that all this would make me guilty in the eyes of God; at any rate this does not strike me as incompatible
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with His perfection or the task which He has laid on me by placing me at the service of some fifteen million people.\textsuperscript{35}

Joseph II’s tone in this letter described the political atmosphere in which Wolfgang Mozart found himself in 1781. Released from Maria Theresa’s motherly and ministerial control, the Emperor set about creating the Enlightened state he had long envisioned. Sonnenfels, who as a converted Jew managed to work under two generations of Habsburgs, aptly recognised the importance of establishing an enlightened metropolis. In his own journal, \textit{Der Mann ohne Vorurtheil (Man without Prejudice)} he professed that:

\begin{quote}
An enlightened people obeys because it wants to; a people blind with prejudice does so because it must.\textsuperscript{36}
\end{quote}

Shortly after settling in Vienna in 1781 Wolfgang set about composing a new comedy for the stage. Leaving the half-completed \textit{Zaide} aside, he was persuaded to work on another \textit{Singspiel} that would have greater appeal to a Viennese audience. Gottlieb Stephanie’s (1741–1800) libretto was to be the basis for \textit{Die Entführung aus dem Serail}, a comic \textit{Singspiel} that mixed Enlightened philosophy and Hanswurstian humour at the expense of the Ottoman Empire. For a population that sought reform for the oppressed minorities, the Viennese attitudes towards Islam and Turkish imagery and music appears rather inconsistent. Furthermore, the Viennese inclination to deride these particular minorities was a behaviour not found in neighbouring cities and should be considered, therefore, exclusively their own.\textsuperscript{37} From the outset one could assume that this may be the Viennese people’s reactive response to the proposal of religious and international tolerance from their newly anointed Emperor. A people’s inherent prejudices and ideologies cannot be reformed overnight, as Kant pointed out.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{35} Documents, 151.
\textsuperscript{36} Joseph von Sonnenfels, ‘Der Mann ohne Vorurtheil’ in \textit{Gesammelte Schriften}, III (Vienna: Baumeister, 1783–1787) 221.
\textsuperscript{38} Furthermore on this notion, Immanuel Kant proposed: ‘But be it noted that the public, which has first been brought under this yoke by their guardians, forces the guardians themselves to remain bound when it is incited to do so by some of the guardians who are themselves capable of some enlightenment – so harmful is it to implant prejudices, for they later take vengeance on their cultivators or on their descendants. Thus the public can only slowly attain enlightenment’. Immanuel Kant, \textit{Critique of
Following the Ottoman Empire’s failed attempt to seize Vienna in 1683, the general perception of the Turks in Vienna was very low. The sultan in particular was seen as the eternal ‘infidel dedicated to conquering Christian civilisation – a man to be feared, to be mocked’. This is precisely how Stephanie and Wolfgang depicted the Turkish adversaries in their Singspiel. The Pasha Selim is portrayed as a ruthless barbarian of irrational sensibilities (until the Finale when he is shown to have been transformed into an Enlightened thinker), and his employee Osmin is presented as the comical version of a Turkish oppressor.

Being born and bred within the confines of relatively conservative and intolerant environments, both Leopold and Wolfgang lived during a transformational period in German society. How, therefore, did the Mozarts adapt to their social surrounding amidst the push from the Aufklärer for a less prejudiced world and how did they each comprehend its implications?

* * *

For Leopold Mozart, whose Catholicism and austerity were central components of his character, the ability to welcome foreign entities was not easy. Although Augsburg had enjoyed a period of religious civility since the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 and again through the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, intolerance and racial differences remained. Being brought up and educated in an orthodox Jesuit environment would have introduced Leopold to the traditional wariness concerning foreigners. The traditionalist view of the elder Mozart regimentally preaching the Catholic doctrine to his son does indeed, as most historical myths do, contain elements of truth. Although many of his sermons centred on Catholicism, much was said about the other denominations, namely the rising forces of German Protestantism.

Leopold’s religious leanings were not as clear-cut as has often been asserted previously. His Catholic loyalty was strong but he maintained a lifelong disdain for

---

40 See Gutman, Mozart: A Cultural Biography, 42, n. 16.
the clergy and their absolutism. His anticlericalism was most fervent before Wolfgang’s birth when he seems to have rebelled against many officials within the church. This can also be seen in relation to the Jesuits and his indifference to them as time progressed. Despite being under their guidance as a youngster in Augsburg, Leopold seemed entirely indifferent to the dissolution of their Order under Pope Clement XIV in 1773. In a letter to his wife Leopold reports from Vienna about the suppression:

Now it is all up with the poor Jesuits! I call them poor, for only those who were the leaders, I mean, the rabbis and corpus religionis as a whole, could be called rich. The ordinary members had nothing. The Jesuit monastery Auf Dem Hof must be cleared out by September 16th. The church treasure, the wine-cellar and, in fact, their entire property have already been sealed up, for the Jesuit Order has been suppressed . . . The public is very much distressed. I hear that a Papal Brief is to be published to the effect that on pain of excommunication no one is to write or even speak a word against their suppression. On the other hand, many good Catholics are of the opinion that except in matters of faith His Holiness the Pope has no right to command and that it may truly be said that they would not have been interfered with if they had been as poor as the poor Capuchins.

Leopold’s letter displays varying emotions over the news of the Jesuits’ demise. On the one hand he mused that their affluent existence was no more, yet became frustrated at the realisation that the Papacy could still execute the canonical tyranny he so despised.

Leopold’s ability to swing from staunch Catholic to liberal Aufklärer has been preserved in many of his letters. He diligently noted when there was any religious or racial animosity in his environment, and took a keen interest in many of the other doctrines’ peculiarities. In particular, the family’s Grand Tour of the 1760s presented Leopold with the opportunity to experience religious practice outside his native Catholic surroundings. At the beginning of their journey, when they were still fairly close to home, Leopold recorded their stay in Schwetzingen and the assortment of religions that were practised there:
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42 Namely, the ‘Egglstainer’ affair, which saw Leopold reprimanded and forced to apologise for circulating anticlerical pamphlets in 1753. See Chapter 1, or Halliwell, The Mozart Family, 20, and Solomon, Mozart: A Life, 29.

43 Letters, 241–42; Briefe, I, 494.
For indeed we see many strange and quite unusual things which we should like you to see too. At present we are staying in places where there are four religions, Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist and Jewish. Save for the court, which accounts for a large number of the inhabitants, Schwetzingen is chiefly Calvinist. It is only a village, but it has three churches, Catholic, Lutheran and Calvinist; and the whole of the Palatinate is like this. Strange to say, since we left Wasserburg, we have not had a holy water stoup in our rooms. For, even though the places are Catholic, such things are not to be found, because many Lutherans pass through, and therefore the rooms are so equipped that all religions can live in them together. In the bedrooms too there are seldom any pictures save a few landscapes or the portrait of some old Emperor; there is hardly ever a crucifix.\textsuperscript{44}

Here Leopold is not so much frustrated at the tolerance shown towards other denominations as rather curious and inquisitive as to their practices. What irritated him, however, is that their presence had come at the expense of Catholic orthodoxy and the monopoly it once enjoyed. The continual rise of Lutherans and Calvinists throughout the German lands caused much annoyance for established Catholics. Earlier in the same letter Leopold described the family’s brief passing through Enzweihingen, a small town near Stuttgart, which he disapprovingly described as ‘entirely Lutheran and a wretched spot’.\textsuperscript{45}

As is the case with many of Leopold’s characteristics and traits his standpoint concerning Lutherans was quite paradoxical. For instance, in a letter from 1764 Leopold mentioned two Lutheran travelling companions he had during the Grand Tour. Although not entirely forbearing of Lutheranism Leopold displayed a rather enlightened level of tolerance towards them:

> And now it is time to tell you something about my two friends from Saxony, Baron von Hopfgarten and Baron von Bose. . . . Here you will find two men who have everything which honest men should have in this world; and, although they are both Lutherans, yet they are Lutherans of a different type and men from whose conversation I have often profited much. When parting, Baron von Bose gave Wolfgang as a remembrance a beautiful book containing spiritual thoughts in verse.\textsuperscript{46}

The book that Wolfgang received from von Bose is lost and its title unknown. It has long been suggested that it was Christian Fürchtegott Gellert’s \textit{Geistliche Oden und

\textsuperscript{44} Letters, 26; \textit{Briefe}, I, 80.
\textsuperscript{45} Letters, 25; \textit{Briefe}, I, 79.
\textsuperscript{46} Letters, 42–43; \textit{Briefe}, I, 140.
Admiration for Gellert’s literary work was perhaps wholly unusual for someone of Leopold’s religious persuasion, because he would have been aware of the former’s place as the most prominent German Protestant poet at the time. Although still religious in style and subject manner, Gellert’s poetic works were devoid of any Christian Baroque or ‘overheated pietistic fervour’. This may well be what made Gellert appealing to the elder Mozart. The common view of Leopold’s Catholicism is certainly based on his final, unbending years when he was preaching to his son from afar. His earlier years appear to have been more open and receptive to alternative – even Lutheran – influences. Wolfgang was well aware of his father’s attachment to Gellert. This is one of the finest examples of the cultural and generational chasm between the two Mozarts.

In relation to Jews, Leopold was much the same, in that his curiosity as to their exotic activities and rituals was enough to quash his underlying prejudices against them. With his experience almost entirely limited to the Jew-free streets of Salzburg, Leopold was bewildered when he met some Jewish intellectuals during the Grand Tour. Having been starved of any contact with – and presumably information about – Jews in his hometown, he was astounded that they did not fit his preconceived image: ‘nothing about them resembles a Jew’ he lamented. Jokingly he then described to Hagenauer in Salzburg a cosmopolitan gathering in London where the only religion missing was the Jewish one. This implies that Leopold’s outlook – whilst still

---

49 A case of great confusion in Mozart scholarship is the authenticity and authorship of a group of fifteen Lieder by Gellert that had been set to music. Originally published at the beginning of the nineteenth century by Löschenkohl in Vienna, they were attributed to Wolfgang. Inscribed on the publication was a tribute to the late composer declaring that these were works ‘in which already the great talent of this youth shined [sic] through’. In the 1970s the Mozart compiler and scholar Wolfgang Plath stated that the songs were actually the work of Leopold. See Mozart-Jahrbuch (Salzburg: Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum, 1951-1970/71). Berke refuted this at the beginning of the twenty-first century, however, suggesting that Wolfgang might indeed have composed some of the songs. (See NMA, 2000). These disparate and fairly unconvincing theories make the examination of Gellert’s Lieder all the more difficult. Any brief survey of the Lieder that were set indicate that the composer had a particular religious patron, dedicatee, or audience in mind. Many of the Lieder begin with lines such as: ‘God is my strength’, ‘Praise the Eternal One of the Skies’, or ‘God, your eternity is so far reaching’. For more on Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s setting of Lieder, see Chapter 1 of this dissertation.
50 The importance of this letter to Hagenauer is now even greater thanks to some recent research. In his 2008 publication The Mozart Cache: The Discovery and Examination of a Previously Unknown Collection of Mozartiana, historian Daniel N. Leeson discusses Hagenauer’s religious curiosity courtesy of a Protestant Bible with his initials printed on the front. While Leeson reiterates Hagenauer’s Catholic faith, he suggests that Hagenauer – and many other educated eighteenth century citizens of Salzburg, including Leopold Mozart – were remarkably tolerant and proud of their German
relatively narrow – had begun to adopt a more liberal and tolerant quality not synonymous with that of his homeland.

Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s respective attitudes towards the Jewish community reflected the generational difference between them. The greatest indication of this was during Wolfgang’s time in Vienna during the 1780s, as the following section will illustrate.

* * *

Leopold never possessed more than a moderate level of curiosity towards the Jews. In many ways he was symptomatic of the Enlightenment spirit of inquiry. His toleration and observance of Jewish customs never developed beyond the basic level of understanding. After the liberal and somewhat radical days of his youth, Leopold became increasingly reluctant to embrace new ideas or practices. On the other hand, Wolfgang placed himself in one of the epicentres of Aufklärung sensibilities. By moving to Vienna and leaving his father behind in Salzburg, Wolfgang was distancing himself from much more than just Leopold’s parental guidance.

Before too much is presumed, however, it must be stated that Wolfgang was not a public or vocal campaigner for Jewish emancipation like Lessing or Joseph II. Having said that, it must be assumed that he held no general or inherent dislike for Jews. Among his circle of Viennese friends were both Jews and, more commonly, converted Jews. Why, then, did Wolfgang establish a connection with Jewish families in Vienna, and to what extent was he aware of the tolerance reforms being implemented by Joseph II?

As stated at the opening of this chapter, Wolfgang’s letter of 9 January 1782 mentions the impending visit of Pope Pius VI to Vienna with the intention of persuading the Emperor to curb his sweeping reforms. In a following letter Wolfgang tells his father of the Pope’s arrival and that he thought it a ‘pleasant piece of news’.51 Being Catholic, Wolfgang’s delight that the Pope was visiting his new home city is not surprising. What is unsure, however, is whether he was also pleased about the

heritage. This meant admiration for Luther’s achievements as a reformer, even if, by their Catholic standards, he was a heretic. Leeson, The Mozart Cache: The Discovery and Examination of a Previously Unknown Collection of Mozartiana (Bloomington, AuthorHouse, 2008) 81–82.

51 Letters, 798; Briefe, III, 199.
pontiff’s proposed suppression of the Josephinian reforms. Neither Mozart mentioned anything more on the matter.

During the ensuing years Wolfgang became close to a number of individuals who were connected with Judaism. Firstly and most famously was his association with Lorenzo da Ponte (1749–1838). Although the pair would collaborate to create Le nozze di Figaro, Don Giovanni, Così fan tutte and a handful of small and unfinished works, their initial contact seemed awkward and unsure, at least from Wolfgang’s perspective:

Our poet here is now a certain Abbate da Ponte. He has an enormous amount to do in revising pieces for the theatre and he has to write per obbligo an entirely new libretto for Salieri, which will take him two months. He has promised after that to write a new libretto for me. But who knows whether he will be able to keep his word – or will want to? For, as you are aware, these Italian gentlemen are very civil to your face. Enough, we know them! If he is in league with Salieri, I shall never get anything out of him.  

Da Ponte had converted to Catholicism at an early age and was, therefore, allowed to work in the Habsburg domains as a poet. He sneakily evaded mentioning his Jewish heritage in the memoirs he wrote over a number of years in the 1820s. He simply wrote of how he came under the guidance of the Catholic Church and the origins of his new name. His success, it should be stressed, would not have been possible if, in order to marry a Christian girl, his father had not arranged for his whole family to be converted.

Sonnenfels was another who benefited as a result of his childhood conversion. This can be shown by the fact that he was a more successful public servant under the perennially anti-Semite Maria Theresa than under the progressive Joseph II. Sonnenfels’ loyalty to the Empress was seemingly based on her need for a wide range of intellectuals. Her disdain for Jews was often brushed aside in favour of subjects who could adequately advise her on political and state matters. In describing the different role Sonnenfels played under each ruler, Robert A. Kann saw it as a matter of philosophical comparability:
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52 Letters, 848; Briefe, III, 268.
53 See Da Ponte, Memoirs, 33.
In particular, Joseph II, probably because he was much closer to Sonnenfels’ ideas, was far less in need of an enlightened monitor and far more sensitive to the man’s frequently criticised faults, his disagreeable loquaciousness, irritability, tactlessness, and vanity. The qualities in the reformer which in the empress’ eyes largely made up for these faults, his indisputably sincere zeal and originality, did not count much with a ruler who himself was amply endowed with these traits.  

Hence, during the decade that Wolfgang was a resident of Vienna, Sonnenfels’ status had sunk somewhat and he was no longer considered the integral and imperative intellectual figure he had been under Maria Theresa. His name was nonetheless still held in high esteem around Viennese circles and Wolfgang interacted with him regularly. As well as owning the writings of Sonnenfels, Wolfgang welcomed him as a frequent subscriber to his concert series and spoke of him highly in letters to his father. His Jewish ancestry was known – he was often referred to as ‘the Nikolsburg Jew’ – yet that did not deter Wolfgang seeking him as a friend and someone who could help him rise in Viennese society.

Wolfgang did not hesitate either in socialising with the few publicly – and legally – accepted Jews of Vienna. Among the many houses in which Wolfgang resided, none is more important than the fourth-floor apartment he moved into in August 1781. His eleven-month stay at No. 1175 Auf dem Graben was organised by the Weber family, who were friendly with the Arnstein family. Adam Isaac Arnstein (1721–1785), the imperial court’s supplier of food, owned the building and would have had the final word on Wolfgang’s residency there. Arnstein was the most famous Jew in Vienna because of the highly liberal allowances he was granted. Unlike most Jews who were sanctioned under civil laws, his important position permitted him, and his family, to be on virtually equal footing with their Catholic neighbours. The fact that Wolfgang lived in Arnstein’s building is highly significant. He described the apartment, where he would have completed most of Die Entführung, as a ‘very prettily furnished room in the Graben’ that did not look onto the street so

54 Kann, A Study in Austrian Intellectual History, 159–60.
55 In a letter written to his father on 22 December 1781 Wolfgang tried to impress by listing some of the highly regarded figures of the imperial court that he had come to know. Probably as an indication of Sonnenfels’ declining status, Wolfgang mentioned him when talking of the ‘old and new aristocracy’. Apparently recently arrived citizens, such as Wolfgang, knew of the decaying eminence of ‘Herr von Sonnenfels’ as well. Letters, 789; Briefe, III, 187–188.
56 See Letters, 736; Briefe, III, 121.
57 Kann, A Study in Austrian Intellectual History, 161.
he could, therefore, concentrate on composing.\textsuperscript{58} Wolfgang subsequently became good friends with the Arnsteins, and they also became subscribers to his concerts. In explaining Wolfgang’s relations with the Arnsteins, biographer Braunbehrens wrote that:

Mozart was free of social prejudices and, without being aware of it, was perhaps more fascinated by outsiders – who had heightened social awareness and a seismographic feel for the small tremors that precede great earthquakes – than by his conventional contemporaries who sought only pleasant entertainment from art and avoided anything unusual. Despite his dependence on the court and influential aristocratic circles for commissions, and his great natural self-confidence in these circles, Mozart refused to let himself be influenced or led astray in his opinions and interests.\textsuperscript{59}

Wolfgang was not totally oblivious to the social implications of religious intolerance, however. In a letter while in Paris with his mother in 1778, he explained to his father how he did not want to live in Salzburg but reside and succeed somewhere else. The position of Kapellmeister at the court ultimately became vacant: ‘I know only too well that all these gentlemen are longing for a Kapellmeister as eagerly and hopefully as the Jews are awaiting their Messiah’.\textsuperscript{60}

In September 1782 an enormous scandal broke in Vienna. It involved the Jew Eleonore Eskeles (1752–1812) and one of Wolfgang’s closest friends, Johann Valentin Günther (1746–?). Günther, who was Privy Councillor to Joseph II, and his mistress Eskeles were accused of leaking highly secret information to the Prussians. As a result, Günther was demoted to a ‘lower profile’ position – a functionary in the War Office at Hermannstadt in Siebenbürgen. Joseph exiled Eskeles too. Leopold II exonerated her from all charges in 1792 and she returned to Vienna at the beginning of the new century.\textsuperscript{61} Wolfgang’s account of the famous affair was included in his letter to Leopold on 11 September 1782:

The Jewess Eskeles has no doubt proved a very good and useful tool for breaking up the friendship between the Emperor and the Russian court, for the day before yesterday she was taken to Berlin in order that the King might have the pleasure of her company. She is indeed a sow of the first order. Moreover, she was the whole cause of Günther’s misfortune, if indeed it

\textsuperscript{58} Letters, 762; Briefe, III, 153.
\textsuperscript{60} Letters, 595; Briefe, II, 439.
\textsuperscript{61} Einstein, Mozart: His Character, His Work, 102–03.
be a misfortune to be imprisoned for two months in a beautiful room (with permission to have all his books, his pianoforte and so forth) and to lose his former post, but to be appointed to another at a salary of 1200 gulden; for yesterday he left for Hermannstadt. Yet an experience of that kind always injures an honest man and nothing in the world can compensate him for it. I just want you to realise that he has not committed a great crime. His conduct was due entirely to étourderie, or thoughtlessness, and consequently lack of discretion, which in a Privy Councillor is certainly a serious fault. Although he never divulged anything of importance, yet his enemies, chief of whom is the former Stadtholder, the Count von Herberstein, managed to play their cards so cleverly that the Emperor who formerly had such immense confidence in Günther that he would walk up and down the room arm in arm with him for hours, now began to distrust him with an equal intensity. To make matters worse, who should appear on the scene but that sow Eskeles (a former mistress of Günther’s), who accused him in the most violent terms. But when the matter was investigated, these gentlemen cut a very poor figure. However, the affair has already cause terrific commotion; and great people never like to admit that they have been in the wrong. Hence the fate of poor Günther, whom I pity from my heart, as he was a very good friend of mine and, if things had remained as they were, might have rendered me good service with the Emperor. You can imagine what a shock and how unexpected it was to me and how very much upset I was; for Stephanie, Adamberger and I had supper with him one evening and on the morrow he was arrested.62

Wolfgang’s anger is twofold. First, he appears disappointed that Günther’s relocation may have cost him the chance to enter Joseph II’s inner sanctum and therefore gain a wealth of patronage. Second, and more pertinent to this subject, Wolfgang is disappointed in losing a friend so early in his Viennese residency. He saw Eskeles as the root of all these problems. His sentiments expressed in this letter were provoked by her actions rather than her religion. Her suspicious and disreputable character was the reason for Wolfgang’s written criticism.

