

Mozart, Fragment of a Sinfonia Concertante in A for violin, viola, cello and orchestra, Fr 1779 (K. 320e): two completions and three cadenzas

Editorial Introduction

The Historical Context of the Fragment

The only authentic source of this piece is the autograph manuscript held by the Bibliotheca Mozartiana of the International Mozart Foundation in Salzburg.¹ The document has four leaves of *Querformat* paper ruled with 10 staves, on a paper type that Mozart used between 1779 and 1781, and the score fills all eight pages with one system per page. The title, given in Mozart's hand at the top of the first page, reads: 'Sinfonia Concertante à tre istromenti / violin, viola, e Violoncello'. The tempo marking in Mozart's hand is 'All[egr]o'. The 134-bar fragment consists of a completed 51-bar opening ritornello, and the *particella* of a 68-bar first solo section, a seven-bar middle ritornello, and the first eight bars of the second solo section.² In the solo sections the solo staves are complete,³ but the orchestral lines are only notated (incompletely) for two brief punctuating passages in bars 74–77¹ and 96–101¹. In the middle ritornello (bars 120–127¹) only the violin 1 and basso lines are notated. In the second solo section (b. 127ff), only the solo violin and viola lines are notated.

Despite the incomplete state of the last 83 bars of the fragment, it appears to contain all the thematic substance of the movement, including a new theme at the start of the second solo section. But the source gives singularly little information about the orchestra's accompanying role during the solo sections. Mozart's only other concertante for three instruments, the Concerto for three pianos K. 242 of February 1776, is not a useful model for a completion because of the self-sufficiency of each of its solo instruments and the deliberately unbalanced role of the three pianos. And although Mozart might well have known the *Sinfonia Concertante* in A for violin, viola and cello by Ignaz Holzbauer, the Mannheim-based composer whose church music and opera *Gunther von Schwarzburg* he singularly admired, it is a work whose resemblance to Fr 1779b is so slight that it cannot be regarded as a significant influence on the substance of Mozart's piece.⁴ Nor do we have any concrete information about the intended soloists for the piece or a likely occasion for an intended first performance. For stylistic models for the fragment, it is necessary to turn to contemporaneous works by Mozart himself.

Mozart's interest in concertos for multiple instruments was at its height in the late 1770s, during and after his visits to Paris and Mannheim. The *sinfonia concertante* genre came to prominence in both

¹ Signature KV⁶ 320e. A facsimile of the manuscript is in *NMA X:30/4*, pp 44–51, with Ulrich Konrad's commentary on pp 323–3.

² Strictly speaking, the opening ritornello is also a *particella*, because the oboe and horn staves are blank in bars 5–8 and the oboe staves in bars 29–30; but the context makes it clear that whole-bar rests are intended in both instances.

³ The blank bars in the solo parts – cello bars 62–3, all three instruments bars 98–100, cello bars 110–111 – are clearly intended to be whole-bar rests.

⁴ There is a recording of Holzbauer's A major *Sinfonia concertante* by Camerata Bern: *Die Mannheimer Schule* (Deutsche Grammophon, Archiv).

those cities during the 1770s and had reached in peak in its popularity in Paris at the time of Mozart's visit in 1778.⁵ In 1778 and 1779 he worked on at least six works of this type:

- Concerto for flute and harp K. 299/297c
- Sinfonia Concertante for four wind instruments K. 297b
- Concerto for piano and violin Fr 1778b (K. 315f)
- Concerto for two pianos K. 365/316a
- Sinfonia Concertante for violin and viola K. 364/320d
- Sinfonia Concertante for violin, viola and cello Fr 1779b (K. 320e)

in addition to the concertante movements in the 'Posthorn' Serenade K. 320.⁶

Mozart's nomenclature seems rather casual, and it is not clear that he made any significant generic distinction between 'concerto' and 'sinfonia concertante' in these works.⁷ Only four of these pieces can be dated with certainty: K. 297b and K. 299/297c to April 1778, Fr 1778b to November 1778, and K. 320 to 3 August 1779. The detailed chronology of the other three pieces, K. 364, K. 365 and Fr 1779b, is speculative. None of them is mentioned in the Mozart family correspondence, and the surviving source materials have little to contribute to the question. Ulrich Konrad has put forward the hypothesis that they were written in 1779 in the order Fr 1779b, K. 365, K. 364 on stylistic grounds.⁸ He notes that in both K. 364 and K. 365 the opening ritornello contains a 'false' second subject, a procedure that became standard in Mozart's Viennese piano concertos (from 1782 onwards) but was not a feature of his earlier concertos. The opening ritornello of Fr 1779b does not contain a 'false' second subject. Why, asks Konrad, would Mozart secure the significant stylistic development of a 'false' second subject in K. 364 and K. 365, and subsequently revert to the older type in Fr 1779b? It follows, then, that Fr 1779b must be an earlier work.⁹ But is Konrad right to see artistic 'progress' in such a strictly linear way? For example, the Piano Concerto K. 488 (completed in 1786) has no 'false' second subject in its opening ritornello, but it is hard to imagine a plausible