The most intriguing friendship that Wolfgang had with a Jewish resident of Vienna was with Baron Raimund Wetzlar von Plankenstern (1752–1810). Wolfgang was friendly with his father, Karl Abraham (1716–1799) as well, for they regularly attended his concerts. The former was briefly a landlord to Wolfgang and Constanze and a confidant throughout their marriage. Referred to by the composer as a ‘rich Jew’, Wetzlar became godfather to the Mozarts’ first child in 1783.63 This greatly irritated Leopold. Not only was Leopold relegated to the middle position in the

63 Incidentally, Wolfgang had previously referred to the elder Wetzlar as ‘the rich converted Jew’. See Letters, 780; Briefe, III, 176.
naming of Raimund Leopold (b/d. 1783), but Wolfgang and Constanze also decided
the first name should be in honour of their landlord, a well-known Jew. Wolfgang had
originally asked his father to be the godfather, and described how they would call the
child either ‘Leopold’ or ‘Leopoldine’ depending on the sex.64 However Leopold’s
absence at the baptism and the continued strain in their distant relationship caused a
reversal of promises from Wolfgang’s end. The letter to his father on 18 June 1783
describes the confusion:

Now for the godfather question. Let me tell you what has happened. After my wife’s safe
delivery, I immediately sent a message to Baron Wetzlar, who is a good and true friend of
mine. He came to see us at once and offered to stand godfather. I could not refuse him and
thought to myself: ‘After all, my boy can still be called Leopold’. But while I was turning this
round in my mind, the Baron said very cheerfully: ‘Ah, now you have a little Raimund’ – and
kissed the child. What was I to do? Well, I have had the child christened Raimund Leopold. I
must frankly confess that if you had not sent me in a letter your opinion on the matter, I
should have been very much embarrassed, and I am not at all sure that I should not have
refused his offer! But your letter has comforted me with the assurance that you will not
disapprove of my action! After all, Leopold is one of his names.65

Despite the reassurances to his son, the godfather scenario must have disappointed
Leopold enormously.66 It was one of the most decisive actions that Wolfgang took in
distancing himself from his father. Replacing his father with a Jew brings to mind
once more the subject of Nathan der Weise. Wolfgang’s relocation to Vienna and his
tolerance of other religions – or at least not fear them – contributed to the many
apparent differences between him and Leopold:

SALADIN: A man like you remains not where his birth
By accident has cast him.67

---
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66 As a sign of how much the Mozart children knew it meant for Leopold to have his grandchildren
named after him, Nannerl baptised her first-born Leopold Alois Pantaleon Berchtold zu Sonnenberg in
1785. Leopold was also the godfather. His gratification was evident as he referred to him as ‘little
Leopold’ or ‘Leopoldl’. For more on Leopold and his grandson ‘Leopoldl’, see Chapter 6.
67 DWL I, 303.
In Josephinian Vienna, Wolfgang discovered a city in the process of enormous social reforms. The imperial capital subsequently became the city that evoked the liberalism prominently featured in Die Entführung aus dem Serail.

Die Entführung aus dem Serail (The Abduction from the Seraglio, 1782), Wolfgang’s most successful stage work during his lifetime,68 was written to please the Viennese audience of the 1780s. Abraham a Sancta Clara’s notion of the Turk as a ‘discontented pile of carrion’ and ‘tyrannical monster’ still held true to some degree in the Viennese consciousness. As Wolfgang described to his father in his letter dated 26 September 1781, the music was styled on Turkish fashion and sounds with the intention of ridiculing their style and pleasing the listeners:

Osmin’s rage is rendered comical by the use of the Turkish music . . . The Janissary chorus is, as such, all that can be desired, that is, short, lively and written to please the Viennese.69

The adaptation of Turkish music or subjects based on Turkish themes was not isolated to Entführung. Fully aware of the public’s fascination with the Turkish musical style, Wolfgang used it in many of his other compositions. Most commonly recognised through the use of drums, cymbals and triangles, the alla turca style was also identified by means of brash and abrupt musical entrances or passages, according to how composers imagined it to be. Although Entführung is the grand culmination of Wolfgang’s embrace, the ‘Turkish mode, or mood, persists’ through his entire body of work.70

A Freemason friend of both Wolfgang and his Die Zauberflöte collaborator Schikaneder, was Angelo Soliman (1721–1796). Soliman lived in Vienna during the ‘tolerance’ reforms of the 1780s. Although he is not mentioned in Wolfgang’s correspondence, his and Soliman’s names regularly appeared together in Masonic documents and Lodge minutes, suggesting they had a close connection.71 Soliman was an African immigrant who was a prominent tutor to the Viennese aristocracy: he
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68 See Peter Branscombe’s table in The Mozart Compendium, 370.
69 Letters, 769; Briefe, III, 162–163.
70 Benjamin Perl, ‘Mozart in Turkey’ in Cambridge Opera Journal, Vol. 12, No. 3 (November, 2000) 219–235. Most famous of Wolfgang’s compositions that adopt this style include the final movement of Piano Sonata in A major, K. 331 (so called ‘rondo alla turca’), and the Violin Concerto in A major, K. 219 (so called ‘Turkish concerto’). Perl suggests that as late as Die Zauberflöte in 1791 Wolfgang used the style to write Monostatos’ aria ‘Alles fühlt der Liebe Freuden’. Also, Don Giovanni’s hurried aria ‘Fin ch’han dal vino’ from 1787 alludes to the style and, according to Perl, is more Turkish in sound than anything he wrote.
was originally ‘owned’ by Prince Johann Georg Lobkowitz (1686–1753), and then, following the latter’s death in 1753, Soliman was bequeathed to Prince Joseph Wenzel Liechtenstein (1696–1772). Following his dismissal from the service of Liechtenstein, Soliman settled permanently in Vienna in the early 1780s and became heavily involved in its intellectual and Masonic life.

Wolfgang and Schikaneder’s portrayal of the Moor Monostatos in *Die Zauberflöte*, is, thus, paradoxical. They confronted the notion of racial minorities whilst simultaneously portraying Monostatos in a prejudicial light. Hence, when Papageno is confronted by Monostatos in Act I, he asks:

PAPGENO: Am I not a fool, to let myself be terrified?

There certainly are black birds in the world, so why not black people?\(^72\)

Despite this allusion to racial prejudice, Monostatos is provided with no further positive, just, or heroic moments during the *Singspiel*. Had Wolfgang and Schikaneder intended Papageno’s rhetoric to be aimed directly at Soliman, it was a brief and fleeting instance. Monostatos’ inclusion in the *Singspiel* was primarily to appease the Viennese who continued to harbour animosity towards their eastern neighbours. The Viennese’s racial aversion to Turks continued well after the eighteenth century, and was reputed to have extended to Soliman following his death in 1796,\(^73\) although these reported acts of barbarity have since been refuted by academic research.\(^74\)

When Joseph II’s military sided with Russia during the Russo-Turkish War (1787-1792), the Habsburg citizenry’s hostility towards the Turks was again intensified. It also damaged the Emperor’s own reputation as serfs, artisans and peasants’ frustrations rose following enormous taxation. The war with Turkey was seen as Joseph’s final attempt to rally his citizens for his Enlightened utopia, but in

\(^72\) *NMA*, IX, 153.

\(^73\) ‘At the Emperor’s wish, and despite vigorous protest from his family, who had been defrauded of the body and whose case was supported by a strong letter from the Archbishop of Vienna, Soliman was skinned and stuffed by the sculptor Franz Thaler, then incorporated into the imperial collection as a human specimen. There, in the company of a capybara and various waterfowl, he was exposed to the frivolous curiosity of the public. During the bombardment of Vienna in 1848, this shameful reminder of dynastic tastelessness went up in flames’. Quoted in Braunbeherens, *Mozart in Vienna*, 87.

fact it left his reign it ruins and gave his younger brother Leopold the task of
disestablishing many of his reforms upon his own accession to the throne in 1790.\textsuperscript{75}

Considering the decrease in Joseph’s popularity towards the end of the 1780s,
a \textit{Lied} Wolfgang set for keyboard and voice in 1788 is rather perplexing. \textit{Beim Auszug in das Feld (When troops are leaving for the front)} was written by an unknown author
and patriotically defends Joseph against the avalanche of religious and political
criticisms. Although there is no evidence to suggest Wolfgang, in fact, wrote the text
he must have seen something in the words that prompted him to set it to music. The
\textit{Lied} promoted strongly Joseph’s tolerance reforms and the notion that he embraced
people of all nations:

True to the Emperor’s lofty degree,
Joseph called to his armies;
they wing their way there
thirsting for victory and glory.

Everyone is happy to fall in with a father
who loves his children and takes care
that no hardship
or even danger should upset them.

Wherever they appeared they found
plenty of food and drink;
and are not heroic efforts rewarded
often just by thanks and goodwill?

Yet more than all this
men’s hearts are hardened for battle
by the consoling thought that in the field
God himself goes with them.

We shall be joined by every brother
who prizes justice and humanity,
for it is to enhance their fortunes
that we sharpen our swords!

\textsuperscript{75} Ernst Wangermann ‘Joseph II and the Retreat from Enlightenment’ in \textit{Enlightened Despotism}, 115–120.
Human beings everywhere
are the creatures of God.
Heathen, Turk, Jew, and Christian
are all his children.

He causes rain to fall
for Jew, Turk, and heathen;
For Christians rich and fertile fields
are made by clothing bare earth.

So, brave warriors, fight with courage
for your crowns of glory!
God himself will reward your heroic blood
before his throne!

Like God on earth
Joseph is tolerant to Turks and Jews
shielding all from hurt and
seeking peace for all nations. 76

Although Beim Auszug in das Feld managed to convey an enlightened message of
tolerance and humanity’s perpetual brotherhood, it also, rather contradictorily,
supported the necessity of war, suggesting that a holy war would always be granted
God’s approval. In Nathan der Weise, in contrast, Lessing was of the firm belief that
human warfare was not the answer to prejudice and religious intolerance:

RECHA: “His God!” whose God? To whom can God belong,
And how can God belong to any man,
Or need a human arm to fight his battles? 77

Furthermore, one of Wolfgang’s last works, a little German cantata, Die ihr des
unermesslichen Weltalls Schöpfer ehrt (You who honour the Creator of the
measureless Universe), possessed a considerable touch of Josephinian religious
liberalism. With the opening lines ‘You who revere the Creator of the boundless
universe, call him Jehova or God, call him Fu, or Brahma’, it implied a level of

76 CME, XXIII, 302–04; NMA, X, 952–953. See also Leeson, ‘Mozart, the Jews, and Late 18th Century
Austria’, 155–167.
77 DWL, I, 292.
enlightened equality amongst various faiths rather than that usually associated with a Catholic state.\(^7^8\)

In conclusion, the social progress during Wolfgang’s formative years was far more influential than that made throughout Leopold’s time. Although this dissertation has proved up to this point that Leopold was more inclined to embrace the pursuits of the \textit{Aufklärung} than his son, the issue of tolerance had a more long-term effect on Wolfgang because he witnessed the way it changed the foundations of social conventions. More so than any other pursuit of the \textit{Aufklärer}, the abolition of social prejudice was seen by certain representatives of the eighteenth century as the stepping-stone by which all other aims could be sought.

In a letter from 1784, Moses Mendelssohn outlined the necessity for human tolerance. ‘As long as [the desire to establish] a systematic union of faiths is lurking hidden in the background,’ he wrote, ‘this tolerance is a sham that seems to me more dangerous than open persecution’.\(^7^9\) Conversion to opposing religions according to Mendelssohn, such as that made by his southern counterpart Sonnenfels, would only incite greater prejudice and defeat the purpose of the \textit{Aufklärung}. Rather than combining faiths, it would simply make for a better state if these denominations were accepted. Johann Pezzl suggests this in his notes on Josephinian Vienna:

\begin{quote}
one can be a good citizen of the state without adhering to the one or the other rite; that it is wrong to try to impose ideas on someone who cannot be convinced about their correctness; that the state itself is guilty of an unpardonable transgression if it persecutes peaceful, hardworking and decent subjects, excludes them from society or indeed expels them simply because of differences in their religious opinions and customs.\(^8^0\)
\end{quote}

Joseph II’s \textit{Toleranzpatent} of 1782, which emancipated the Habsburg Jews in many ways, did not grant the Jews as many liberties as one would immediately have expected. It must be considered that the Emperor was attempting to create the union of many cultures and religions, however in doing so he was moving towards the problem of which Mendelssohn had forewarned. For example, the insistence that Jewish children be taught at Christian schools, and that German replace Hebrew and

\begin{footnotes}
\item[78] CME, XXII, 278; NMA, III, 1151.
\item[79] Mendelssohn, \textit{Jerusalem}, 147.
\item[80] H. C. Robbins Landon \textit{Mozart and Vienna}, 130.
\end{footnotes}
Yiddish languages were problems that arose from the Edict. As a result, Joseph II was seen as an Enlightened ruler, but a rather flawed one. For many of the *Aufklärer*, religious tolerance was considered a principle that would benefit mankind rather than the state. The historian Charles H. O’Brien wrote:

Steeped in pagan literature, classic and modern, and inspired by Masonic ideals of brotherhood, Alxinger, Pezzl, Watteroth, and other secular humanists tried to inculcate in the people a tolerance synonymous with religious indifference. Not only did they condemn religious discrimination among citizens and deprecate the idea of a state church, but they also argued that dissent from the doctrines and practices of the Catholic church is harmless so long as the dissenters adhere to the rules of natural morality.

As we have seen, Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart both commented on the prejudiced attitudes of the age. The reason behind their respective thoughts, however, was due to their different social surroundings. The Habsburg domains under Maria Theresa and then Joseph II transformed the ideologies and attitudes that had existed for centuries. Both Mozarts had unique and individual ideas when it came to the acceptance of foreigners. The reality the *Aufklärer* sought from society was ultimately the ideal Wolfgang sought from his father: to be free. Wolfgang set a song in 1786 to the text from his friend, the poet Johannes Aloys Blumauer (1755–1798), that aptly describes the suffering man endured when freedom was disallowed:

The man who, like a slave, cringes
Under a girl’s thumb
And, spellbound by love,
Lies in vile fetters:
Alas for him! he is a poor wretch,
He has no knowledge of golden liberty.

---

81 *Documents*, 152–53.
82 Johann Baptst von Alxinger (1755–1797) was a contemporary and friend of Wolfgang. He was one of the leading poets of the Viennese *Aufklärung*. His poem *Lied eines alten Juden* from 1784 is in the mould of Lessing’s *Nathan der Weise*. It differs, however, in that Alxinger has his old Jew vent his anger against the injustices of the Christian doctrine. See Erwin Frank Ritter, *Johann Baptist von Alxinger and the Austrian Enlightenment* (Berne: Herbert Lang & Co. Ltd., 1970) 124.
83 Heinrich Joseph Watteroth (1756–1819) was professor of political science at the University of Vienna.
The man who, with bitter toil, strives
For rank and the favour of princes
And, in harness all his life,
Pulls the plow of the state:
Alas for him! he is a poor wretch,
He has no knowledge of golden liberty.

The man who, for the sake of gleaming metal,
Serves evil Mammon
And thinks of only increasing
The number of his full moneybags:
Alas for him! he is a poor wretch,
He has no knowledge of golden liberty.

But the man who readily does without all
That the fool yearns for
And, happy at his own hearth,
Lives only for himself, not for others,
It is he alone who can say:
Good for me, I am a free man.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{85}NMA, X, 924–925.

In considering Wolfgang’s life in Vienna from 1781 to 1791, his incredible output of music is, understandably, usually central to the discussion. Any outpouring of genius that produces the likes of Figaro, Don Giovanni, Così, the mature piano concerti, and the Requiem, is naturally the focal point of most musicological studies. This chapter though, as part of a study of the relationship between father and son, will attempt to steer clear of the musical discussion and focus on Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s interactions during this period. For Leopold and Wolfgang, the decade in which the latter resided in Vienna was a trying period not only for them collectively but individually as well. The present chapter, therefore, will follow their relationship’s progress from their initial break in 1781 to Leopold’s death in 1787.

In doing so, this chapter will avoid some well-trodden paths of Mozart scholarship. Although it exists as an integral component in Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s respective lives, their involvement in Freemasonry, for example, will be discussed and examined in minimal detail. While the importance of this subject will be acknowledged, the sheer magnitude implicit in covering such a topic prevents any just or judicious discussion being presented within this dissertation. Instead, this chapter will be used to examine in some detail the other areas of the Mozarts’ interests and actions during this period that do not usually attract as much attention. Four particular areas will be covered in Chapter 6.

---

Wolfgang’s relationship and eventual marriage to Constanze Weber will form the first area of discussion in this chapter. The relevance of this union in the Mozart story is explained by the effect it had upon Leopold. The senior Mozart’s hesitancy in allowing his son to marry was as much to do with his attitude to women as it was to Constanze in particular. One of the more profound effects of the Aufklärung and the Enlightenment as a whole was the push for the liberation of women and attitudes with them. The differing perspectives of Wolfgang and Leopold in relation to women was but one issue that illuminated the generation gap in attitudes.

The second area to be discussed will be Wolfgang’s increasing desire for a clear German identity to be formed. Consequently, his growing intolerance of foreign influence will also be examined. Although German nationalism, as we now know it, did not fully develop until the nineteenth century, it had its primitive beginnings during the 1770s with the writings of the Sturm und Drang. Like the Stürmer und Dränger, Wolfgang first identified the lack of any national identity during the 1770s. However, it was not until his time in Vienna during the following decade that the idea took firm root in his mind. Surrounded by a concoction of foreign styles and manners, the Imperial capital proved to Wolfgang that a series of German institutions and laws were needed. Many of these desires were answered by the Enlightened monarch, Joseph II, who had similar notions of forming stronger and relatively unambiguous German institutions. Joseph II’s arbitrary and selective reforms, however, left any comprehensive system of cultural revolution wanting. As will be demonstrated in this chapter, Wolfgang’s frustration at these spiritless measures rekindled the brief revolutionary fire he had felt during his days in Paris in the late 1770s. Whilst not personally connected to any of the contributors to the Sturm und Drang, Wolfgang’s nationally minded tendencies during his Viennese period substantiate his affiliation with that generation.

The common procedure for Mozart biography when covering the Viennese years is to focus solely on Wolfgang’s movements. This, as Chapter 6 will attempt to illuminate, subsequently neglects Leopold’s situation back in Salzburg. Leopold’s final years were not spent in the solitary tranquillity perhaps expected of an elderly widower. Rather, the senior Mozart was concocting an elaborate scheme to begin the career of another Mozart Wunderkind, with Wolfgang’s nephew, the son of Nannerl. By scrutinising Leopold’s dealings with his grandson, this chapter will try to
corroborate Leopold Mozart’s notion of himself as a teacher. The lifelong desire to become a Man of Letters was his chief motivating force until his death.  

Leopold’s death in 1787 is the final and concluding area of examination in Chapter 6. In this chapter, therefore, Wolfgang’s varying attitudes towards death are explored. First appearing after the death of his mother in Paris in 1778, Wolfgang’s matured response to his father’s impending death a decade later not only reflects the attitudes of the Aufklärer, but a son who had found solace in the void left by his father. During this stage of the dissertation and in direct relation to Wolfgang’s reaction to his father’s death, the notion of suicide will be studied. Recollecting Wolfgang’s actions in the wake of his mother’s demise in Paris and relating them to the theories and notions of the Sturm und Drang, a case for Wolfgang’s vulnerable and suicidal state can be made. His discussions with his father on the nature of life and death are an important airing of many of the theories circulating towards the end of the eighteenth century.

The last years of the Mozarts’ relationship before Leopold’s death facilitate a fascinating exegesis of father–son relations. Whilst their relationship had become relatively discordant and their correspondence irregular leading up to Leopold’s death, he and Wolfgang continued to show flashes of unity and agreement on many issues. When related directly to the constantly evolving world in which they lived, their unique situation can be more adequately explained. Chapter 6 of this dissertation, therefore, will elucidate the complexities of the Mozarts’ relationship while simultaneously reinforcing their perspectives on the Aufklärung.

* * *

If the events surrounding Wolfgang’s unfortunate and unrewarding journey to Paris had precipitated the initial rift between father and son, then the arrival of Constanze Weber in their lives effected the final separation. In the letters between Leopold and his son prior to 1782, there remained the hope that Wolfgang would return to Salzburg and complete his father’s pedagogical and musical dream. Leopold quickly realised, however, that his son’s apparent infatuation with Constanze was genuine and that he would soon be replaced as the chief object of his son’s affection.

---

2 See Chapter 1 for detailed discussion of Leopold’s desire to become a Man of Letters.
Although most of Leopold’s letters to his son during this period are lost, his sentiments can be reconstructed from his son’s replies.

Leopold’s initial disapproval, which was caused by his son’s hastiness in marrying, led Wolfgang to reassure his father of his obedience to him. However, the fact that Wolfgang chose Constanze over Leopold is proof that he had ultimately moved away from his father’s control. The whole affair is reminiscent of two similar yet separate scenarios. The first is the scene from Johann Anton Leisewitz’s play, *Julius von Tarent (Julius of Tarento)*, 1776, which Wolfgang supposedly saw performed in Salzburg.3 Torn between paternal, patriotic, and intimately personal love, Julius eventually chooses the affection of Blanca. Looking back to when he had seen the play performed in 1779, Wolfgang must have realised the strong similarities to his own complicated relationships:

**JULIUS:** To abandon forever . . . forever! If only I had known that this feeling would be so strong! But I had thought only of my union with Blanca, not of separation from father and fatherland. To abandon a father on the brink of death! How he will suffer until he learns my fate! Yet when he learns it, will he be happier, exchanging uncertain anguish for certain grief? Never again to see you, Tarento! . . . Never again shall I hear my father say, ‘God bless you, my children’. Some of these bonds I possessed even before I first entered the world; now I tear myself from them all for the sake of a woman! For the sake of a mortal woman! No, not for a mortal woman, for you, Blanca! You are my fatherland, father, mother, brother, and friend.4

Just like Julius, Wolfgang was leaving Leopold and Salzburg for the opportunity to marry Constanze in Vienna.

The second scenario relates to Leopold’s youth and his affinity with the poet, Johann Christian Günther, which is detailed in Chapter 1 of this dissertation. Günther’s ongoing love affair with Leonore Jachmann caused an inexplicable amount of heartache for his father, who subsequently disowned Günther. This parental strain is evident throughout Günther’s poetry; having lost his own father at a similar age, this helps explain Leopold’s fascination with the poet’s work.5

Leopold had many misgivings about the Weber women, and particularly Constanze. This is in accordance with the general attitude of the later eighteenth

---

century. The emancipation of women had occurred to some extent, particularly in the arts, through, for example, the writings of Wieland’s first love, Sophie LaRoche (1731–1807) and in the sciences through Voltaire’s mistress, Émilie du Châtelet (1706–1749); Herder proposed that women be given equal opportunities in education, however not in politics because they are the ones who ‘think beautifully’. The freedom that women sought was hampered, however, by men’s lingering doubts concerning their genuineness. Women were, from a man’s perspective, still the sources of corruption and temptation. The long process of eradicating these age-old prejudices was not fulfilled in the eighteenth century, and their lingering presence can easily be seen in many of Wolfgang’s most prominent works for the stage. Men’s perpetual frustration over women’s colluding and intrigue was presented to the audience in Le nozze di Figaro with the notion that all women are the same (‘così fan tutte’). Even Die Zauberflöte, supposedly the pinnacle of enlightened liberalism, expressed the theory that women were naturally corruptive:

SPEAKER AND SECOND PRIEST: Be on your guard against the guile of women:
This is the first obligation of the Craft!
Many a wise man has let himself be captivated,
Has erred, and was not aware of it!
At the end he found himself abandoned,
His loyalty repaid with scorn.
In vain he wrung his hands,
Death and despair were his reward.

This is not to suggest that Wolfgang discriminated against women, but rather that the ancient stereotypes towards women continued to permeate late eighteenth century society.
Leopold, in particular, was extremely sceptical when it came to women’s intentions. Once again channelling the words of his moral hero Gellert, Leopold warned his son of the dangers associated with the fairer sex. He wrote to Wolfgang on 5 February 1778:

You are but a young man of twenty-two; so you cannot have that settled gravity which might discourage any young fellow, of whatever rank he may be, an adventurer, jester or deceiver, old or young, from seeking your acquaintance and friendship in order to draw you into his company and then by degrees bend you to his will. One drifts imperceptibly into these traps and then one cannot get out. I shall say nothing about women, for where they are concerned the greatest reserve and prudence are necessary, Nature herself being our enemy.¹¹

Gellert had written in his 1751 *Briefe*, that learning to deal with the lure of women and the temptations that could incite impassioned and unreasoned actions were a dangerous but necessary part of a young man’s development. Gellert’s style was – as is evident in this passage – a guide by which Leopold developed his own tone. Gellert wrote:

You are of that age which is, properly speaking, most likely to decide on the future good or evil of your life. [These years] are the more dangerous, as the fervour of the passions being, during that period, in full force, will not always leave your judgment sufficiently cool to allow you to follow exactly the dictates of wisdom and virtue; and as the liberty you acquire at this time, and which has proved fatal to so many young students, leaves you in many points entirely master of your own actions.¹²

Wolfgang’s description of Constanze to his father towards the end of 1781 would not have done much to quell Leopold’s suspicions towards her. Wolfgang went to great lengths to denounce the members of the Weber household in an attempt to portray Constanze as the white sheep. As honest as his report was, however, it failed

---

to convince Leopold that Constanze was deserving of his son’s affection. Note how Wolfgang first described the unattractive qualities of Constanze’s sisters as if those attributes were somehow synonymous with women. Wolfgang wrote:

A bachelor, in my opinion, is only half alive. Such are my views and I cannot help it. I have thought the manner over and reflected sufficiently, and I shall not change my mind. But who is the object of my love? Do not be horrified again, I entreat you. Surely not one of the Webers? Yes, one of the Webers – but not Josefa, nor Sophie, but Constanze, the middle one. In no other family have I ever come across such differences of character. The eldest is a lazy, gross perfidious woman, and as cunning as a fox. Mme Lange is a false, malicious person and a coquette. The youngest – is still too young to be anything in particular – she is just a good-natured, but feather-headed creature! May God protect her from seduction! But the middle one, my good, dear Constanze, is the martyr of the family and, probably for that very reason, is the kindest-hearted, the cleverest and, in short, the best of them all . . . She is not ugly, but at the same time far from beautiful. Her whole beauty consists in two little black eyes and a pretty figure. She has no wit, but she has common sense to enable her to fulfil her duties as a wife and mother . . . I love her and she loves me with all her heart. Tell me whether I could wish myself a better wife?  

In the ensuing letters to his father, Wolfgang explained the predicament in which his rash decisions had placed him. He claimed that malicious gossip and vilification were circulating through Vienna concerning his relationship with Constanze, most notably from Peter von Winter (1754–1825), the Mannheim–born composer who eventually came to write the music for Schikaneder’s Singspiel, Das Labyrinth, oder Der Kampf mit den Elementen (The Labyrinth, or the Fight of the Elements, 1798) which was the sequel to Die Zauberflöte. ‘You are a fool to get married’, was one of Winter’s comments that infuriated Wolfgang. ‘Keep a mistress. You are earning enough money, you can afford it. What prevents you from doing so? Some damned religious scruple?’ In order to stop such talk, Wolfgang penned a formal guarantee to Constanze. Wolfgang explained to his father:

So I drew up a document to the effect that I bound myself to marry Mlle Constanze Weber within the space of three years and that if it should prove impossible for me to do so owing to

---

13 Letters, 783–784; Briefe, III, 181.
14 Letters, 790; Briefe, III, 188.
my changing of mind, she should be entitled to claim from me three hundred gulden a year.

Nothing could have been easier for me to write. ¹⁵

Owing to the fact that Wolfgang’s financial security in Vienna was precarious, Leopold was furious. For his son to have legally tied himself to a commoner such as Constanze Weber was beyond Leopold’s comprehension. In accord with his practice of only sporadically saving his father’s correspondence, Wolfgang did not preserve Leopold’s replies. It can be assumed that Leopold disapproved of the arrangement for two reasons.

First, Wolfgang’s constant reassurance of Constanze’s honesty and integrity presents the likelihood that Leopold doubted her suitability. Second and most striking was Leopold’s delayed consent to the marriage. As necessary as Wolfgang regarded his father’s permission to wed, he had clearly committed himself to marrying Constanze and no amount of fatherly discouragement would sway him. ‘All that you have written and may possibly write to me on the subject’, he told his father,

     can only be well-meaning advice which, however fine and good it may be, is no longer applicable to a man who has gone so far with a girl. In such a case nothing can be postponed. It is better for him to put his affairs in order and act like an honest fellow! God will ever reward that. I mean to have nothing with which to reproach myself. ¹⁶

As insignificant as it may initially seem, Leopold’s forced consent eventually arrived a few days after the marriage on 4 August 1782. For Wolfgang to have proceeded with the wedding before the arrival of parental approval, would have crushed Leopold’s sense of importance. This level of thanklessness was astutely defined in Lessing’s play Der junge Gelehrte (The Young Scholar, 1748) when the dramatist wrote:

     ANTON: There can be no greater ingratitude under the sun than when a son will not show recognition of the pains his father must have taken to bring him into the world. ¹⁷

Similarly, and more relevant to Leopold and Wolfgang’s situation, was Friedrich Schiller’s play Kabale und Liebe (Intrigue and Love, 1784). Having been written

¹⁵ Letters, 788; Briefe, III, 186.
¹⁶ Letters, 811; Briefe, III, 217.
¹⁷ DWL, II, 43.
almost simultaneously with the Mozarts’ dispute over Constanze, the desperation of the father to prevent his daughter from marrying is poignantly comparable:

MILLER: Listen, Luise . . . I would give you the few dregs of my years if you had never seen the Major.

LUISE (startled): What are you saying? What? . . . No, my good father means something else. You cannot know that Ferdinand is mine, created for me, created for my joy by the Father of those who love.

MILLER (hurries to her, clasps her to his bosom): Luise . . . dear . . . magnificent child . . . take my hoary old head . . . take everything . . . everything . . . but the Major . . . God is my witness . . . I can never give him to you. 18

Having officially established their union, Wolfgang and Constanze tried to convince Leopold of their loyalty to him. Wolfgang, particularly, knew how devout in his Catholic faith his father had become during the last few. He played on these inclinations. In his letter of 17 August 1782, Wolfgang attempted to convey to Leopold that their religious affinity was as strong as ever and that, despite their recent differences, it would continue that way:

I forgot to tell you the other day that on the Day of Portiuncula my wife and I performed our devotions together at the Theatines. Even if a sense of piety had not moved us to do so, we should have had to do it on account of the banns, without which we could not have been married. Indeed for a considerable time before we were married we had always attended Mass and gone to Confession and received Communion together; and I found that I never prayed so fervently or confessed and received Communion so devoutly as by her side; and she felt the same. In short, we are made for each other; and God who orders all things and consequently has ordained this also, will not forsake us. We both thank you most submissively for your fatherly blessing. 19

As mentioned earlier, Leopold’s letters to his son have not survived and, therefore, his attitude to this whole affair can only be surmised from Wolfgang’s responses. The greatest insight, however, comes from Leopold’s letter to Baroness Waldstädten shortly after Wolfgang and Constanze’s wedding. In it, Leopold produced a fascinating survey of his son’s life, mentality and convictions from the viewpoint of a

19 Letters, 814; Briefe, III, 220.
father. It remains an incomparable description of not only the pain Wolfgang had caused him but of where the two Mozart men’s relationship stood in 1782. Leopold wrote:

I thank your Ladyship most warmly for the very special interest you take in my circumstances and for your extraordinary kindness in celebrating my son’s wedding day with such liberality... For having done my duty as a father, having in countless letters made the clearest and most lucid representations to Wolfgang on every point and being convinced that he knows my trying circumstances, which are extremely grievous to a man of my age, and that he is aware of the degradations I am suffering in Salzburg, since he must realize that both morally and materially I am being punished for his conduct, all that I can now do is to leave him to his own resources (as he evidently wishes) and pray God to bestow him His paternal blessing and not withdraw from him His Divine grace. For my part I shall not abandon the cheerfulness which is natural to me and which in spite of my advancing years I still possess; and I shall continue to hope for the best. On the whole, I should feel quite easy in my mind, were it not that I have detected in my son an outstanding fault, which is, that he is far too patient or rather easy-going, too indolent, perhaps even too proud, in short, that he has the sum total of all those traits which render a man inactive; on the other hand, he is too impatient, too hasty and will not bide his time. Two opposing elements rule his nature, I mean, there is either too much or too little, never the golden mean. If he is not actually in want, then he is immediately satisfied and becomes indolent and lazy. If he has to bestir himself, then he realizes his worth and wants to make his fortune at once. Nothing must stand in his way; yet it is unfortunately the most capable people and those who possess outstanding genius who have the greatest obstacles to face... My dear lady, please instill a little patience into my son.

Leopold recognised the independent strand in Wolfgang’s mentality, namely that he wanted to be left to ‘his own resources’. Furthermore, in his categorization of his son’s characteristics Leopold distinguished some of the fundamental differences between his and Wolfgang’s generation. While Leopold could never overcome his own social conditioning, the sentiments belonging to Wolfgang’s generation were pushing him further from Leopold’s control. The golden mean that Leopold mentions was more akin to the philosophies of the moderate Aufklärung – ideas belonging to men such as Lessing and Mendelssohn. Wolfgang, on the other hand, belonged to a generation aligned more with the Sturm und Drang movement, which was more likely to perpetuate radical ideas and notions. Leopold’s admission that his son was either

20 According to Wolfgang’s letter to his father on 7 August 1782, Waldstädten had provided a wedding feast that was ‘more princely than baronial’. Letters, 813; Briefe, III, 219.
21 Letters, 815–816; Briefe, III, 222–223.
one extreme or the other, recalls the philosophy of Johann Georg Hamann, who is regarded as one of the spiritual fathers of the *Sturm und Drang*. In a letter to J. G. Linder dated 20 May 1756, Hamann pleaded with his friend: ‘Do either nothing or everything; the mediocre, the moderate, is repellent to me: I prefer an extreme’.\textsuperscript{22}

Leopold’s two surviving letters to Baroness Waldstädten are extremely important in understanding more lucidly his social and mental condition at the time of their composition. He admitted to her that he had become so disenchanted with many aspects of society and humanity that he had purposely been avoiding large social gatherings, yet sought intimate reciprocated friendships, such as the one he had initiated with her: ‘I feel certain that your Ladyship’s outlook entirely agrees with mine, and that we should chatter away to our hearts’ content’.\textsuperscript{23} It was a trying period for Leopold, for he was coming to grips with the fact that life was passing him by. ‘Your Ladyship has withdrawn herself from social functions’, he noted of his companion, ‘and for several months I too have not appeared at Court and only do so when I am obliged to’.\textsuperscript{24} Leopold, who was now sixty-one years of age, was acknowledging the passing of his generation, and that his declining years were now upon him. ‘I live quietly with my daughter’, he commented, ‘and have a few friends who come to visit me’.\textsuperscript{25} No longer the globetrotting educator, his life was only a shadow of its former self. His final years were spent with the ‘modicum of cheerfulness which I still possess’.\textsuperscript{26}

\* \* \*

The relevance of discussing Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s patriotic tendencies within the context of Josephinian Vienna is that the Emperor was largely responsible for instigating the patriotic fervour that burned so fiercely within the younger Mozart, particularly during the mid-1780s. Joseph II once stated in a letter to his brother, Leopold, that ‘Patriotism, [and] the welfare of the monarchy, these, dear brother, are my only passion, and they would inspire me to do anything’.\textsuperscript{27} Joseph’s theatre

\textsuperscript{23} Letters, 821; Briefe, III, 222.
\textsuperscript{24} Letters, 820; Briefe, III, 222.
\textsuperscript{25} Letters, 820–821; Briefe, III, 222.
\textsuperscript{26} Letters, 821; Briefe, III, 223.
\textsuperscript{27} Documents, 49.
initiatives, namely the German National Theatre and the German National Singspiel, instilled in Wolfgang a strong and passionate dedication to his German homeland. Music theatres, particularly those in Vienna, traditionally employed Italian composers and Joseph’s reforms during the late 1770s and early 1780s attempted to eradicate them. Their monopoly of musical positions in German cities had been a continual irritation for the Emperor and local musicians, including Wolfgang. The rise and fall of Joseph’s plans for a theatre dedicated solely to the promotion of German work and artists created an unprecedented range of patriotic emotions in the young composer. Unlike his father, who could only acknowledge the cultural barrier, Wolfgang spoke proudly of his German identity.

In July 1768, while Leopold and Wolfgang were touring in Vienna, Leopold wrote to Hagenauer in Salzburg and described how the Italian contingent of musicians in the imperial capital was trying to sabotage the Mozarts’ efforts to have one of Wolfgang’s operas performed. Leopold, who had successfully presented his *Wunderkind* to the rest of Europe, could not understand the undermining that was taking place in Vienna:

> All sensible people must with shame agree that it is a disgrace to our nation that we Germans are trying to suppress a German, to whom foreign countries have done justice by their great admiration and even by public acknowledgements in writing. But by patience and perseverance one must convince people that our adversaries are wicked liars, slanderers and envious creatures, who would laugh in their sleeves if we were to get frightened or tired out and, by going off in a huff, give them victory.\(^{28}\)

As has been established throughout the previous chapters of this dissertation, Leopold was more than willing to explore foreign ideologies and customs. His eclectic anthology of foreign writings and objects demonstrates that his patriotism was not a driving force in his decisions. His theory of ‘patience and perseverance’, too, highlights his willingness to endure such cultural imbalances rather than to fight them.