⁵ See Barry S. Brook, 'The Symphonie Concertante: its Musical and Sociological Bases', *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music*, 25 (1994), 131–148.

⁶ Mozart's earlier ensemble concertos, the Concertone K. 190/186E and the Concerto for three pianos K. 242, chronologically and stylistically stand outside this period of intense focus on the genre. After 1779 aspects of ensemble-concerto thinking appear most clearly in three soprano arias: 'Se il padrei perdei' in *Idomeneo* Act 2; 'Traurigkeit war mir zum Lose' in *Die Entführung* Act 2; and the incomplete 'Et incarnatus est' from the fragmentary Mass in C minor K. 427/417a.

⁷ Brook speculated that 'concerto' may have signified work designed for performance by amateurs (for example, K. 299/297a) and 'sinfonia concertante' a work for professionals to perform in a large public venue (for example, K. 297b); but this distinction hardly holds for Fr 1778b or K. 365. To complicate matters, the first page of the autograph manuscript of K. 299 has no title in Mozart's hand, and the manuscripts of K. 297b and K. 364 are lost. Ulrich Konrad notes a pattern: works with a non-orchestral soloist are called 'concerto', those whose soloists are orchestral instruments are called 'sinfonia concertante' (see Ulrich Konrad, 'Mozarts "Gruppenkonzerte" aus den letzten Salzburger Jahren: Probleme der Chronologie und Deutung' in Reinmar Emans and Matthias Wendt (eds), *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Konzerts: Festschrift Siegfried Kross zum 60. Geburtstag* (Bonn: Gudrain Schröder, 1990), 141–57: p. 144). This is an intriguing proposition, but hardly affects detailed stylistic issues.

⁸ Ulrich Konrad:1990. The surviving manuscript materials for all three of those pieces is on a paper type that Mozart began using in the middle of 1779 (the earliest datable work written on that paper type is K. 319 of July 1779). So, apart from establishing a *terminus post quem* for the works, the autograph material does not help with questions of chronology.

⁹ Konrad:1990, p. 154.

critical argument that the movement is formally more primitive than the concertos from 1784 and 1785.¹⁰ Konrad's chronological hypothesis *may* be correct, but it remains conjectural.

Why did Mozart abandon work on Fr 1779b? No historian has been able to identify a suitable occasion for its intended first performance in Salzburg, and crucially it is not even clear that the Salzburg Kapelle had three soloists capable of performing the work.¹¹ It is possible that Mozart, having completed the solo lines of the first solo section, discovered that none of the local players could meet the taxing demands of his cello writing.¹² But such a miscalculation seems out of character. An alternative hypothesis is that Mozart was writing the piece speculatively, with a forthcoming trip to Munich – and the former Mannheim virtuoso cellists that had relocated there – in mind.¹³ If, unusually, Fr 1779b was a speculative project, then it is more likely that Mozart stopped working on it because of compositional problems.

The Style of the Fragment

To identify potential problems, and to seek solutions in attempting to complete Fr 1779b, it is worth comparing the fragment with the Sinfonia Concertante K. 364, starting with their most general characteristics before focusing on details. What is immediately striking is the number of respects in which the first movements seem to be broadly conceived as a contrasting pair. Aside from the tritone between the two work's tonalities, the famously dark *tinto* of K. 364 – with its constantly divided violas (often into four voices), independent cello and basso writing (with the cellos doubling the violas to give their tenor voicing extra body), the depth of sound contributed by the writing for the horns in E flat, and the solo viola scordatura of a raised semitone – finds an antipode in the brightness of Fr 1779b, with its bright horns in A, its focus on the higher tessitura of its instruments, the prevalence of three open strings in its violin and solo viola parts, and the added brilliance of the solo viola scordatura raised by a whole tone. Broad formal and stylistic comparisons must be speculative, given the fragmentary state of Fr 1779b, but in even the most cursory comparison of the opening ritornellos and first solo sections of the two pieces two features stand out. The first is how the thematic luxuriance of K. 364 contrasts with the more stringent thematic economy of Fr 1779b.¹⁴ In K. 364 the opening ritornello is a chain of seven themes, and the first solo section a further chain of seven completely different themes.¹⁵ But thematic repetition plays a significant role

¹⁰ An obvious objection to my point here is that the opening ritornello of the first movement of K. 488 was probably written several years before the movement was finished, and what makes the finished movement sophisticated is what Mozart did with the formal 'primitivism' of the opening ritornello when he came back to the piece to complete it in the Spring of 1786. However, my underlying point is that this particular formal issue is not an incontrovertible guide to a work's date.