Wolfgang, on the other hand, voiced his concern over German adversity much more clearly and passionately. Buoyed by the writings of the *Sturm und Drang* – a movement that was intrinsically German because of its strong revival of German

\(^{28}\) *Letters*, 90–91; *Briefe*, I, 273.
heroism and history\textsuperscript{29} – Wolfgang’s patriotism was typical of his generation. In his impassioned play \textit{Die Räuber} (\textit{The Robbers}, 1781), Friedrich Schiller highlighted what he believed to be an unjust situation between German and non-German artists:

\begin{quote}
SPIEGELBERG: Oh yes, yes! Everyone must have his due, Italy has had its share of good men, and if Germany goes on as it is going today, and they abolish the Bible completely, as there is every appearance, then Germany may produce something worthwhile too, in time.\textsuperscript{30}
\end{quote}

The evolution of the movement that subsequently became known as \textit{Sturm und Drang} was, therefore, a very necessary one. As alluded to above by Schiller, the German speaking lands lacked originality in their literature and philosophy when compared to other Enlightened centres of Europe, simply because France and Britain had completed ‘the formulation of man’s new interpretation of the world’ much earlier.\textsuperscript{31} The literary movement of the 1770s, however, was the stepping stone that many Germans considered would help bring them level with the Franco-British model:

It was perhaps necessary for German literature, if it was to reach European rank quickly, to have some sort of exotic prop with which to help itself along. A great deal of energy and fury was expanded in the first sixty or seventy years of the eighteenth century over the kind of support desirable, whether the beribboned and betasselled, silver-mounted French ebony cane, or the homely English ash walking-stick.\textsuperscript{32}

Wolfgang, who was an advocate of the need for national institutions and patriotic identities, would have recognised the idiosyncratic voice in the \textit{Sturm und Drang} movement.\textsuperscript{33}

\begin{quote}
Wolfgang, while technically a \textit{Salzburger}, mostly referred to himself as a \textit{German} (‘\textit{daß ich ein Ehrlicher Teutscher bin}’).\textsuperscript{34} In this, too, he was extremely
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{33} See \textit{Letters}, 890–91; \textit{Briefe}, III, 392–394.
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Letters}, 544; \textit{Briefe}, II, 368.
proud and would often defend the musical credibility of his ‘beloved fatherland’, referring to the German lands collectively rather than exclusively to Salzburg. The prospect of a German Comic Opera being established in Vienna in which German works would be given preference was seen as an important landmark towards establishing a greater national identity. Franz von Heufeld (1731–1795), dramatist and director of the National Theatre since 1769, considered Wolfgang as a likely candidate to ascend to the position of theatre composer. Discussing the possibility with Leopold, Heufeld declared that Wolfgang’s previous compositions should be enough to award him the position. In January 1778 he explained to Leopold:

What has happened is that His Majesty the Emperor, to whose hands his mother has entirely entrusted the theatre, intends to start a German Comic Opera . . . They recently had the first rehearsal for the first opera, for which Herr Weidmann has furnished the text and the violist of the theatre orchestra, Herr Umlauf, has composed the music; the performance is to take place soon. All this is for the moment only a trial, to see whether anything is to be done with the Germans in this department. What is certain, however, is that for the present no musical composer will be specially taken on, particularly as Gluck and Salieri are in the Emperor’s service . . . If your son will take the trouble of setting some good German comic opera or other to music, to submit it, to leave his work to the imperial judgement and then to await a decision, he may succeed in being admitted, if the work pleases.

Heufeld then proposed to Leopold that this plan would be more efficient if Wolfgang were actually in Vienna, promoting his own works. In collaboration with Heufeld, Joseph Mesmer, an educational reformer and cousin to the famous magnetist Anton Mesmer, wrote to Leopold shortly after and again proposed that Wolfgang move to Vienna:

Why did you not send your son to Vienna? Or why do you not send him even now? . . . After all, there is always a good opening here for a great talent, even if one does not always succeed at once . . . and when all is said, Vienna is still the best place to live in.

35 Letters, 814; Briefe, III, 220.
36 On 17 February 1778, the librettist Paul Weidmann (1744–1801) and composer Ignaz Umlauf (1746–1796) gave the premiere of their Singspiel, Die Bergknappen (The Miners).
37 MDB, 170.
38 MDB, 172.
When all this was being discussed, Wolfgang was in Paris, having been sent there by his father to seek fame and employment. Deciding to send his son to Paris rather than Vienna may, as Heufeld and Mesmer discussed, have been the wrong decision by the elder Mozart. Wolfgang presumably learnt of this news upon his arrival home and considering his propensity for Germanic commissions, it may have strongly contributed to his falling out with his father shortly after.

Wolfgang had to wait a long time before gaining a paid position in Joseph II’s court. Furthermore, the young composer was finding the Viennese aristocracy’s complacency frustrating. Having his compositions unappreciated, Wolfgang had not ruled out relocating to a foreign country in an attempt to gain favour in a different court. The only factor swaying him otherwise, as he told his father on 17 August 1782, was the love for his homeland:

The Viennese gentry, and in particular the Emperor, must not imagine that I am on this earth solely for the sake of Vienna. There is no monarch in the world whom I should be more glad to serve than the Emperor, but I refuse to beg for any post. I believe that I am capable of doing credit to any court. If Germany, my beloved fatherland, of which, as you know, I am proud, will not accept me, then in God’s name let France or England become the richer by another talented German, to the disgrace of the German nation. You know well that it is the Germans who have excelled in almost all the arts. But where did they make their fortune and their reputation? Certainly not in Germany! Take even the case of Gluck. Has Germany made him the great man he is? Alas no! Countess Thun, Count Zichy, the Baron van Swieten, even Prince Kaunitz, are all very much displeased with the Emperor, because he does not value men of talent more, and allows them to leave his dominions. Kaunitz said the other day to the Archduke Maximilian, when the conversation turned on myself, that ‘such people only come into the world once in a hundred years and must not be driven out of Germany, particularly when we are fortunate enough to have them in the capital’.

Wolfgang’s frustration had generated from his German patrons’ inability, or perhaps unwillingness, to take his art seriously. In an age when musicians were treated less like idols and more like servants, royal or aristocratic patronage was still a valuable

39 In 1787, upon the death of Gluck, Wolfgang was offered the position of Imperial Chamber Composer or Kammerkomponist. While his predecessor had been awarded an annual salary of 2000 gulden, Wolfgang was only granted 800 gulden per year.

40 Letters, 814; Briefe, III, 220–221.
commodity. The German lands’ seemingly inferior support of the arts was a common thread in the mentality of those who resided there. One contemporaneous commentator observed that, unlike Shakespeare in England and Molière in France, ‘we Germans are far less fortunate’ in not having a playwright whose works had been continuously performed and appreciated upon the stage. Almost half a century earlier, Lessing wrote of how the German intellect was generally unappreciated from within and that recognition was best received abroad. In Der junge Gelehrte, Lessing’s estimation of the situation is a striking foretelling of Wolfgang’s own sentiments:

DAMIS: Oh, ye stupid Germans. Yes, truly, it needs another genius to value properly such works as mine. You will ever remain in the darkness of your barbarism, and be a laughing stock to your intelligent neighbours. But I will be revenged on you, and from this time forth will cease to be called a German. I will leave my thankless fatherland. Father, relations and friends are all, all unworthy that I should recognise them any longer, since they are Germans; since they are of the people who casts its greatest spirits with violence from itself! I am sure that France and England will recognise my desert –

ANTON: Herr Damis, Herr Damis, you are beginning to rave. I am not safe with you; I shall have to call someone.

DAMIS: They will feel in good time, those stupid Germans, what they have lost in me! Tomorrow I will make arrangements to leave this unhappy country.

Following the return to dominance of Italian opera in the early 1780s – which had been eclipsed for half a decade by Joseph II’s attempt to establish a greater German presence on the stage – many Germans found it difficult once again to succeed artistically. Wolfgang gave a report on the stagnation in the German arts in Vienna to his friend in Mannheim, Anton Klein (1748–1810), professor of aesthetics and philosophy. Given that Klein himself had been the dramatist of a number of German texts, Wolfgang believed that he could confide in the professor, whom he classified a ‘true German’. He wrote on 21 May 1785:

41 The 1780s lay right on the cusp of a new era in musical patronage. From Wolfgang Mozart to Beethoven, there was an enormous shift in the composer’s reliance on royal or aristocratic patronage. Wolfgang’s move to Vienna should be seen as a giant artistic leap into the unknown.
43 DWL, II, 103.
At the moment I cannot send you any news about the coming German operatic stage, for at present, apart from the building operations at the Kärtnerthor theatre, which has been set apart for this purpose, things are progressing very slowly. They say that it is to be opened early in October. I for my part have no great hopes of its success. To judge by the preparations which have been made up to the present, it looks as if they were trying altogether to ruin German opera, which is probably only suffering a temporary eclipse, rather than to help to put it on its legs again and keep it going. My sister-in-law Madame Lange is the only singer who is to join the German opera. Madame Cavalieri, Adamberger, Mlle Teiber, all Germans of whom Germany may well be proud, have to stay at the Italian opera – and compete against their own countrymen! At present it is easy to count up the German singers, male and female; and even if there really are as good singers as the one I have mentioned, or even better ones, which I very much doubt, yet I am inclined to think that the directors of our theatre are too niggardly and too little patriotically-minded to offer large sums of money to strangers, when they have on the spot better singers, or at least equally good ones, whom they can rope in for nothing. For the Italian company does not need them – so far as numbers go. The company can fill all the parts themselves. The idea at present is to carry on the German opera with actors and actresses, who only sing when they must. Most unfortunately the directors of the theatre and those of the orchestra have all been retained, and it is they who owing to their ignorance and slackness are chiefly responsible for the failure of their own enterprise. Were there but one good patriot in charge – things would take a different turn. But then, perhaps, the German national theatre which is sprouting so vigorously would actually begin to flower: and of course that would be an everlasting blot on Germany, if we Germans were seriously to begin to think as Germans, to act as Germans, to speak as Germans and, Heaven help us, to sing as Germans!!

The sarcastic tone in the final statement of Wolfgang’s letter is testament to his undeniable allegiance to the German artistic cause. The preference he had once shown for alternative artistic expressions had now dissipated following the demise of a national institution.

One constant criticism of Wolfgang throughout two centuries of Mozart scholarship is that he had no interest in political matters. It is generally believed that

44 Letters, 890–891; Briefe, III, 392–394.
45 Early on in his tour of Paris, Wolfgang wrote of his desire to write an opera: ‘Writing operas is my one burning ambition; but they must be French rather than German, and Italian rather than either’. His predilection for a certain language may have been influenced by the Parisians’ taste more than anything. Letters, 468; Briefe, II, 265.
46 W. J. Turner was one who believed Wolfgang was uninterested in politics. Rather classing him as ‘apolitical’, Turner simply described the composer as being ‘too personally humane to be carried away by mechanical theories’, such as those prevalent in Figaro, while Einstein began the fifth chapter to his biography of Wolfgang with one simple sentence: ‘Mozart was not interested in politics’. See Turner, Mozart: The Man and His Work, 272 and Einstein, Mozart: His Character, His Work, 98.
this was one of the greatest differences between him and Leopold. Shortly after his
death, for example, the inclination to present Wolfgang as a genius whose mind was
only ‘limited to those ideas which concerned music’, was too tempting. His own
sister’s reminiscences in 1792 proposed the notion that ‘Apart from his music he was
almost always a child, and thus he remained: and this is a main feature of his
character on the dark side’. Hence, the supposition that Wolfgang was an apolitical
being, who was uninterested in subjects other than music, was championed by history.
Most important in this regard was the early twentieth century biographer Hermann
Abert (1871–1927). Wolfgang was, according to Abert, simply uninterested in the
abstract nature of politics and found it difficult to make time for such a theoretical,
intellectual subject:

> Mozart was not a political animal: the state was of even less interest to him than society, with
> political theories belonging in the realm of abstraction, a world that could not be grasped
> through the senses and for which he therefore had no time. Here, as elsewhere, there was a
> vast gulf between him and his father, who was unusually interested in both the theory and
> practice of politics. For Mozart, conversely, political principles were a matter of almost total
> indifference and he had time only for the people who represented them, hence the fact that in
> choice of friends he never allowed himself to be influenced by political considerations . . . The
> French Revolution, receives not a single word of mention in his letters. Never once do we hear
> him speak of freedom, equality, human rights and so on as universal demands. Whenever he
> came into contact with individuals who championed these principles, as occasionally
> happened in Masonic lodges, it was again the people who fascinated him, not the principles.
> As a result, readers will search his letters in vain for a political creed.

While Abert was correct in stating that there is no overriding creed discernible in
Wolfgang’s correspondence, this is not to say that the composer was totally devoid of
political interest. The reason that he does not mention the French Revolution should
be attributed to the fact that following Leopold’s death in 1787, Wolfgang’s letters
became few and far between (or, at least, those which have been preserved). It would
be naïve to suggest that an event as consequential and relevant as the French

---

47 *MDB*, 498. From Jean–Baptiste–Antoine Suard’s ‘Anecdotes sur Mozart’ written in 1804.
48 *MDB*, 462.
49 Abert, *W. A. Mozart*, 736.
Revolution did not induce some emotion or reaction from an individual such as Wolfgang.  

Leopold did, indeed, have a greater knowledge of and curiosity about political happenings. This, as a result, may have contributed to the scarcity of Wolfgang’s political references. Rather than compete with Leopold’s enthusiasm for politics, Wolfgang steered clear of becoming involved in his father’s intellectual and social discussions. Hence, the passages within the correspondence in which Wolfgang did demonstrate a keen eye for political events were not written to his father. The letter of 7 August 1778 was written to his Salzburg friend Abbé Bullinger, a close confidant in whom he first confided the death of his mother. While his knowledge of events was fragmentary, the letter reveals Wolfgang’s ability to absorb news and current events. The fact that Bullinger – rather than Leopold – was on the receiving end of this report suggests that Wolfgang found greater insight and contentment discussing such matters with a member of his own generation:

Now for the war. As far as I know we shall soon have peace in Germany. The King of Prussia is rather alarmed, it seems. I have read in the papers that the Prussians surprised an Imperial detachment, but that the Croats and two regiments of cuirassiers were in the neighbourhood and, hearing the tumult, came at once to their rescue and attacked the Prussians, placing them between two fires and capturing five cannon. The route by which the Prussians entered Bohemia is now entirely cut up and destroyed, so they cannot retreat. The Bohemian peasants are making it as hot as they can for the Prussians, who are suffering moreover from constant desertions among their troops. But these are matters of which you must have had earlier and more accurate news than ourselves. But I now must send you some of our news here. The French have forced the English to retreat, but it was not a very hot fight. The most remarkable thing is that of friends and foes, only a hundred men were killed. Nevertheless there is tremendous jubilation here and nothing else it talked of. It is also reported that we shall soon have peace. It is all the same to me as far as this country is concerned. But I should be very glad indeed for many reasons if we were soon to have peace in Germany.

50 In an 1829 conversation with Vincent and Mary Novello, Constanze Mozart refused to disclose the titles of some of her late husband’s favourite literature. Mary Novello suggested they were French revolutionary works. MDB, 539.
51 Wolfgang’s mother, Maria Anna, had a similar interest in politics to that of her husband. On 14 May 1778 she wrote to Leopold: ‘What I should like to hear is something about the war, for there is a rumour here that peace has been concluded between the Emperor and Prussia. War between France and England has not yet been declared, but great preparations are being made’. Letters, 537; Briefe, II, 355.
52 Letters, 596; Briefe, II, 441.
While this may appear as an isolated instance of Wolfgang discussing political events, the fact that he discussed two separate scenarios – the wars in France and Germany – suggests that his political awareness was not as lacking as previously thought. His reference to the French victory over the English similarly demonstrates that he was aware of the ramifications of the American Revolution. 53

As Wolfgang’s Germanic interests demonstrate, it was difficult for an active citizen of Josephinian Vienna to not, at the very least, be aware of the current political situation. Having assembled an impressive array of friends involved in Viennese social, artistic and intellectual life, Wolfgang would have found it challenging to avoid discourse on such matters. Wolfgang’s and Joseph II’s support of nationalism – which were glorified posthumously by Otto Jahn (1813–1869) 54 and Carl Ramshorn (1812–1887) 55 respectively – certainly represented an early chapter in the evolution of what was to become a very marked nineteenth century phenomenon. Jahn’s evaluation, particularly, was, whilst inflated, accurate in noting how Wolfgang’s emergence as a genuine and flourishing artist in Vienna in the 1780s mirrored the blossoming of national and patriotic sentiments amongst Germans. That Wolfgang had more patriotic sentiments than Leopold, is, therefore, an important distinction in this dissertation’s findings relating to the Mozarts perception of eighteenth century society. Leopold’s more purposeful attempt to associate himself with noted Aufklärer is thwarted by his enthusiastic drive to gain popularity and patronage across all of Europe. Contrastingly, Wolfgang’s often detached position from the ‘enlightened’

53 In relation to the American Revolution, however, Leopold undoubtedly had the more intense fascination of the two. When Wolfgang was in Paris in 1778, Leopold seemed envious that his son was amidst the diplomatic fallout of the War: ‘Write and tell me whether France has really declared war on England. You will now see the American Minister, Dr. Franklin. France recognises the independence of the thirteen American provinces and has concluded treaties with them’. Letters, 525; Briefe, II, 337.

54 Jahn’s enormous legacy as a Mozart biographer owes much to his realisation of the simultaneous rise of German nationalism and the appreciation of his subject as an artist. Not living long enough to see the nationalistic connotations that accompanied the nineteenth century, Wolfgang was, according to Jahn, largely restricted by the social and political measures enforced upon him. Yet he was ready and eager to break his artistic shackles: ‘When at last the spiritual and intellectual life of the nation has become free and impelled to artistic activity, the great master arises, who, disposing at will of the inheritance of knowledge and genius bequeathed to him by his fathers, fulfills the highest task of art in his representations of ideal beauty’. Otto Jahn, Life of Mozart, Vol. I. (London: Novello, Ewer & Co., 1891) Pauline D. Townsend, trans., 328.

55 Similarly, history had begun to portray Joseph II as the liberator of Germany and the patriotic pursuer of the ideas of the Aufklärung. Writing in the 1845 publication Kaiser Joseph II und seine Zeit, Carl Ramshorn asked: ‘Who does not feel himself penetrated at the mention of the name of this truly great German man, with a feeling of holy pride that the German people can call such a nobility its own? [He was] the man who took it for his most holy duty to bring to fruition all that tended to the good of humanity, for his people and for the entire German fatherland, who planted the root of the greatness of the Austrian state and thus brought a wider citizenship to the rest of the atomised German fatherland’. Carl Ramshorn, Kaiser Joseph II und seine Zeit (Reclam, 1845) 7.
principles and ideals, yet strong Germanic and nationalistic agenda, again establishes him within the *Sturm und Drang* generation. These differences demonstrate how, once again, Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart differed following the latter’s move to Vienna, where he found himself outside his father’s orbit amidst a synthesis of novel and enlightened ideas.

* * *

Leopold Mozart’s final years in Salzburg are often, understandably, overshadowed by Wolfgang’s life in Vienna. For the purposes of this dissertation, however, an episode between Leopold and his grandson will be explored in order to better understand the tension that existed between him and Wolfgang. Similarly, it underlines his life-long pursuit of pedagogical excellence. The absence of Wolfgang from his life had left a void – one that could only be filled, as he soon discovered, by replacing one *Wunderkind* with another. Following Wolfgang’s move to Vienna, Leopold found genuine solace in the company of his grandson, Leopold Alois Pantaleon (1785–1840). The child – ‘Little Leopold’ or ‘Leopoldl’ – was the first of Nannerl’s children with her husband, Johann Baptist Franz von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg (1736–1801). To a large extent, Wolfgang was unaware of the relationship that formed between his nephew – whom he never met – and Leopold. What we know about Leopold’s bond with the child survives through his correspondence with Nannerl. From what can be gathered, it seems that Leopold harboured great and unrealistic expectations that his grandson would become a *Wunderkind*, a child musical prodigy or, in effect, another Wolfgang.