¹¹ Ulrich Konrad:1990 notes that at least two of the court violinists, Antonio Brunetti and Joseph Hafeneder, had the virtuoso credentials for the violin part, and that one of them could have taken the solo viola part too (not Mozart?); but there is no evidence of similar virtuoso abilities on the part of the two court cellists Antonio Ferrari and Joseph Zugeisen.

¹² This hypothesis might be supported by the fact that the fragment seems to break off at the moment when the solo cello is about to make its first appearance in the second solo section.

¹³ A return visit to Paris was surely unthinkable at that time and, as events were to demonstrate in the 1780s, Vienna was not fertile ground for the sinfonia concertante. But if this hypothesis is correct, and Mozart was thinking ahead to Munich and *Idomeneo*, then Konrad's proposed date for the fragment (early summer of 1779) might be too early.

¹⁴ I'm not attaching a value judgement to either position: merely noting the contrast.

¹⁵ In the middle ritornello, too, the first idea is new, but the second theme (bars 168–173) is a developed reprise of bars 58–62 from the opening ritornello. The second solo section is also a concatenation of new

in Fr 1779b. The opening motive, which starts the movement gently, is transformed into a forceful tutti within the opening ritornello (at bars 31–6). A syncopated piece of two-part counterpoint that first appears in bars 13–14 reappears twice more in the opening ritornello (bars 20–21 and bars 39–44), punctuates the first solo section at bars 74–76¹, and forms the entire substance of the middle ritornellos (bars 120–127¹).¹⁶ And the secondary theme from the opening ritornello (bars 22–30) is reprised in V at bars 96–105¹ in the first solo section. The second, related, feature concerns both the size and relative proportions of the different formal components in the earlier stages of each movement. In K. 364 the *feel* of the first solo section is of broad paragraphs containing a beautifully balanced, varied and well paced series of ideas for the soloists; but the *feel* of Fr 1779b is of less sure-footed pacing and – in places – a certain short-windedness in which there is tension between the character and function of the material. How surprising, then, that the proportions between opening ritornellos, first solo section and middle ritornellos are roughly the same in both pieces (approximately in the proportion 4:5:1).¹⁷ So the seeming compression of the first solo section in Fr 1779b is not due to the movement’s proportions. Its cause must be sought elsewhere.

The answer may lie with the number of potential scenarios for the different combinations and types of solo writing for a two-part ensemble versus a three-part ensemble. Table 1 sets out the combinations for solo violin and viola writing that Mozart used in the first solo section of K. 364.

Table 1: Potential combinations of solo writing for a two-voice ensemble (as in K. 364)

- 1) Violin solo: thematic
- 2) Violin solo: bravura display
- 3) Violin solo: dialogue with the orchestra (or group of instruments within the orchestra)
- 4) Viola solo: thematic
- 5) Viola solo: bravura display
- 6) Viola solo: dialogue with the orchestra (or group of instruments within the orchestra)
- 7) Violin/viola dialogue: violin leads
- 8) Violin/viola dialogue: viola leads
- 9) Violin ‘accompanies’ viola
- 10) Viola ‘accompanies’ violin
- 11) The two instrument play as a composite persona (in octaves, thirds, sixths, etc)
- 12) The two instruments play as a composite persona in dialogue with the orchestra

themes, so that by the time the recapitulation is reached in bar 223 there have been 19 different themes and only one (six-bar) reprise of an earlier idea. This approach to form building is, to my knowledge, unique at this scale within Mozart’s works.

¹⁶ By the time the fragment breaks off at bar 134, this theme has therefore become a punctuating motto for the ‘entire’ movement. This has significant implications for any completion.