On her marriage to Berchtold zu Sonnenberg in 1784, Nannerl became the stepmother to his five children. Whether it was due to illness or sheer exhaustion is unclear, but Nannerl found it necessary to relinquish the primary duty of raising Leopoldl to her father. For an enlightened pedagogue, Leopold not only embraced this decision but also viewed it as a wonderful opportunity. As the family correspondence attests, Leopold was so proud of the education he had given his own children that he obviously believed he could similarly achieve success with Leopoldl. His first report to Nannerl in St. Gilgen reveals Leopold’s enthusiasm for the challenge:
I hope you reached Hof by 1 o’clock and that by 5 you’d been reunited, safe and sound, with your husband and children. Sad though your departure was, I nonetheless spent a very happy day – except between 12 and 1 – in the company of little Leopold . . . I hope that you too will have confidence in my care and attention, as you know how much I love the child. He was again much friendlier and livelier than yesterday – yesterday, as you know, he endeared himself neither to me nor to the rest of us. But this afternoon his eyes are bright and clear again, and he’s sleeping gently and calmly: in a word, I’m completely reassured and hope to be able to keep him until I can bring him by hand to St. Gilgen, but for that I’d have to live another ten years or so and as a result it would be little Leopold who would be leading me, not the other way round . . . the children should drink to little Leopold’s health.56

The fact that Leopoldl was only a few months old when Leopold took him into his care seems not to have deterred the senior Mozart from beginning his primary education. This obviously owes much to his belief that the earlier a child begins to learn the better – a philosophy that one of his pedagogical heroes, Erasmus of Rotterdam, thoroughly believed:

since nature has brought us forth so that we might acquire knowledge, it can never be too early to satisfy this urge, of which the seeds, as it were, have been implanted in us by nature, the mother of all things. Furthermore, things which are also essential to an adult’s store of learning, such as the alphabet, a command of languages, and morally edifying stories in prose or verse, are mastered much more quickly and easily at a tender age, thanks to some natural inclination, than at a sturdier one.57

Despite Leopoldl’s infancy, Leopold was already thinking of his grandchild’s intellectual potential:

He clearly says ‘a’ and ‘b’, and thus I am jokingly teaching him to speak the alphabet, not in strict order, but rather I try to teach him those letters which are easiest to speak.58

Furthermore, it was not only a linguistic education that Leopold was enforcing on his grandson. There was no more efficient way, he believed, to produce another Wunderkind than to present him with early musical training. He realised Leopoldl’s early inclination to react instinctively to musical sounds:

56 Briefe, III, 404–405.
58 Briefe, IV, 5.
I haven’t yet let him hear a violin. I performed a safe test with a brass candlestick, where I alternately played pianissimo and then forte with a small key on the rim and sang along with it. At that moment he became so motionlessly attentive that he could not take his eyes off me; he didn’t move his feet or hands, not so much a finger, although usually he would be constantly in motion . . . People could say what they wanted to him, it wouldn’t matter, he wouldn’t pay the least attention to it. In brief – he remained motionless looking at me and the candlestick.59

Although Leopold’s descriptions to Nannerl were surely exaggerated, they nonetheless convey his pleasure in witnessing Leopoldl’s early development, as was the case with keyboard:

I can never look at the child’s right hand without being moved. The most skilled pianist cannot place his hand so beautifully on the keyboard as he customarily holds his hand; often he doesn’t move the fingers; often the fingers are placed with curved hand in the playing position, and when he sleeps his hands lie in such a way as though the fingers were really touching the clavier, as well as with the most proportional relaxation and curvature of the fingers. In brief – one could not see anything more beautiful – I am often truly saddened when I see this, for I wish he were already just three years old so that he would already be able to play.60

Leopold kept the intentions he had for his grandson from Wolfgang. As far as can be gathered, Wolfgang never learnt of his father’s musical ambitions for Leopoldl. He was aware that Nannerl’s son was staying with Leopold, and when he discovered this detail he assumed Leopold was equally prepared to look after his children as well. The letter that Leopold wrote to his daughter on 17 November 1786 is a key reminder of the Mozart family situation at this time:

Little Leopold is well!
And I? – Somewhat better since I shut out the 67th year of my life after drinking a laxative on my birthday; and I was so tempted to drive out to St. Gilgen on the 15th, who knows what sometimes cures a man. I have to joke about it so that I don’t get depressed, I had to reply to one of your brother’s letters today, it took me a lot of time to write it and so I can write only very little to you – it’s late, I also want to go to the theatre today, as I can now get in for free, and I’ve just finished my letter to Vienna. That I had to express myself very forcefully you

59 Briefe, III, 496–497.
60 Briefe, III, 446–447.
can well imagine as he suggested nothing less than that I should take charge of his 2
children while he goes off on tour of Germany and England in the middle of next carnival etc. – I’ve given him a piece of my mind and promised him the next instalment of my letter with the next post. Herr Müller, that good and honest maker of silhouettes, praised little Leopold to your brother, which is how he found out that the child is staying here, something I’ve never told him: that’s how he or his wife hit on the idea. Of course it would suit them down to the ground – they could go off and travel at their convenience – they could die – they could even remain in England – and I’d have to go running after them with the children or chase up the payment for the children that he’s offering me for them and for the maids to look after them etc. – Basta! My excuse is forceful and instructive if he cares to make use of it.

Originally planned for only a few months, Leopold’s care of his grandson extended until Leopold’s death in May 1787. This was, as he himself eventually admitted, his intention from the moment he first began minding Leopoldl: ‘Consequently you know my whole intention’, he told Nannerl, ‘and thus I say to you that I will keep Leopoldl with me so long as I live; this is and was already my resolve from the beginning’. More so than any of his other pupils, Leopold considered the education of a family member as his primary obligation. What is apparent in the elder Mozart at the end of his life is the continuation of his lifelong philosophy: that education was an imperative component in one’s personal and intellectual maturity. His method of tuition reflected what he considered to be a vital cog in the wheel of the Aufklärung – a movement in which he so desperately sought inclusion. The education of Wolfgang, Nannerl, and finally Leopoldl, demonstrated Leopold’s understanding of his right as a father. His hero, Gellert, concluded his own instructions to his son with a heartfelt postscript: that the education he gave was a fatherly obligation:

---

61 Wolfgang’s two children at the time were Karl Thomas and Johann Thomas Leopold. Unbeknown to Leopold, the second child had died two days before he wrote this letter. MDB, 280.
62 Briefe, III, 606.
63 Briefe, III, 512.
64 During those Wolfgang-less days in Salzburg, Leopold did teach some new students. He wrote to his publisher on 29 April 1782: ‘Meanwhile I am having a pleasant time with two pupils, the twelve year old son and fourteen year old daughter of Herr Marchand, theatrical manager in Munich, whom I am instructing. I hope to make a great violinist and clavier-player out of the boy and a good singer and excellent clavier-player out of the girl’. Letters, p. 803. Along with another student Maria Johanna Brochard (1775–1824), siblings Heinrich Wilhelm (1769–1812) and Maria Margarethe Marchand (1768–1800) occupied the rest of Leopold’s remaining years as a teacher.
I love you rationally, and wish to give you such an education as reason and paternal
tenderness require.\textsuperscript{65}

Leopold’s \textit{Versuch}, his admiration for the Men of Letters, his stringent routine of
corresponding in the form of letters, and his interest in pedagogy present a man who
was aware of the importance the \textit{Aufklärer} placed on education. In his largely
forgotten definition of the \textit{Aufklärung},\textsuperscript{66} Moses Mendelssohn declared that one’s
education derives from one’s desire to not only heighten one’s intelligence but one’s
social condition as well:

\begin{quote}
Education, culture, and enlightenment are modifications of social life, effects of hard work
and efforts of human beings to improve their social condition.\textsuperscript{67}
\end{quote}

Leopold’s tireless attempts to better his and his family’s position – whether in
Salzburg or a distant foreign town – was all part of his effort to enlighten those he
loved. For him, education was the key ingredient to this success.

\begin{center}
\textastarsp\textastarsp\textastarsp
\end{center}

Wolfgang’s tour of Paris and various German centres in 1777–79 – which is
documented in the fourth chapter of this thesis – was not the success he and his father
had envisioned. The unexpected and sudden death of Wolfgang’s mother in July 1778
plus the rejection by Aloysia Weber in the twilight of his long journey back to
Salzburg stirred in him a series of tempestuous feelings and outbursts that catapulted
the twenty-two year old composer into a depressive spiral. The comment which best
describes his state of mind at that particularly trying period of his life comes from the
letter he wrote to Leopold on 29 May 1778. The frustration of ill–success in the
Parisian musical scene caused Wolfgang to question his own existence:

\begin{quote}
I am tolerably well, thank God, but I often wonder whether life is worth living – I don’t find
much pleasure in anything.\textsuperscript{68}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{65} Gellert, \textit{Instructions}, 41.
\textsuperscript{66} Mendelssohn, like Kant, answered the question proposed by the \textit{Berlinische Monatsschrift} in 1784:
\textit{Was ist Aufklärung}? His answer has subsequently been neglected in favour of Kant’s.
\textsuperscript{67} \textit{MPW}, 313.
\textsuperscript{68} \textit{Letters}, 544; \textit{Briefe}, II, 368.
\end{flushright}
Leopold immediately replied to his son in an attempt to take his mind away from such morose and dejected thoughts. Wolfgang’s melancholy was merely a part of human nature, according to his father, and affects every strand of humanity. He instantly responded:

My dear Wolfgang! Your remarks: I am tolerably well – I often wonder whether life is worth living – I don’t find much pleasure in anything – seem to me to indicate that you were discontented or annoyed at the time or that you were writing in a bad humour. I don’t like it. But I can’t say anything about it, as I don’t know the cause of your displeasure . . . There is no reason whatever why you should be unhappy. God has bestowed great talents upon you . . . But pains and hard work are necessary! Nothing can be achieved without some effort! You are young! Whereas I in my 59th year have to tear my hair over five pupils, and that too for a wretched pittance! If some things do not turn out as you wish, hope or imagine – if you have enemies – if you are persecuted – in short, if events do not shape themselves as you want and expect them to, remember that in this world it has always been and always will be thus, and that this is something to which everyone, from beggar to king, must submit. 69

This exchange of correspondence was prior to Maria Anna Mozart’s death. The loss of his mother and the rejection by Aloysia Weber in the following months would not have helped Wolfgang’s dejected state of mind. Leopold’s written response was a father instructing his son about life’s harsh realities. It demonstrates again, however, the misunderstandings that were regularly coming between them.

Had the contemplation of suicide entered Wolfgang’s mind during that melancholic chapter in his life, it would not have been a wholly irregular thought for an eighteenth century individual. It was during this century that the debate over the ethics of suicide or ‘self-murder’ as was the more common term, reached its zenith, particularly for the Stürmer und Drängen of Wolfgang’s generation, who considered the ramifications of self-murder most ardently during the 1770s. It became a social ‘arm wrestle’ between the highly powerful and vocal leaders of Christianity who considered it a sin worthy of the highest penalty and condemnation, and the rapidly developing middle-class intellectuals who philosophically classed suicide as a

69 Letters, 546; Briefe, II, 371.
personal and practical decision.\textsuperscript{70} The ethics of self-murder are summarised in this anonymous poem published in London in 1773:

\begin{verbatim}
The spirit free’d, we leave our cares behind,
And quit the burthen of a tortur’d mind.
Religion’s stern command forbids to kill:
The restless spirit, to be free from ill,
Must with Philosophy attend its fate,
Nor Heaven’s just decrees anticipate.
No other guide than will, the wayward know;
Nor can Religion’s voice prevent the blow;
But those whom Judgement’s cool reflection sways,
Attend Time’s hand to finish joyless days.\textsuperscript{71}
\end{verbatim}

In order to best demonstrate the ethical dilemma in which many eighteenth century Germans found themselves, a general synopsis from some of the leading commentators of the age will follow. Self-murder, as the following section will demonstrate, was a conundrum deeply rooted in the psyche of many \textit{Aufklärer}. Their diverse and differing postulations exhibit just how problematic the ethical issue of self-murder had become.

Immanuel Kant hypothesised that self-murder was utterly unjustifiable. Remarkably for a man who considered the freedom of mankind imperatively important, he denounced suicide as fundamentally and morally wrong. Self-murder, Kant wrote in \textit{Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten (Foundations for the Metaphysics of Morals, 1785)}, achieved nothing.\textsuperscript{72}

Moses Mendelssohn was one of the more prominent \textit{Aufklärer} to contemplate the justification of self-murder. One of the recurring themes throughout

\textsuperscript{70} David Hume, for instance, had this to say on suicide: ‘A man who retires from life does no harm to society: He only ceases to do good; which, if it is an injury, is of the lowest kind. – All our obligations to do good to society seem to imply something reciprocal. I receive the benefits of society, and therefore ought to promote its interests . . . I am not obliged to do a small good to society at the expense of a great harm to myself; why then should I prolong a miserable existence, because of some frivolous advantage which the public may perhaps receive from me?’ Hume, \textit{Essays on Suicide and on the Immortality of the Soul} (London: M. Smith, 1783) 18–19.

\textsuperscript{71} Anonymous, \textit{Suicide, A Poem} (London: T. Hookham, 1773) 1–2.

\textsuperscript{72} ‘If, in order to escape from burdensome circumstances, he destroys himself, he uses a person merely as a means to maintain a tolerable condition up to the end of life. Man, however, is not a thing, and thus not something to be used merely as a means; he must always be regarded in all his actions as an end in himself’. Kant, \textit{Foundations for the Metaphysics of Morals} (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1985) Lewis White Beck, trans., 54.
Mendelssohn’s writings is the question of the soul’s immortality, which, inevitably, influences his hypothesis on the ethics of suicide. As the leading Jewish Aufklärer, Mendelssohn’s teachings display the quintessential religious writings of his century: liberal without denouncing the presence or overall authority of a supreme being. In his *magnum opus* concerning the afterlife, Mendelssohn pursues the philosophy of Socrates in a dialogical thesis entitled *Phädon, oder über die Unsterblichkeit der Seele* (*Phädon, or the Immortality of the Soul*, 1767). It was a work that was quite popular; it made Socratic ideas and philosophy available to the German public, including Wolfgang Mozart who owned the fourth edition of the work published in 1776.\(^{73}\)

The work is concerned with the ailing Socrates and the philosophy he preaches to his young disciples on his deathbed. Early on in the first of three sections, Socrates declares categorically that:

> I maintain, that suicide, in every possible case, is absolutely inadmissible. We know there are persons existing, to whom life must be burdensome. It may seem strange to you, on this account, that the sacred duties of society should not permit the unhappy to relieve themselves by voluntary death, but should enjoin them to wait for another helping hand to release them; yet nothing is more consistent with the views of the Supreme Being.\(^{74}\)

Although this is spoken through Socrates, and knowing that the author modelled the work on some writings by Plato, it must be assumed that Mendelssohn adopted, or at least agreed with, what he wrote through the guise of Socrates. It is therefore perplexing to consider what he proposed years earlier in his treatise *Über die Empfindungen* (*On Sentiments*, 1755), a thesis on the acknowledgement and understanding of feeling. In it Mendelssohn again discourages the notion of suicide; however, he openly justifies the voluntary act in some instances. In particular, he puts forward the idea that suicide is acceptable when performed on stage because it stirs an emotion within the audience that is an understandable and empathetic condition of

\(^{73}\) *MDB*, 601–602. Incidentally, Wolfgang also owned a copy of Hannah More’s play *Percy: A Tragedy*, which was first performed in 1777. Important here, however, is the fact that the play does conclude with a highly dramatic suicide at the end of Act V. Similar in dynamics to Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*, Douglas stabs himself after realising his beloved Elwina has swallowed poison. She wakes to see his dead body, before dying herself moments later. Right after he stabs himself, Douglas utters the words: ‘No remedy but this; Cou’d med’cine a disease so desperate’. More, *Percy*, 85.

\(^{74}\) Moses Mendelssohn, *Phaedon; or, the Death of Socrates* (London: J. Cooper, 1789) 16.
humanity. However, it does not include the full complications that follow suicide when committed in reality. Mendelssohn mused:

For my part, I confess that I cannot free myself from this conundrum . . . suicide does not appear to be as much in conflict with the nature of human beings as one might believe. For heaven’s sake, how would someone on the stage be able to bring tears to the eyes of the audience, if he were a man of vice in every thinkable circumstance and despicable in every possible scenario? A piece of villainy can arouse disgust, repugnance, and horror but no sympathy, no social stirring, no pleasantly painful sentiment which is the prerogative of suffering virtue alone.\(^\text{75}\)

Following the villain’s self-murder, however, there occurs a conversion amongst the audience, according to Mendelssohn. It is not a selfish act but rather the climactic result of an individual’s torment and hardship. On stage a suicide is fully justified:

Nothing but a suicide at this point has placed the dubious character of this person in its proper light and sealed their goodness. Our cursing has been transformed into well-wishing, our grief into affection, and our ill will into sympathy. Can a piece of villainy do this? Can this be accomplished by an act that is always supposed to be an abomination to the human race?\(^\text{76}\)

Mendelssohn’s realisation that suicide was an acceptable procedure of mankind – when applied in a fictitious drama – gave credence to other eighteenth century writers in their resolve to adopt the act in their works.

Mendelssohn’s close friend and colleague, Lessing, used it to great effect in two of his stage dramas: firstly in his one-act work *Philotas* (1759), a story based on Greek tragedy but written during and influenced by The Seven Years War (1756–1763). The other was *Emilia Galotti* (1772), which contains many striking similarities to Lessing’s earlier work. The two works differ, however, in their ultimate portrayal of suicide and its ethics. In *Philotas*, the main character views self-murder as a means to regain personal pride and national honour after being captured by the enemy:

PHILOTAS: Farewell, Strato! There, where all virtuous friends and all brave men are members of one blessed state – in Elysium we shall meet again.\(^\text{77}\)

\(^{75}\) *MPW*, 42–43.

\(^{76}\) *MPW*, 42–43.

\(^{77}\) *DWL*, I, 131.
However Lessing, as he himself stated, intended for it to be understood as an act fuelled by ‘raging melancholy’ (*wütende Schwermut*).\(^{78}\) Just prior to this, Philotas defends his suicide by claiming it as the imperishable right given to mankind by divine beings:

> STRATO: But as our prisoner, you had no right over yourself!
> PHILOTAS: Do not say that, Strato! Should a man be able to fetter another’s liberty to die, the liberty which the gods have left him in all vicissitudes of life?\(^{79}\)

On the other hand, the eponymous Emilia Galotti attempts suicide after realising her fate as her capturer’s mistress. Whereas Philotas kills himself in order to reach a greater and nobler place, Emilia’s attempt was intended to prevent her antagonists from seizing their most cherished prize. Although her father Odoardo snatches the dagger from her grasp, the desire to end her own life is then granted by the man who began it. Emilia, desperate to convince her father that by killing her he would in fact be giving her a fresh beginning, claims victory over her would be oppressors:

> EMILIA: In former days there was a father, who, to save his daughter from disgrace plunged the first deadly weapon which he saw, into his daughter’s heart – and thereby gave her life, a second time. But those were deeds of ancient times. Such fathers exist not now.
> ODOARDO: They do, they do, my daughter (*stab her*). God of heaven! What have I done? (*supports her in his arms as she sinks.*)
> EMILIA: Plucked a rose before the storm had robbed it of its bloom.\(^{80}\)

Emilia’s successful plea to her father to end her suffering resonated throughout further German literature of the eighteenth century.

In the 1770s the writers of the *Sturm und Drang* adopted the philosophy of suicide and integrated it into their work with great regularity. With their ‘bombastic’ language and common disdain for organised religion, the *Stürmer und Dränger* routinely included scenes in their plays where suicide is either committed, or at least

---


\(^{79}\) *DWL*, I, 130.

\(^{80}\) *DWL*, I, 224.
contemplated.\footnote{FPSD, v.} For the \textit{Stürmer und Dränger}, self-murder became less of an abominable act and more a justified and liberating one.\footnote{Henri Brunschwig, \textit{Enlightenment and Romanticism in Eighteenth-Century Prussia} (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974) Frank Jellinek, trans., 220.} In Friedrich Schiller’s (1759–1805) play \textit{Die Rauber}, he presents both sides of the suicide debate. He has the cowardly Franz strangle himself in the face of his avengers, and then has Schweitzer shoot himself after realising he can now not capture Franz alive.\footnote{Schiller, \textit{Die Räuber}, 288–89.} Schiller displays suicide here as a quick and easy solution, one which outweighs the consequences a man would have faced if he had not chosen the act. In contrast, Karl decides not to end his life, but only after he had assessed the situation and the ethics involved:

Can I not snap the threads of life that are woven for me there beyond as easily as the present one? – You can make of me – nothing; of this freedom you cannot rob me. (\textit{He loads the pistol. Suddenly he pauses}) And am I to die out of fear of suffering? Am I to grant misery this victory over me? – No! I will endure it! (\textit{Throwing the pistol away}) Let suffering yield before my pride! It shall be accomplished!\footnote{Schiller, \textit{Die Räuber}, 273.}

Schiller’s approach to the subject (‘Dying is more than a harlequinade, and the fear of death is worse than dying itself’)\footnote{Schiller, \textit{Die Räuber}, 230.} left the question open for further debate. Karl’s hesitancy and dithering state aptly illustrates the confusion (Wirrwarr) that is inherently associated with the writings of the \textit{Sturm und Drang}.\footnote{Friedrich Maximilian Klinger’s 1776 play \textit{Sturm und Drang (Storm and Stress)} – from which the literary movement inherited its name – was originally entitled Wirrwarr (Confusion).}

The work that had the most profound concept of suicide was \textit{Die Leiden des jungen Werthers (The Sorrows of Young Werther}, 1774) by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. Its sympathetic portrayal of Werther’s unrequited love for Charlotte created euphoria amongst its readers across Europe, and a following unlike any previous eighteenth century novel.\footnote{Some readers took Werther’s suicide to be the autobiographical philosophy of Goethe. Others saw it as the author’s defence of suicide and of mankind’s right to end his own life. Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz (1751–1792) tirelessly defended Goethe and his famous novel against such allegations. He claimed an artist should be able to freely depict a tale without being hounded by allegations of moral and civil corruption. Lenz’s anger is against Friedrich Nicolai’s (1733–1811) Werther parody, \textit{The joys of young Werther} (1775). Also written the year following Goethe’s original novel, Lenz published \textit{Letters on the Morality of The Sorrows of Young Werther}. He wrote: ‘You consider it a subtle defence of suicide. That seems to me like describing Homer’s \textit{Iliad} as a subtle encouragement of anger, quarrelling, and enmity. Why on earth do people always impute to the poet moral purposes he never
impressionable age of eighteen and many scholars have noted his familiarity with the work, most notably Wolfgang Hildesheimer, who claimed – without reference – that the young composer had read it.\textsuperscript{88} There is no evidence to suggest that Wolfgang read \textit{Werther}, but considering the work’s impact on German and also European society, it is incomprehensible to believe that he was unaware of its premise. The popularity of \textit{Werther} was immense and it became a universal success. As Nicholas Boyle stated: ‘\textit{Werther} became a fashion because it was about a fashion’.\textsuperscript{89} The work was translated into French within a year of its publication and considering Wolfgang was relatively competent in that language at the time of his tour there with his mother in 1778, it would not be too much to suppose that it was there that he became acquainted with \textit{Werther} and thus occupied his mind with the ethics of self-murder.

However, unlike Werther, Wolfgang did not take his own life. Although the circumstances and reasons for his eventual recovery from the depths of a depressive state are unknown, it is quite possible that it was his craft – making music – which assisted in his recovery. In \textit{Werther}, Goethe described the therapeutic nature of music, even when faced with the most unbearable of problems. After hearing Charlotte perform on the harpsichord, Werther wrote:

\begin{quote}
I do not find it difficult to believe the stories of the magic power of music in ancient times. How this simple song fascinates me! And how well she knows when to play it, often at a time when I feel like putting a bullet in my brain! All the confusion and gloom in my soul are dispersed, and I breathe more freely again.\textsuperscript{90}
\end{quote}

Werther’s summation of the power of music therapy was realised by one of his and Wolfgang’s contemporaries – Ludwig van Beethoven (1770–1827). Confronted with the increasing agitation caused by his deafness, Beethoven contemplated suicide only then to withdraw such sentiments because of his devotion to composition. In the undelivered letter to his brothers, Karl and Johann, known as the ‘Heiligenstadt Testament’, Beethoven declared:

\begin{quote}
thought of? \ldots Goethe wanted to represent nothing more and nothing less than the sorrows of young Werther, to follow them to their final goal as Homer pursues the wrath of Achilles. And the whole great work has made so little impression on you that at the end you can still ask about its moral?’ Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz, \textit{Briefe über die Moralität der Leiden des jungen Werthers} (1775) in \textit{Eighteenth Century German Criticism} (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1992)
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{89} Boyle, \textit{Goethe: The Poet and the Age}, Vol. 1, 175.
\textsuperscript{90} Goethe, \textit{The Sorrows of Young Werther}, 37.
Such experiences almost made me despair, and I was on the point of putting an end to my life – The only thing that held me back was my art. For indeed it seemed to me impossible to leave this world before I had produced all the works that I felt the urge to compose; and thus I have dragged on this miserable existence – a truly miserable existence.  

When Leopold Mozart died on 28 May 1787, his son was busily composing Don Giovanni. More so than the other da Ponte operas, this work deals with death in a confrontational manner. The demise of the Commendatore and subsequently Don Giovanni himself are both highly dramatic and spectacular. Although it may be argued – and has regularly been done – that Leopold’s death is represented or subconsciously portrayed within the opera, it is nothing more than mere coincidence that his death occurred during the creation of his son’s darkest and most harrowing of operas. This theory was only compounded by the fact that during the nineteenth century a common practice for companies was to perform the opera without the final sextet of the second Act but rather leave the ‘creepy flesh and D minor un-majorised’ as the concluding dramatic moment.

The poignancy of this work is realised during the initial scenes of the opening Act. When the Commendatore confronts the womanising Don Giovanni for seducing his daughter a fatal sword fight transpires. The death of her father strikes in Donna Anna the most dreadful and disconsolate thoughts. As her betrothed Don Ottavio attempts to comfort her, she cries these words:

DONNA ANNA: Let me die also now that he who gave me life, oh God, is dead!

After hearing these words, it becomes easier to understand why many critics made the parallel between what was occurring on stage and the events that had unfolded in Wolfgang’s own life. Anna’s distraught figure bemoaning the loss of her dear father

---

94 MO, 302; NMA, XIII, 84.
conjures a similar – albeit historically unfounded – image of Wolfgang mourning Leopold’s death. Given that his father was unequivocally the most important and central figure during the first twenty-five years of his life, Wolfgang’s seemingly indifferent reaction to the news of Leopold’s passing is perplexing. His non-attendance in Salzburg in the wake of the death and his impetuous negotiations concerning his father’s estate reveal a son who had come to terms with the loss of his father long before. The fact that Wolfgang made more over the passing of his pet starling, which died only a few days after Leopold, demonstrates an individual who was content with the mysteriousness of human mortality. The poem he wrote to eulogise his bird, Vogel Star, is playful and reflective, not questioning the order of things. As the letter below further indicates, his advice to the dying Leopold reveals a dramatic transformation in his mentality.

The decade between each parent’s death gave Wolfgang the time and experience to differentiate between the evil connotations often associated with death and the peaceful tranquillity that can accompany it. In the case of his mother’s passing in Paris, Wolfgang greeted it with the fear of the unknown and with adolescent curiosity: ‘You know that I had never seen anyone die, although I had often wished to’. In the case of his father, on the other hand, his philosophical outlook and apparently nonchalant approach present an individual who was untroubled by the prospect of dying. Remarkably, the last letter he wrote to Leopold displays the progressive attitude that he had adopted:

As death, when we come to consider it closely, is the true goal of our existence, I have formed during the last few years such close relations with the best and truest friend of mankind, that his image is not only no longer terrifying to me, but is indeed very soothing and consoling! And I thank my God for graciously granting me the opportunity (you know what I mean) of learning that death is the key which unlocks the door to our true happiness. I never lie down at

---

95 See Letters, 909; Briefe, IV, 49.
96 ‘Here rests a bird called Starling,/ A foolish little Darling./ He was still in his prime/ When he ran out of time,/ And my sweet little friend/ Came to a bitter end,/ Creating a terrible smart/ Deep in my heart./ Gentle reader! Shed a tear,/ For he was dear,/ Sometimes a bit too jolly/ And, at times, quite folly,/ But nevermore/ A bore./ I bet he is now up on high/ Praising my friendship to the sky./ Which I render/ Without tender;/ For when he took his sudden leave,/ Which brought to me such grief,/ He was not thinking of the man/ Who writes and rhymes as no one can.’ See Spaethling, Mozart’s Letters, Mozart’s Life, 391–92.
97 Letters, 583; Briefe, II, 422.
night without reflecting that – young as I am – I may not live to see another day. Yet no one of all my acquaintances could say that in company I am morose or disgruntled.  

Wolfgang, who was aware of his father's illness at the time of writing the above passage, had clearly transformed his view of death since the traumatic passing of his mother in 1778. As Robert Spaethling noted, this final letter to Leopold more accurately reflects the philosophy of Moses Mendelssohn's Phädon, oder über die Unsterblichkeit der Seele, rather than the Christian doctrine that Leopold had so regimentally preached throughout his son's early life. How and why Wolfgang came to possess Mendelssohn's seminal work on death is unknown; that he received it from his Viennese Jewish friends is, however, likely. Particular passages from Phädon accentuate the likelihood that Wolfgang was paraphrasing Mendelssohn's words:

My friends, there are but few who know, that he who gives himself up to the love of wisdom, employs the whole time of his life in making himself familiar with death, that he may learn to die.

Furthermore, and directly symmetrical with Leopold's proclamation that he had become somewhat of a 'philosopher' in his old age, Mendelssohn decreed that 'death is never terrible to a true philosopher, but always welcome'. Wolfgang’s final letter to his father, therefore, contained not the compliantly Christian words of an obedient son, but rather the philosophical homily of an impressionable young man routinely impressed by society’s social and literary progressions.

As much as Leopold’s illness and death can be seen as the predominant moment in which Wolfgang’s philosophy was transformed, it was by no means an isolated situation for the young composer. Of the six children that he and Constanze brought into the world only two – Karl Thomas and Franz Xaver – lived past their first year. The untimely deaths of their other four children – Raimund Leopold (b./d. 1783), Johann Thomas Leopold (b./d. 1786), Theresia Constanzia Adelheid Friedericke Maria Anna (1787–1788), and Anna (b./d. 1789) – all occurred within such a short period of time that their existence can easily be overlooked and the likely

98 Letters, 907; Briefe, IV, 41.
99 Spaethling, Mozart's Letters, Mozart's Life, 388–89.
100 Wolfgang’s interaction with the Jewish community in Vienna is detailed in Chapter 5.
101 Mendelssohn, Phaedon; Or The Death of Socrates, 25.
102 Letters, 815; Briefe, III, 222.
103 Mendelssohn, Phaedon; Or The Death of Socrates, 42.
emotional impact on the parents similarly forgotten. Despite the fact that the Mozart family survival rate was typical of eighteenth century standards,\textsuperscript{104} this should not trivialise the sad response that such a personal loss would bring. Particularly for Wolfgang, the death of his first child Raimund Leopold, who died in the hands of a Viennese wet-nurse while his parents were visiting Salzburg for four months, must have been difficult to bear. The joy and parental enthusiasm with which Wolfgang spoke of his first child is evident in a letter to his father:

\begin{quote}
Little Raimund is so like me that everyone immediately remarks it. It is just as if my face had been copied. My dear little wife is absolutely delighted, as this is what she had always desired. He will be three weeks old next Tuesday and he has grown in an astonishing manner.\textsuperscript{105}
\end{quote}

When Wolfgang and Constanze returned home in late November 1783, it was only then that they learned that Raimund Leopold had been dead for three months. The seemingly emotionless and plain style in which Wolfgang wrote in his first surviving letter to Leopold following the tragedy has provoked some to suggest that death, and in particular those of infants, was a common, painless and uncomplicated matter with which to deal. Recent studies have shown that there was a shifting philosophy in eighteenth century attitudes towards infant mortality. The previously trusted Christian notion that the death of a child was a ‘natural Evil’ implemented by God as punishment for Eve’s sin, was eventually replaced by anger at the ineptitudes of the medical profession.\textsuperscript{106} While the Aufklärer sought medical rather than spiritual revelation, they were still hesitant in approaching new medicine and vaccines.

Leopold Mozart’s dedication to the Enlightenment’s cause was constantly tested by his devotion to the Christian faith. While in Paris in 1763 as part of his family’s Grand Tour, he was horrified by the Parisian public’s widespread use of inoculation against smallpox. Detailed in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, Leopold chose to rely on God’s will rather than any new medical drug.\textsuperscript{107} The death of a child in the eighteenth century was a common but nonetheless traumatic experience for any parent.

In the contemplation of death, Wolfgang ultimately transformed his ideology from the fear he found in the Catholic doctrine to the liberal and contented attitude

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{104} Braunbehrens, Mozart in Vienna: 1781–1791, 100.  
\textsuperscript{105} Letters, 855; Briefe, III, 277–278.  
\textsuperscript{107} Letters, 40; Briefe, I, 131.
\end{flushright}
that accompanies his final letters. Neither Leopold nor Wolfgang ever relinquished their Christian faith; this was similar to the decision embraced by many of the Aufklärer. Rather, they managed to assimilate many outside and contemporary beliefs. From the melancholy sentiments he had expressed surrounding his troubled stay in Paris, Wolfgang’s attitude to death changed over the course of the following decade. It was not that he came to oppose suicide, but more that he had become comfortable in the fact that he did not need to use it as a means of gaining happiness and tranquillity.

Leopold Mozart’s literary idol, Christian Fürchtegott Gellert, wrote a celebrated short poem on suicide. Ironically, it reflects Wolfgang’s trying period surrounding the loss of both his mother and Aloysia Weber. Entitled Selbstmord (Suicide) from his publication, Fabeln und Erzählungen (Fables and Tales, 1746–1748), it depicts a ‘sterling lad’ and his ‘aging father’, and centres on the former’s heartache upon being denied the love of a girl. Gellert’s resolution, ultimately like that of Wolfgang’s, was that self-murder was not an avenue to discover peace and that it remained nobler to sustain life rather than to end it:

O Youth, let life’s experience,
even as it drives you to tears,
teach you just what bitter fruit
your passion for beautiful women brings!

A sterling lad, well brought-up,
the strength and comfort of his aged father,
a youth whose early virtues
gave rise to greatest hopes;

---

108 As Joachim Whaley states ‘reason was to complement religion rather than replace it’. See The Enlightenment in National Context, 106–117.

109 Another reason could be that suicide was no longer fashionable by the mid to late 1780s. In Berlin between 1781 and 1786, for example, suicides accounted for only 8 percent of all deaths, a stark decline from the previous decade. Furthermore, the reason behind many of these deaths must be carefully considered. As Henri Brunschwig has noted, the so-called ‘suicide drownings’ during this period were more likely accidents that resulted from the new fashion for bathing. See Brunschwig, Enlightenment and Romanticism in Eighteenth-Century Prussia, 221.

110 In his 1774 comedy Der Hofmeister, oder Vorteile der Privaterziehung, Lenz had one character refer to Gellert’s poem when her lover threatened to stab himself: FRITZ: I’ll even carry a dagger. Oh, I can even stab myself, if it comes to that.
GUSTCHEN: Go on! Yes, you’ll do it like in Gellert: he viewed the point and cutting-edge, and stuck it in again slowly. See FPSD, 8.
the force of sweet desire drove him
lovingly to approach Climene;
with sighs he sought her favour;
but his pleas were unavailing.

Meekly he moans forth his misery.
All in vain! Climene tells him go.
Yes, he cries out, yes, I will turn away,
I will withdraw from you forever.

He tears the dagger from its sheath,
and O what can be more daring!
Just this: he looks at the point and at the blade,
and slowly puts it back.\footnote{Christian Fürchtegott Gellert, \textit{Fabeln und Erzählungen} (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1966) 94.}
7. Wolfgang Mozart, 1787–1791: The end of Leopold’s vision.

Chapter 7, the final chapter of this dissertation, is dedicated to an analysis of Wolfgang Mozart’s life and times following the death of Leopold. Barring the final years, Wolfgang’s entire life was under his father’s paternal eye. From the death of Leopold in 1787 to his own in 1791, establishing how Wolfgang coped and managed his affairs is a fascinating study of individuation. As this dissertation has addressed the collective lives of Leopold and Wolfgang against the backdrop of the Aufklärung, the already deeply studied areas of Wolfgang’s final stage works and Requiem will not serve as prime focus. On the contrary, the subject chosen to conclude this dissertation will emphasise once more the glaring differences in attitude and manner between the two Mozart men, which had become more and more marked with the passage of time.

The ideology and method which Leopold and Wolfgang chose to educate their children is the final example of how adhering to or abandoning the ideas of the Aufklärung polarised their relationship. This dichotomy was a combination of personal conviction and Josephinian reform, and can only properly be understood by examining Wolfgang’s life during the years following Leopold’s death. For it was during these final years of Wolfgang’s own life that he began the process of educating and schooling his own son, Karl Thomas. His eldest surviving son’s education is the vital component, therefore, by which the contrast with Leopold’s pedagogical method can be realised. While Leopold’s defining ideal was a life-long pursuit of pedagogical excellence, Wolfgang’s reluctance to embrace and enforce the principles of education vis-à-vis his own child and also his music pupils, reiterates each Mozart’s position in relation to the Aufklärung. The emphasis that Leopold placed on education was synonymous with the philosophy of the Aufklärung, and underlines his aspiration to be regarded as a Man of Letters. Wolfgang’s carefree approach to teaching and education, on the other hand, reinforces his life within the context of the Aufklärung because it reveals how he was a much more accidental, subconscious observer than his father. Leopold’s intentional drive and Wolfgang’s relatively passive attitude are best demonstrated in their application of pedagogy.
While Leopold was a dedicated theorist in all forms on instruction,¹ Wolfgang took a nonchalant approach to the way he taught his pupils and son.² The reasons for this, as will be explained, were twofold: first, the reforms within the Habsburg empire did not allow Wolfgang to educate his own children in the same way that he had been taught by Leopold. Second, Wolfgang never harboured the same intentions as his father to become a Man of Letters. His idea of writing an instruction manual like Leopold’s Versuch was only a brief and unrealistic notion, while his teaching of music students was only ever a means to support his composition. Exactly how, therefore, did Wolfgang differ from his father as a teacher, and was it a deliberate and final attempt to distance himself from Leopold’s legacy?