¹⁷ In K. 364 the opening ritornellos lasts 72 bars, the first solo 86 bars and the middle ritornellos 16 bars, giving as ratio of 4.1:5.0:0.9; in Fr 1779b the equivalent figures are 51 bars, 68 bars and 8 bars, giving a ratio of 4.0:5.3:0.7. I will argue (below) that a solution to one of the problems of Fr 1778b is to follow Mozart’s precedent in some of his Piano Concertos and add another phrase to the middle ritornellos ‘after the event’. If an 8-bar phrase is added to the middle ritornellos in this way, then the proportions of the three opening sections are even closer to 4:5:1.

Table 2 scales up these potential combinations to incorporate the solo cello in the solo ensemble of Fr 1779b, using exactly the same parameters as Table 1.

Table 2: Potential combinations of solo writing for a three-voice ensemble (as in Fr 1779b)

- 1) Violin solo: thematic
- 2) Violin solo: bravura display
- 3) Violin solo: dialogue with the orchestra (or group of instruments within the orchestra)
- 4) Viola solo: thematic
- 5) Viola solo: bravura display
- 6) Viola solo: dialogue with the orchestra (or group of instruments within the orchestra)
- 7) Cello solo: thematic
- 8) Cello solo: bravura
- 9) Cello solo: dialogue with the orchestra (or group of instruments within the orchestra)
- 10) Violin/viola dialogue: violin leads
- 11) Ditto, accompanied by cello
- 12) Violin/viola dialogue: viola leads
- 13) Ditto, accompanied by cello
- 14) Violin/cello dialogue: violin leads
- 15) Ditto, accompanied by viola
- 16) Violin/cello dialogue: cello leads
- 17) Ditto, accompanied by viola
- 18) Viola/cello dialogue: viola leads
- 19) Ditto, accompanied by violin
- 20) Viola/cello dialogue: cello leads
- 21) Ditto, accompanied by violin
- 22) Three-way dialogue: statements in order of violin, viola, cello
- 23) Three-way dialogue: statements in order of violin, cello, viola
- 24) Three-way dialogue: statements in order of viola, violin, cello
- 25) Three-way dialogue: statements in order of viola, cello, violin
- 26) Three-way dialogue: statements in order of cello, violin, viola
- 27) Three-way dialogue: statements in order of cello, viola, violin
- 28) Viola accompanies violin
- 29) Cello accompanies violin
- 30) Violin accompanies viola
- 31) Cello accompanies viola
- 32) Violin accompanies cello
- 33) Viola accompanies cello
- 34) Violin (thematic or bravura) accompanied by composite persona of viola/cello
- 35) Viola (thematic or bravura) accompanied by composite persona of violin/cello
- 36) Cello (thematic or bravura) accompanied by composite persona of violin/viola
- 37) Composite persona of violin and viola
- 38) Ditto, accompanied by cello
- 39) Composite persona of violin and cello
- 40) Ditto, accompanied by viola
- 41) Composite persona of viola and cello
- 42) Ditto, accompanied by violin
- 43) Composite persona of violin, viola and cello
- 44) Composite persona of violin, viola and cello in dialogue with the orchestra

This is a stark reminder that adding one instrument to the solo ensemble gives rise to many more options, and it brings into focus some of the most pointed compositional issues Mozart faced in Fr 1779b, namely:

- How to provide balanced opportunities for the soloists without expanding the form to an unmanageable (or tedious) size?
- How to balance thematic statements, display and dialogue?
- How to construct, challenge, mitigate, reinforce or destroy a hierarchy within the solo ensemble?
- How to give the orchestra something to do?
- How to manage these issues within the confines of a well-balanced, coherent, entertaining concerto-allegro form?

These are significant challenges, and might go some way to explaining why Mozart abandoned the project. It is scarcely conceivable that all 44 options would have found their way into the first movement of Fr 1779b: to overcome the pedantry of such a solution might have been beyond even Mozart at that stage in his career. So one of the most important components of the artistry of Fr 1779b lay in the choices Mozart made when he selected from the 44 options available to him. In the first solo section he selected the following:

- Option 22: bars 52–6
- Option 36: bars 57–60
- Option 37: bars 61–3
- Options 20 and 41: bars 64–7
- Option 23: bars 68–70
- A composite of options 2, 5, 8 and 22: bars 71–4
- Option 1: bars 77–81
- A composite of options 7 and 14: bars 81–5
- Option 4: bars 85–8
- Option 42: bars 89–92
- Option 1: bars 93–6
- Option 44: bars 96–105
- Option 31: bars 105–9
- Option 28: bars 109–11
- Option 22: bars 111–13
- Option 43: bars 114–120

The high 'strike rate' here, with 19 out of the 44 options (ie 43%), might imply the Mozart indeed intended to be thorough in his inclusion of all the options over the course of the entire movement. But the musical disadvantage will be obvious: the composer changed the functions so often that no single option controls the discourse for longer than a phrase and many last less than the length of a phrase. As a result the music can feel breathless in comparison with K. 364's broad paragraphs. The second solo section of Fr 1779b starts with another of the available options (Option 10) in bars 127–34. While the effect is broader than the first solo section, this is the point at which the fragment

breaks off, so we have no way of knowing how Mozart might have followed through the implications of these final bars in the manuscript.

If the functional mutability of the relationship between the solo instruments may account for the impression of short-windedness in the first solo section, then how balanced, well paced and coherent is the succession of options? Mozart found the most satisfactory balance in two passages in the first solo section. The first is the period that establishes E as the local tonic (bars 77–96). It presents a series of three solo phrases that highlight each soloist's cantabile credentials while deftly establishing contrasting characters for each of the instrumental personae. An (implied) imperfect cadence in bars 87–8 leads to a phrase in which the violin accompanies a composite viola/cello persona. By serving the other solo instruments in this way, the violin earns the right to a solo sub-phrase that signs off the entire period in bars 93–96¹. There is an attractive logic of move and counter-move here, underpinned by a dramatic sense of harmonic pacing (the implied standing on the dominant in bars 88–92 setting up the pay off the violin's brilliant conclusion to the period). Everything is given its proper space to make its effect. And there is a charming symmetry in the violin solos that frame the entire period. Similarly, in the climactic bravura phrases that end the first solo (bars 105–120) the virtuoso demands are distributed evenly between the three solo instruments in a way that neither forces the pace of the phrasing and harmonic rhythm nor strains the relationship between the motivic material, the expressive gestures and the counterpoint. In two other sections, however, Mozart's handling of the solo ensemble seems less assured. The opening period (bars 52–74¹) has some rhetorical panache and is certainly effective in establishing the soloists' independence from the orchestra, but its initial material is bland (bars 52–60) and when the virtuoso cello figuration gives way to more characterful melodic ideas the three-part counterpoint becomes rather congested in bars 69–70. The material sounds constrained by the medium here. The return of the second theme in bars 96–105¹ also projects some tension between the material and the medium. The theme consists of two unbalanced phrases, the first has five bars because its normative four-bar pattern is elongated by an expanded cadential phase; the second has the normal length of four bars. Rather than give the entire theme to the soloists or to develop it into a double statement – the first time through by the orchestra, the second by the soloists (or vice versa) – the concertante effect occurs at the level of the phrase rather than the period. This is an oddly unsatisfactory effect: the music pays lip service to the expected concertante effect without any inner motivation. It has neither the charm nor the sprezzatura of so many such passages in the piano concertos; and it cannot be said that the string trio texture of bars 101–4 is an improvement on the four-part orchestral string texture of the preceding five bars.¹⁸

A comparison between the solo writing in Fr 1779b and the equivalent sections in the first movement of K. 364 highlights a fact of late-eighteenth-century musical rhetoric that is problematic for Mozart's treatment of the three-instrument ensemble in the fragment: while the 'rule of three' holds good at a gestural level, rhythmic units larger than the incise (the level at or within which expressive gestures tend to operate in this style) are grouped in twos (that is, pairs of phrases, periods, principal periods, and so on). So, while the duality of the solo ensemble in K. 364 can easily be reflected at increasingly large formal levels, such a hierarchical symmetry quickly breaks down in Fr 1779b. This in itself is enough to explain (or at least enable) the broader, more suave pacing of K.

¹⁸ It is, of course, possible that Mozart imagined bars 101–5 as an orchestral rendition of the second phrase amplified by the soloists, with the violin solo as a '4-ft stop'. For a realisation of this solution, see Version 2.

364. It also suggests that the solo writing in K. 364 will only be of limited use as a model for the solo writing and the formal unfolding in any attempted completion of the fragment.