Even though Leopold considered ‘my duty as a father’ done, he still managed to highlight an ‘outstanding fault’ in his son’s character. In a letter to the Baroness von Waldstätten in 1782, Leopold outlined the elements of Wolfgang’s nature that he believed would hinder his son’s achievements. Leopold, as this letter attests, was beginning to realise that his son did not possess the qualities required to become a pedagogue. ‘He is far too patient or rather easy-going’, Leopold wrote, ‘and becomes indolent and lazy’.³

Although Leopold’s assessment of his son’s nature appears somewhat exaggerated, it is true that their temperaments were not similar. While Leopold possessed the patience and self-restraint required to instruct, Wolfgang’s manner and disposition did not suit the nature of teaching. Wolfgang admitted to Leopold that ‘I like to enjoy myself’,⁴ which would not have sat well with the father who had relinquished his career as a musician to educate his children. Leopold’s plea to Wolfgang demonstrates their contrasting attitudes to education and life:

---

¹ Detailed in chapters 1, 3 and 6.
² This chapter will not dissect what the Mozarts taught or the ‘musical school’ which their theory belonged. Rather, it will demonstrate their various attitudes and interests in pedagogy and how that was relevant in relation to the Aufklärung. For the similarities and differences in what the Mozarts taught, see Alfred Mann, ‘Haydn and Mozart’ in Theory and Practice: The Great Composer as Student and Teacher (New York, 1987) 41–62.
³ Letters, 816; Briefe, III, 222–223.
⁴ Letters, 429–30; Briefe, II, 199.
When you were children, I gave up all my time to you in the hope that not only would you be able to provide later on for yourselves, but also that I might enjoy a comfortable old age, be able to give an account to God of the education of my children, be free from all anxiety, devote myself to the welfare of my soul and thus be enabled to meet my death in peace.5

In relation to having pupils himself, Wolfgang described how he viewed students as an inconvenient obstacle. It is clear from this letter to his father that Wolfgang did not inherit Leopold’s inclination to teach ‘truth and purity’6: ‘I could have many more [students], it is true, if I chose to lower my terms,’ he wrote to his father. ‘I make it clearly understood that I am giving them as a favour. I would rather have three pupils who pay me well than six who pay badly’.7

Despite his indifferent approach to teaching, Wolfgang was evidently a competent and successful musical instructor. Some of the pupils who subsequently succeeded as musicians spoke of his charm, warmth and knowledge.8 This, as far as can be gathered, was a mixture of his supreme musical capabilities and the result of being the son of an obsessed pedagogue.9

Wolfgang’s seemingly lackadaisical attitude to his own son’s education reflects both his break from Leopold’s methods, and the radical reforms of primary education in Josephinian Vienna. While Wolfgang had two surviving sons, it is the education of his eldest, Karl Thomas (1784–1858), which is most relevant here.10

Unlike Nannerl and himself who were well-travelled children – Leopold modelled this form of education on Wieland’s Abderiten11 – Wolfgang and Constanze would

---

5 Letters, 464; Briefe, II, 256–257.
6 Versuch, 7.
7 Letters, 744; Briefe, III, 131.
8 The two most successful pupils were Ludwig van Beethoven (1770–1827) and Johann Nepomuk Hummel (1778–1837). While the former’s tuition was only fleeting owing to personal circumstances, Hummel boarded with the Mozarts in Vienna from 1786–1787. Hummel’s father wrote of his son’s experience: ‘Shortly after, my son Nepomuk moved to Mozart’s house, where he was treated like a son of the family. He was as comfortable and well cared for as possible; Wolfgang looked after him like a father, and Constanze cared for him like a mother’. MDB, 570.
10 Wolfgang and Constanze’s second surviving son was Franz Xaver Wolfgang (1791–1844). Despite his father dying within a year of his birth, he eventually became a notable composer, largely thanks to Constanze’s insistence on musical tuition. Franz Xaver (he later adopted the name ‘Wolfgang Amadeus junior’) was taught by some of the leading musicians of the age, including Hummel and Antonio Salieri (1750–1825). Incidentally, the story that Wolfgang was murdered by Salieri can almost wholly be refuted by the fact that Constanze willingly sought Salieri to teach her son.
11 See Chapter 3 for Leopold’s admiration of Wieland’s work.
often leave their own children in the company of wet-nurses or boarding schools whilst they toured. Thus, they left the instruction of Karl Thomas in the hands of a boarding school in the Viennese suburb of Perchtoldsdorf. In the letter that is universally recognised as Wolfgang’s last, written to his wife in Baden near Vienna, on 14 October 1791, he ridiculed the teaching methods of the school and believed Karl’s intellect to be suffering because of it. The difference in pedagogical principles and standards between Leopold and Wolfgang is nowhere more evident than here:

He is looking splendid. As far as his health is concerned, he could not be in a better place, but everything else there is wretched, alas! All they can do is to turn out a good peasant into the world. But enough of this. As his serious studies (God help them!) do not begin until Monday, I have arranged to keep him until after lunch on Sunday. I told them that you would like to see him. So tomorrow, Saturday, I shall drive out with Karl to see you. You can then keep him, or I shall take him back to Heeger’s after lunch. Think it over. A month can hardly do him much harm . . . On the whole, Karl is no worse; but at the same time he is not one whit better than he was. He still has his old bad manners; he never stops chattering just as he used to do in the past; and he is, if anything, less inclined to learn than before, for out there [at Perchtoldsdorf] all he does is to wander about in the garden for five hours in the morning and five hours in the afternoon, as he himself confessed. In short, the children do nothing but eat, drink, sleep and go for walks.12

When Wolfgang and Nannerl were children, Leopold had the advantage of instructing them prior to any systematic schooling method being adopted. Other options for him in Salzburg during the 1760s were to send his children to board or to employ the services of a private tutor or Hofmeister, a common practice among many middle-class parents.13 Presumably after his own education at the hands of the Jesuits in Augsburg, Leopold saw himself as fit to instruct his children in music and all other disciplines. Furthermore, his less than impressive progress through the Augsburg and then Salzburg education system left him determined to present Wolfgang and Nannerl with a more substantial, Continental education. Conversely for Wolfgang, as his above description of Karl’s schooling attests, arranging a solid educational foundation for his son was not the same priority as it had been for Leopold. Although this was as

---

12 Letters, 970–71; Briefe, IV, 162–163.
much to do with Wolfgang’s lack of interest in all forms of instruction, including teaching pupils, it was also a result of the education system in Vienna in 1791.

The education revolution in the Habsburg domains under the reign of Maria Theresa and then her sons Joseph and Leopold, brought about an immense upheaval in archaic and outdated institutions. The dissolution of the Jesuits in 1773 was the nucleus for the reforms that took place during the 1780s. Moreover, the Jesuits and their instruction methods had become a sore point for the Habsburgs themselves, who had grown suspicious and tired of their secretiveness. Maria Theresa, in particular, did not have much faith in the Jesuit education system. Advice given to her by her physician, Gerard van Swieten (1700–1772) – the father of Wolfgang’s friend and mentor, Gottfried – confirmed her doubt concerning the Society. He stated: ‘I am in a position to prove conclusively that the true aim of the Society was to make money, and that the religious motive was only a pretext to take advantage of the piety of Your Majesty and her ancestors’.  

Following the Jesuits’ dissolution in 1773 at the hands of Pope Clement XIV, Maria Theresa explained her attitude towards them:

I have not been well disposed towards the Society for many years. I removed both the education and spiritual guidance of myself and my children from it. No one was so determined as I, when the Society was suppressed, to take away from them all theological Chairs immediately.  

Joseph II saw the dissolution of the Jesuits as an opportunity to implement a new education system within his Empire. This passion, as is subsequently documented, burned in him long before the Society was disbanded. In only his second year as co-Emperor with his mother, he wrote of his inability to understand the education system that was then in place. ‘I begin with education,’ he wrote to her in 1766, laying down his early intentions,

---

14 While it was Maria Theresa and Joseph II who had most to do with the Mozarts and are, therefore, most relevant to this dissertation, Leopold should not be altogether forgotten. He became Leopold II upon the death of Joseph II in 1790. Wolfgang travelled to Frankfurt for his coronation and composed a new piano concerto for the festivities, presumably in an attempt to win favour with the new Emperor. See H. C. Robbins Landon, 1791: Mozart’s Last Year (Thames and Hudson, 1999) 11–20.
It is dearly neglected here. All that parents want is to see their children adopt certain attitudes of mind and manners corresponding to their own. The good souls think that they have achieved everything and have produced a great man for the State, if their son goes to mass, tells his beads, confesses every fortnight and reads only what he thinks his narrow-minded confessor would permit. As long as he does not raise his eyes from the ground, as long as he blushes in society, keeps one hand in his belt and the other in his jacket, can bow correctly or asks politely ‘What time is it?’ or ‘How do you do?’, who would venture to say: ‘He is a very nice young man, very well brought up’? ‘Yes’, I would like to reply, ‘if our State were a monastery and our neighbours Carthusian monks’.  

Joseph II’s remark concerning parents who wanted their children’s ideologies to correspond with their own, aptly reflects the social atmosphere in which it was written. The generational gap that existed between Leopold and Wolfgang mirrors to some extent the relationship between Maria Theresa and her eldest son. The submissive subject that Joseph spoke of was an allusion to his mother’s reign. Similarly, it summarises the behaviour of Leopold’s generation, which was taught to ‘endure’ the social prejudices and imbalances, and to remain ‘silent’. In Lenz’s 1774 play, Der Hofmeister, the Councillor acknowledges the folly involved in assuming a child would naturally inherit the social, professional, religious and philosophical outlook of the parent: ‘Our children should not and must not become what we were’, he declared. ‘The times are changing: customs, conditions, everything’.

Joseph was under no illusion as to the debt owed to the Jesuits for their dedication in educating the masses. The papal dissolution of the Order, which was now irrevocable, forced him to begin plans for reform. In the early 1780s, he detailed his vision:

The education of youth, at least of the most important part of it, in religion as well as in other subjects, has been until now almost entirely entrusted in these lands to the Fathers of the Society. Neither among the secular clergy nor in the other regular Orders will it be possible to find immediately, especially in the bigger towns, a sufficient number of qualified persons to fill the places of the Jesuits, with comparable success, in Gymnasien, academies and Universities, and to occupy the many endowed teaching posts. So it must be considered what provision should be made in education, especially in the noble academies and foundations, in the Theresianum, in the colleges at Olmütz, Prague, Tyrnau

17 Documents, 183.
18 Letters, 727; Briefe, III, 110.
19 Lenz, Der Hofmeister, 3.
and all other academies and Gymnasien, and whether it would not be desirable – indeed, for
the good of religion and the state, necessary – that even after the suppression of the Society,
teachers of this Order should remain in their existing posts, and on what basis one could keep
them on at least until [other] able persons can be trained to fill the teaching posts in
future and match the existing provisions.
It will take long application and preparation to educate teachers for this [sort of] instruction, to
which the whole institution of the Society was especially devoted.\textsuperscript{20}

This new pedagogical philosophy was soon applied to primary education.\textsuperscript{21} Its effect
was so great that Catherine II of Russia incorporated it into her own schooling
system.\textsuperscript{22}

While dissolution of the Jesuits in 1773 created an enormous hole in the
educational system of the Habsburg domains, it bequeathed an extremely valuable
amount of assets to the Empire. The total value of ex-Jesuit property was valued at
approximately thirteen million florins when in 1780 Joseph II became Emperor in his
own right.\textsuperscript{23} When this economic windfall first became available following the 1773
dissolution, however, Maria Theresa set in motion the process that would establish a
new and compulsory schooling system for children. She obtained the assistance of
Johann Ignaz Feltiger (1724–1788), a Jesuit-trained, Catholic school reformer from
Berlin, who despised the Jesuitical schooling system. His success as a pedagogical
bureaucrat warranted his appointment to the Commission on Education and the Lower
Austrian School Commission in Vienna on his arrival in 1774. As a result, he held the
highest authority on all matters relating to elementary schooling in the Imperial city
and its neighbouring territories.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{20} Aus der Zeit Maria Theresias. Tagebuch des Fürsten Khevenhüller-Metsch, kaiserlichen
Schlitter, eds., 53–56.
\textsuperscript{21} Ernst Wangermann, ‘Reform Catholicism and Political Radicalism in the Austrian Enlightenment’ in
Mikulas Teich, ed., 127–40. ‘A new instruction issued in November 1785 obliged primary school
teachers to impart rules by illustrating them with examples, asking the children questions about them
and demonstrating their practical application. The teachers were instructed to teach all subjects by
engaging their pupils singly in “Socratic dialogue”. Religious teaching was explicitly included in this
instruction’.
\textsuperscript{22} J. L. Black, Citizens for the Fatherland: Education, Educators, and Pedagogical Ideals in
\textsuperscript{23} Hanns Leo Mikoletzky, Österreich: Das grosse 18. Jahrhundert (Vienna, 1967) 250.
\textsuperscript{24} James van Horn Melton, Absolutism and the eighteenth-century origins of compulsory schooling in
Although Joseph eventually had Felbiger replaced following the latter’s unwarranted involvement in military education, the reformation of the Habsburg education system had already begun. Felbiger proudly proclaimed shortly before his forced resignation that well over two-hundred thousand children aged between five and twelve attended school, including twenty thousand for free because they could not afford the fees. This was a stark contrast to when Felbiger took on his role at the Commission on Education in 1774, when only a third of school age children in Vienna were receiving a formal education, and only a fifth in the provinces.

An anonymous memorandum written just prior to the Jesuit dissolution summarises the need for educational reform in the Habsburg domains. It embodied the sentiment of the Aufklärung, namely the necessity of education for all, irrespective of social standing or religious denomination. Although it contained an underlying message of ‘Enlightenment’, its essential agenda was to free the streets of those who could not be beneficial to the State. Written in 1771, this Viennese statement prophetically embodied the Josephinian spirit in relation to education:

The main purpose of our comprehensive school reform is to provide the poorest members of society with the enduring capacity to fulfil the duties pertaining to their occupation and station in life . . . Does not one observe daily how so many youths, left to their own devices, loiter in the streets and grow up into idle, ignorant beggars? How can the church and the State expect them to become anything other than useless and unskilled parasites who plagued the human race and the fatherland?

In relation to the general public, the subjects of ‘education’ and ‘enlightenment’ were universally synonymous. It is for this reason that this dissertation will conclude with the thoughts of the Aufklärer on how education would affect and shape the evolving society in which they lived.

---

26 van Horn Melton, Absolutism, 229.
27 van Horn Melton, Absolutism, 8.
28 This is precisely what Moses Mendelssohn warned in his answer to the Berlinische Monatsschrift question Was ist Aufklärung? from 1784: ‘Certain truths which are useful to the human being as a human being, can at times be harmful to him as a citizen’. In other words, the distinction between the enlightening of human beings and the enlightening of citizens should be made. See MPW, 315.
29 Nachricht an das Publikum. Von der Absicht und dem Nutzen des auf allerhöchsten Befehl verbesserten Schulwesens in Österreich unter der Enns (Vienna, 1771) 2.
In his *Skizzen von Wien* (*Sketches of Vienna, 1786–1790*) Johann Pezzl, a literary figure with whom Wolfgang was familiar,\(^{30}\) described a typical middle-class Viennese who had benefited from a well-rounded education:

In Vienna, the man in the street is upright, polite, openhearted, obliging, sincere, tractable, willing, and a good patriot, even if he doesn’t applaud the Emperor when he sees him on the streets, out walking, or in the theatre. He despises cunning, humbug, avarice, arrogance, slander, meanness and mistrust of foreigners. He is fair and punctilious in his daily affairs, accommodating with his neighbour, and friendly and well-disposed towards foreigners. His guiding principle is: live and let live . . . I am referring here not to the rabble but to the bourgeois or, to put it more precisely, professional men, tradesmen, lower-ranking court servants and servants of the nobility, shopkeepers; in short, the usual kind of people between the nobility and domestic servants.\(^{31}\)

It was this class of people, or rather citizens, who were the nucleus of a truly enlightened nation. At either end of the scale, the process of education and subsequently ‘Enlightenment’ was not viewed as an imperative undertaking. Furthermore, as one anonymous categorisation from 1791 stated, although the notion of Enlightened principles had been discussed and dissected throughout the eighteenth century, this was only from the perspective of one rather elite section of the population:

The Aufklärung is usually divided into the academic Aufklärung of the universities and the general Aufklärung of the public at large. And quite rightly so. The former is the pathfinder of the latter, it bears the torch. An opinion may be expounded in the lecture–room for twenty, thirty years before it is accepted and is put into practice by the general public.\(^{32}\)

Comparably to the educated and scholarly elite, the lowest class of citizenry was not considered pivotal in the process of Enlightenment. Theodor Heinsius (1770–1849) outlined in his *Ideen und Vorschläge zu der höchstnötigen Verbesserrung des Landschulwesens* (*Ideas and Proposals for the collaborative Betterment of Country*

\(^{30}\) Discovered in Wolfgang’s personal library was a copy of Pezzl’s publication *Faustin, oder Das aufgeklärte philosophische Jahrhundert* (*Faustin, or the Enlightened Philosophical Century, 1783*). *MDB*, 602.


Schools, 1798) the impracticability and uselessness of attempting to educate and, therefore, enlighten all classes of society:

I would be very much misunderstood if one were to believe I intended to acquaint the peasant systematically with the full extent of these sciences. That is neither possible nor useful. The slumbering mental capacities of these crude natural men could not comprehend such matters, and even if one were to do everything to awaken them, such learning would be neither intelligible nor useful to them. 33

Not as harsh as Heinsius, but nonetheless forthright in his estimation, was Johann Heinrich Tieftrunk (1759–1837), who similarly suggested that a ‘majority’, rather than every citizen, should be given formal education in order to gain Enlightenment. In his Über den Einfluß der Aufklärung auf Revolutionen (On the Influence of Enlightenment on Revolutions, 1794), he declared that:

Not the parroting of a single great writer but rather knowledge acquired through one’s own activity, makes one truly enlightened. And for a nation to be called fully enlightened, such knowledge must be possessed not merely by a few individuals, by rather by the majority of the population and especially by those who are entrusted with the education of a nation. 34

The Enlightenment process of the broader middle-classes and Weltbürgertum – the Mozarts’ class – was the essential purpose of education for writers of the late eighteenth century. As Kant forewarned, however, this process should be a slow one, because the violent overthrowing of a system, government, or monarchy will only replace the old prejudices with new ones. Kant’s thoughts on Enlightenment foresaw the bloody ramifications of the French Revolution. 35

The schism in educational ideologies between Leopold and Wolfgang reflected a social difference that was far larger than any teaching method or instruction manual. Whereas Leopold belonged to an age in which obedience to the

33 Theodor Heinsius, Ideen und Vorschläge zu der höchstnötigen Verbesserung des Landschulwesens in der Mark Brandenburg (Leipzig, 1798) and Helmut König, Zur Geschichte der Nationalerziehung in Deutschland im letzten Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960) 64.
35 Kant postulated: ‘So harmful is it to implant prejudices, for they later take vengeance on their cultivators or on their descendants. Thus the public can only slowly attain enlightenment. Perhaps a fall of personal despotism or of avaricious or tyrannical oppression may be accomplished by revolution, but never a true reform in ways of thinking. Rather, new prejudices will serve as well as old ones to harness the great unthinking masses’. KPW, 55.
nobility was expected, Wolfgang was born into the generation that shook those foundations to its core. Similarly, yet reciprocally, it was Leopold who took education and the pursuit of principles and knowledge so seriously. Wolfgang’s uninterested attitude to education did not reflect the generation into which he was born, or his relocation to Vienna during Joseph II’s period of ‘Enlightened’ reforms. Essentially, it was Leopold’s drive to teach ‘truth and purity’, as dictated in his ‘enlightened’ Versuch,\(^{36}\) that separates his agenda from that of Wolfgang. The younger Mozart may have embodied his generation’s intolerance of the nobility and its stance on political and social freedom, as best represented by Kant’s definition of Enlightenment; however his personal indifference to the education of his son Karl and his pupils, belies the principles to which his father passionately adhered.

\(^{36}\) *Versuch*, 7.
Conclusion

This dissertation was conceived with the objective of viewing the social, literary and philosophical evolution of the eighteenth century from the perspective of Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart. The Enlightenment, and particularly in this dissertation, the German *Aufklärung*, was an intellectual movement which attempted to emend many of society’s seeming imbalances, such as class structure and church authority. Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart perceived the same *Aufklärung*; however, they implemented their understanding in different and conflicting ways. While neither Leopold nor Wolfgang contributed to the outcome of the *Aufklärung*, they both responded to and chronicled its course. The manner in which they embraced many of its principles and ideals illustrates how receptive they were to the age in which they lived.

Ultimately, however, they held incompatible attitudes in relation to the manner in which one should live. For many of the *Aufklärer*, the imbalance of class structure was a driving force in their pursuit of social change. For the middle-class – to which the Mozarts belonged – this struggle was one of the constant factors confronting their existence. For Wolfgang, in particular, the insignificance of musicians and their ‘servant’ status irked him greatly. His confrontation with his employer, the Prince–Archbishop Colloredo in 1781, was an archetypal example of Wolfgang’s personality and, furthermore, his generation. Leopold – who by this stage had relinquished the rebellious and radical days of his youth – was unable to conjure up a similar fortitude or spirit. This, as demonstrated throughout this dissertation, was the underlining distinction between the Mozart men’s generations. Wolfgang’s willingness to question his place and existence in society was much more than Leopold could ever have achieved. This distinction between Leopold and his son is revealed in two separate yet related letters written by Wolfgang.

The first of the two letters was written to Leopold on 9 May 1781 – which was precisely amid the furor between Wolfgang and the Prince–Archbishop. He explained to his father the circumstances that led to their argument. The barrage of insults that he encountered – according to Wolfgang – infuriated him immensely. He wrote:
He called me a rascal and a dissolute fellow and told me to be off. And I – endured it all, although I felt that not only my honour but yours was being attacked. But, as you would have it so, I was silent.¹

It is highly necessary to emphasize Wolfgang’s comment – ‘as you would have it so, I was silent’ – because this establishes the generational and ideological gulf between him and his father. Leopold had instructed his son to remain obedient to the nobility, as was the standard of the age.

Following on from this incident, Wolfgang wrote again to his father on 4 July of the same year. Still seething over the manner in which the Prince–Archbishop and his assistant, Arco, had attacked him, Wolfgang defiantly defended his actions to Leopold. What is more, he pleaded with his father to stand up to the court as well. The remarkable aspect of the following passage is that the roles in the Leopold–Wolfgang relationship are here reversed. Unlike the usual situation in which Leopold instructed his son in the task at hand, on this occasion Wolfgang laid forth what he expected of his father. The social expectation that Wolfgang required from his father was beyond Leopold’s capability. Wolfgang wrote:

I have not written to Count Arco and shall not do so, since you ask me to desist for the sake of your peace of mind. It is just as I suspected. You really are too timid, and yet you have nothing whatsoever to fear; for you – you yourself are as much insulted as I am. I do not ask you to make a row or even to put forward the slightest complaint. But the Archbishop and the whole pack of them must be afraid of speaking to you on the subject. For you, my father, need have no scruples in saying boldly (if you are driven to it) that you would be ashamed of having brought up a son who would allow himself to be grossly insulted by such an infamous scoundrel as Arco; and you may assure them all that if I had the good fortune to meet him today, I should treat him as he deserves and he would certainly remember me as long as he lived. All I insist on, and nothing else, is that you should show the whole world that you are not afraid. Be silent, if you choose; but when necessary, speak – and speak in such a way that people will remember it.²

Again, the outstanding comments here are: ‘You really are too timid . . . All I insist on, and nothing else, is that you should show the whole world that you are not afraid. Be silent, if you choose; but when necessary, speak – and speak in such a way that

¹ Letters, 727; Briefe, III, 110.
² Letters, 749; Briefe, III, 136.
people will remember it’. Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s distinctly contrasting *modus operandi* are described here in a straightforward manner. Wolfgang’s generation emerged into an uneasily shifting environment. According to historian W. J. Turner, it was one in which the ‘seeds of revolution had already been sown’.3

In order to better understand this generational divide, Chapter 1 showed the life of Leopold Mozart before Wolfgang’s birth in 1756. The importance of this chapter, therefore, was in its exploration of the foundations from which the multi-dimensional Mozart relationship grew. Leopold’s role in Mozart biography has generally been relegated to a subsidiary one over the past two centuries. Chapter 1 attempted to dissipate some of these misconceptions by accentuating the fact that Wolfgang’s life was enormously affected by his father’s experiences as a youth. As this dissertation has illustrated, the death of Johann Georg Mozart in 1736 affected Leopold enormously. In 1778, when Wolfgang was showing the first signs of withdrawing from Leopold’s control, the father made sure to remind his son of his good fortune in receiving fatherly advice:

> As you know, it has ever been my habit to reflect and consider; and but for this I should not have got on as well as I have, for I never had anyone to advise me; and, as you are aware, from my youth up I have never confided in anyone until I had definite proofs of his sincerity.4

The fastidiousness with which Leopold subsequently educated his children should be attributed to the events prior to 1756. His grand pedagogical plan – which is explained in various chapters of this dissertation – is largely established in Chapter 1. Within this opening chapter we learnt of his desperation to be regarded as one of the Men of Letters. His *Versuch*, of which he was proud, was his *magnum opus*, and intended to underline his status as a supreme pedagogue. Similarly, his fascination and admiration for celebrated Men of Letters – namely, Gellert and Gottsched – and fellow pedagogues – namely, Erasmus and Fénélon – illustrated how keen he was to be considered a supreme instructor and educator of children. His declaration to Nannerl towards the end of his life that ‘You know I understand what youth is, I have studied children and young people’,5 proved not only that he was fascinated with instruction,
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4 *Letters*, 524; *Briefe*, II, 335.
5 *Briefe*, III, 407.
but that he was also continuing to think of education in the twilight of his life. His
desperate attempts to mould another musical genius in Nannerl’s son, ‘Leopoldl’,
which is detailed in Chapter 6, is the final example of his lifelong education crusade.

Finally, Leopold’s pedagogical campaign and his strained relations with his
son during their final years are best demonstrated when juxtaposed with Wolfgang’s
own attitude to education. The purpose of Chapter 7 was to demonstrate the method in
which Wolfgang instructed his own child. The contrast between Wolfgang’s
technique and Leopold’s fanatical method is most evident here. Although the
educational reforms in the Habsburg domains were also influential, it was Leopold’s
and Wolfgang’s respective approaches to education which were most decisive.

Isolated from the chronological order of this dissertation is Chapter 2, which
established the differences in aesthetic opinion between father and son Mozart. This,
however, was a natural sequel to the first chapter because it follows from Leopold’s
aesthetic opinion on art, which is to be found predominantly in his Versuch. This
seminal work not only demonstrated Leopold’s abilities as a teacher and violinist, but
laid out his most fundamental thoughts in relation to music, aesthetics, and art.
Leopold considered it a rite of passage for Men of Letters to publish a treatise relating
to their specific field. Although his dream to be included in the circle of German Men
of Letters was not realised, his stylistic and artistic pursuits remained throughout his
life.

Furthermore, this chapter demonstrated how Leopold and Wolfgang differed
in relation to the aesthetic notions and principles of the age. Without this chapter, the
task of illustrating their differences would have been much more arduous. It also
proves that any artist – whether of Leopold or Wolfgang’s calibre – is not immune to
their social, literary, or artistic environment. One cannot justifiably document the
lives of the Mozarts without taking into consideration the aesthetic Zeitgeist.

The third chapter of this dissertation showed the early evolution of the
Mozarts’ relationship. It also continued to demonstrate how influenced Leopold was
by the ideas and pursuits of the Aufklärung. Often overshadowed by his son’s early
musical development, Leopold’s construction of the Grand Tour and the subsequent
tours of Vienna and Italy demonstrate more about his own agenda than that of his son.
While Wolfgang was primarily the instrument by which he justified these tours, he
saw the Tour as an opportunity for him to establish his reputation as an Enlightened
pedagogue of the highest order. Furthermore, these travels were the most extensive
Leopold himself had ever undertaken, and the experience of visiting Paris, London, the Hague, Vienna and Rome – the largest and most vibrant centres for Enlightened thinkers – was not lost on him. Any quick survey of Leopold’s correspondence and his eclectic collections of contemporaneous instruments and memorabilia from these journeys will substantiate Leopold’s interest in matters not exclusively relating to music.⁶

In actual fact these journeys had an adverse effect on the elder Mozart. The liberal attitudes and radicalism that Leopold discovered in these cities caused him to re-evaluate his allegiances. While many of the leading contributors to the Aufklärung and broader European Enlightenment either denounced or questioned Christian dogma, Leopold was unable to relinquish his faith. In Paris and Rome, in particular, the progressive and free-thinking individuals he encountered shocked him, and consequently strengthened his Catholicism. By investigating Leopold’s spiritual evolution during this period, it becomes clear that he would never have aligned himself with any philosophical strand more extreme than the moderate Aufklärung.

To complete the third chapter, the relationship between the Mozarts and Christoph Martin Wieland was discussed. Much more than any other prominent writer of the eighteenth century, Wieland’s work was a common ground on which Leopold and Wolfgang could meet. Additionally, this chapter placed Wieland’s literary importance to the eighteenth century in context with the Mozarts’ relationship. He was aptly situated between the crossover period between Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s generations, whereas with other literary figures such as Gellert, whom Leopold greatly admired, such interest was not reciprocated by his son.⁷ Similarly, Leopold had a strong aversion to Voltaire, whereas Wolfgang displayed an interest in the Frenchman’s work, which was demonstrated in Chapter 4.⁸

Both Leopold and Wolfgang had genuine affection for Wieland. Once again, this section displays how responsive and reactive the Mozarts were to literary forces. Their repeated mention of and reference to some of Wieland’s writings not only demonstrate their interest in and knowledge of him, but further validates the notion

⁷ See *Letters*, 110; *Briefe*, I, 309
⁸ See Chapter 4 for discussion on Voltaire and the likelihood that Wolfgang’s *Zaide* was influenced by Voltaire’s *Zaire.*
that they were actively aware of much contemporary literature. It was necessary to
discuss the importance of Wieland during Chapter 3 because it set the scene for the
following chapter, which details Leopold and Wolfgang’s relationship progressing
through the first signs of the latter’s emerging independence. The discussion of
Wieland prior to this placed their relationship within the context of the ever-shifting
literary and philosophical ambience of the eighteenth century.

What the fourth chapter of this dissertation aimed to achieve was to look
closely at the period when Wolfgang was in Paris with his mother, and suggest how
that affected his relationship with Leopold. It was during this period that the
incompatibility of the aging Leopold and the rapidly maturing Wolfgang is first
clearly defined. What is more, the impact of events such as Maria Anna’s death and
Wolfgang’s defection to Vienna in 1781, are considered in relation to the age. The
1770s witnessed the emergence of a new literary force. Wolfgang’s generation
included writers such as the young Goethe, Schiller, Klinger, and Lenz, all of whom
were actively involved in what was later classified as the *Sturm und Drang*
movement. It became clear throughout Chapter 4 how typical Wolfgang was of his
generation. Although he did not contribute to the mechanisms or doctrine of the
above-mentioned movement, he was the quintessential example of how representative
the writings of the *Stürmer und Dränger* were of their generation. Although the *Sturm
und Drang* period was a relatively brief manifestation, its impact and relevance were
nonetheless lastingly important. Its youthful contributors confronted many pertinent
issues such as nationalism, patronage, the dynamics of a father and son relationship,
and the ethics of death and suicide. These dilemmas were so intrinsically tied to
Wolfgang’s life during this period that, as Chapters 4 and 6 demonstrated, he himself
was a microcosm of the evolving eighteenth century, and this led to his eventual

9 It is dangerous to attempt to define the beginning and end of any single social-political-literary
movement. Philosophies and ideas are usually discussed and dissected for decades before they really
conquer the public’s imagination. As historian T. C. W. Blanning has noted in regards to the
*Aufklärung*: ‘The *Aufklärung* is usually divided into the academic *Aufklärung* of the universities and
the general *Aufklärung* of the public at large. And quite rightly so. The former is the pathfinder of the
latter, it bears the torch. An opinion may be expounded in the lecture-room for twenty, thirty years
before it is accepted and is put into practice by the general public’. See Blanning, ‘The Enlightenment
in Catholic Germany’ in *The Enlightenment in National Context*, 118–26. In regard to the *Sturm und
Drang*, however, it has been suggested that the movement’s starting point can be pinpointed to
September 1770, because that was when Herder visited Strasbourg and met the young Goethe. See
Sven Aage Jørgensen, *Aufklärung, Sturm und Drang, frühe Klassik: 1740–1789* (München: Beck,
1990) 434.
departure from Salzburg, abandonment of princely patronage and, ultimately, his father, Leopold.

Similar to the second chapter, with its momentary deviation from the chronological order of this dissertation, Chapter 5 was written to demonstrate both Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s attitudes to one of the most prevalent issues confronting citizens of the eighteenth century. For the Aufklärer, the notion of religious and ethical tolerance was a decisive predicament that permeated all German lands. In relation to the Mozarts, the issue was applicable during their many travels, but particularly while Wolfgang was residing in Vienna from 1781 to 1791. Under the reformist Joseph II’s reign, Wolfgang witnessed an unprecedented array of religious and ethnic reforms that, in turn, influenced the circle with which he associated.

The sixth chapter of this dissertation detailed the lives of Leopold and Wolfgang while the latter lived in Vienna. In sidestepping Wolfgang’s involvement in Freemasonry this chapter chose to highlight some other issues relating to his and Leopold’s lives against the backdrop of the Aufklärung. The first subject discussed was Wolfgang’s relationship with women in Vienna, particularly his future wife, Constanze, and the importance of womanhood during the Aufklärung. Leopold’s anguish vis-à-vis Constanze and his son’s decision to marry her was one of the decisive factors in the father and son’s relationship. Leopold acknowledged that Constanze had replaced him as the most important figure in Wolfgang’s life, and realised that his final years would be spent separated from his son.

Consequently, this led to Leopold’s decision to educate his grandson, ‘Leopoldl’. Having lost regular contact with Wolfgang, Leopold turned his attention to Nannerl’s son and began instructing him in rhetoric and music. Although only an infant, Leopold looked past his grandson’s age and embraced the Aufklärung notion that one was never too young to begin learning. It is evident from his correspondence with Nannerl during this period that he envisaged a new Wunderkind in ‘Leopoldl’. His tutoring of ‘Leopoldl’ is the final chapter in the life of a pedagogue who insisted that he knew the secrets of a fine education because he had meticulously ‘studied children and young people’.  

A necessary subject for discussion in relation to this dissertation and, indeed in relation to Wolfgang’s life in Vienna, was the emergence of national identity amongst
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10 Briefe, III, 407.
Germans. Wolfgang’s frustration at the lack of national theatres and institutions was an archetypal feature of his generation. The importance of this subject was to demonstrate another marked dissimilarity between him and his father. Furthermore, it brought together Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s various attitudes to neighbouring countries. While Leopold was willing to embrace foreign ideas and objects because they all conformed to a larger Enlightened agenda, Wolfgang came to centre his attention more on German ideals. The passion with which he argued for a more organised national identity was, again, an offshoot of the Sturm und Drang movement, which had influenced him during the late 1770s. It was the Stürmer und Dränger, after all, who had first ignited the flames of patriotism that led to the explosive fervency of German nationalism during the nineteenth century.

Additionally, it was the Sturm und Drang movement that modelled the final subject of this chapter. The idea of death and, in particular, the ethics associated with suicide, formed the basis of the conclusion to Chapter 6. Leopold’s death in 1787 is discussed and, in turn, related to his wife Maria Anna’s death a decade earlier while in Paris with Wolfgang. Their son’s attitude to their respective deaths was dissected in relation to the various attitudes of the age. Furthermore, the notion that Wolfgang contemplated self-murder in response to his incessant melancholy whilst in Paris in 1778 was put forward. The ethics of suicide were a constant topic during the 1770s following its accentuation by the Stürmer and Dränger, most notably Goethe and his sensational offering, Werther. Although Wolfgang did not commit such an act, it remains possible – through his sentiments and affinity with his generation – that such a thought was not too far from his mind.\footnote{It has been cleverly noted by Henri Brunschwig that despite their glorification and defence of self-murder, not one of the writers from the Sturm und Drang actually committed suicide. See Brunschwig, \textit{Enlightenment and Romanticism in Eighteenth-Century Prussia}, 220.}

The concluding chapter to this dissertation demonstrates the non-realisation of Leopold’s pedagogical dream. Wolfgang’s attitude and application in educating his son, Karl Thomas, is subsequently discussed to highlight its differences to Leopold’s draconian method. Joseph II’s reformation of the education system throughout the Habsburg Empire, was one of the deciding factors in this dissimilarity. By creating a series of rules and regulations in regard to children’s primary schooling, Vienna, fundamentally, took the responsibility of teaching from Wolfgang and placed it in the hands of formal instructors. Wolfgang’s seemingly indifferent approach to his son’s
education, and reluctance to instruct music, was far removed from his father’s desire to be regarded as a supreme pedagogue of the *Aufklärung*. By concluding the chapter with pertinent statements and attitudes regarding the importance of education and Enlightenment, the divergent convictions of Leopold and Wolfgang and their attitudes to the philosophies of the *Aufklärung* became manifestly clear.

When Wolfgang wrote to his father from Vienna on 24 March 1781, he was in the process of withdrawing from the service of the Prince–Archbishop of Salzburg. He spoke of his desire to be employed by the recently anointed Emperor Joseph II. In the letter, he clarified for Leopold his attitude towards not only his Salzburg employers but all patronage in general. He stated:

> If he wants me, he must pay me, for the honour alone of serving him is not enough.\(^\text{12}\)

It has been the objective throughout this dissertation to demonstrate the contrasting perspectives of the *Aufklärung* as seen – often simultaneously – through the eyes of Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart. In doing so, three main points have been made. Namely – but in no particular order – Leopold’s preoccupation with education and his yearning to be considered amongst the Men of Letters of the *Aufklärung*; Leopold’s and Wolfgang’s incompatible attitude to social structure and the behaviour that was required of their respective standing; and, finally, the difficulties in maintaining a close father–son relationship in the rapidly evolving eighteenth century.

In conclusion, the largest contributing factor to the relationship between Leopold and his son, Wolfgang, was the social environment in which they lived. They differed on many musical ideas, as demonstrated in Chapter 2, yet this was further compounded by the evolution in German literature, aesthetics, and philosophy. This dissertation has demonstrated, particularly in Chapters 1 through 4, that Wolfgang’s life can not be adequately understood without first examining that of Leopold. The elder Mozart’s over-emphasis on education and the careful manner in which he raised his children, is an essential ingredient in comprehending the eventual friction that came between him and Wolfgang. While Leopold’s ambition to become a contributor to the *Aufklärung* did not progress further than the publication of his *Versuch*, his idealistic pedagogical philosophies and assortment of scientific paraphernalia demonstrate how loyal he remained to the *Aufklärung* in general.

\(^{12}\) *Letters*, 799–800; *Briefe*, III, 201.
Wolfgang, on the other hand, who is often placed atop an ‘Enlightenment’ pedestal because of his late operas, is proved to have possessed quite different ideologies from his father. Although he evidently inherited many of his father’s liberal leanings, he was born into a different age and generation. Wolfgang’s keenness to escape his father’s controlling parenting during his journey to and stay in Paris in the late 1770s, developed simultaneously with the Sturm und Drang movement – a literary phenomenon which encapsulated the sufferings of father and son. The movement also furthered the early ideas of the Aufklärung concerning class structure and subservience, and injected them with an often bombastic but always vigorous tone. This was a key and pivotal difference between Wolfgang and Leopold, and one underlined throughout this dissertation.

Once their respective attitudes towards literature, style, social responsibility, education, fashion, nationalism, religious tolerance, and music are considered, it becomes easier to understand how the relationship between Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart was unable to remain harmonious.
Leopold made sure to mention he had visited the statue of Erasmus in his correspondence. Leopold shared many of Erasmus’ pedagogical ideals.
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Plate 2

‘Descent from the Cross’. Peter Paul Rubens. 1612–1614.

The artwork of Rubens made an impression on Leopold during the family’s travels, and the ‘Descent from the Cross’ was one such painting mentioned by him.
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Plate 3

Wolfgang wearing the Order of the Golden Spur. Unknown artist. 1777.

Not only was Wolfgang very proud of this award, but he was pleased with the portrait as well. He spoke of how the artist managed to capture his ‘serious air’.
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