Given that the autograph manuscript of Fr 1779b is a *particella* in which none of the orchestral accompaniment to the solo sections is notated, the *Sinfonia Concertante* K. 364 comes into its own in this project as a model for how the orchestra should support the solo ensemble. Two aspects of the scoring of K. 364 facilitate a potentially direct transfer of solutions to the fragment: first, they share the same orchestral complement of two oboes, two horns and strings; second, the ways in which each of the functional options listed in Table 1 is supported by the orchestra can be mapped on to the relevant options listed in Table 2. The situation is complicated by several factors: as the tables demonstrate, many of the functional options available in Fr 1779b have no precedent in K. 364; the low register of some of the solo cello writing in the fragment gives rise to balance problems that do not occur in K. 364; and if some of the kaleidoscopic nuances in texture and timbre that characterise the orchestral writing in K. 364 were to be applied unthinkingly to Fr 1779b, then they might reinforce the short-winded feel of the fragment's phrasing – surely contrary to the function Mozart was likely to have intended for the orchestra in those passages. There is also the broader point that if, as I have suggested, these two works may have been conceived as a contrasting pair, then it would go against the grain to apply solutions mechanically from K. 364 to Fr 1779b. Nevertheless, K. 364 has such a rich vocabulary of accompanimental patterns deployed so imaginatively that it would be perverse not to draw on it, even if to react against its details (or rethink them in new contexts) rather than reproduce them.

For the purposes of this introduction I will not give a detailed analytical account of the orchestral accompaniment in the first movement of K. 364, but the following summary highlights characteristics that particularly informed my approach to the accompaniment in Fr 1779b:

- (a) There is very little dialogue between the soloists and the orchestra, but copious dialogue between different orchestral voices within the accompanimental patterns. For example, in bar 106ff of K. 364 a descending four-crotchet motive, derived from the transition passage at the end of the opening *ritornello*, is passed bar to bar between the violas, oboes and violins. Similarly, the virtuoso figuration in the solo instruments in bars 133–4 and 138–9 is accompanied by a four-quaver motive that passes, in inversion, between different instrumental groups within the orchestra.
- (b) Much of the textural variety in the accompaniment is underpinned by contrasts between bass lines in the cellos/double basses and *bassetto* writing in which the bass line appears in the violins or violas. Examples of the latter include bars 70–89 (with two short *tutti* punctuations), bars 126–9, and bars 146–8. One of the main functions of the bass/*bassetto* contrasts is to underline registral contrasts in thematically parallel passages between the two solo instruments.
- (c) When the soloists play as a composite persona in octaves, thirds or sixths, the orchestra usually only supplies a third (bass) voice, for example in bars 74–7 (in the violins) and in bars 143–8 (first in the basses, then in the violins). The exception is in the final cadential passage of the first solo section (bars 149–57) in which first the entire wind band, then the whole orchestra accompanies the soloists' composite persona – a move that is clearly designed to reinforce the music's climactic rhetoric.

- (d) Small linking cells between phrases form part of the motivic web of the orchestral accompaniment, most often appearing in the oboes (see bars 79–80, 83–4, 125–6 and 129–30).
- (e) When the solo viola dips between the register of the orchestral violas in bars 99–101 it is doubled at the octave by the first oboe (presumably in order to clarify the voice leading). This is a potentially useful tactic for dealing with the low tessitura of the cello in Fr 1779b.
- (f) Within phrases the orchestral texture can change rapidly. For example, in bars 82–92 there are seven distinct orchestral textures: strings and horns, strings and oboes, a viola pedal in octaves, the same with the addition of punctuating violin chords, a horn fanfare, a flourish for the wind band and upper strings, and a tutti. All this ‘accompanies’ and punctuates a phrase in which the solo instruments progress from viola-led imitative dialogue to a composite persona. The textural inflections in the orchestra are so effective because of the coherence of the solo process they accompany. Such an approach would be less successful with more rapidly changing processes in the solo voices.
- (g) The sound of a divided viola section, so prominent throughout K. 364, is echoed more sparingly in the opening ritornello of Fr 1779b. So, while it makes sense to deploy divided violas in the accompanimental textures of the fragment, the consistency of the relationship between K. 364 and Fr 1779b is best served by using the texture as a special effect rather than the norm in the completion.

Attempting to complete the fragment

The mixed success of the solo writing in Fr 1779b leads to some uncomfortable questions for anyone attempting to complete the fragment. Should one try to produce a better balanced, more evenly paced integration of the functional possibilities of the three solo instruments in the later sections of the movement? Quite aside from the matter of hubris, this approach would carry a heavy risk of producing a disjointed result, where a change in attitude towards the solo instruments would risk looking incoherent over the course of the movement (*pace* the broader phrasing at the very end of the fragment). But to confine compositional choices strictly within the parameters Mozart established in the first solo section would merely amplify the weaknesses one finds there over the entire canvas of the movement. This is a conundrum that made me pause for several years between first studying the fragment in detail (and thinking about completing it) and finally taking the plunge in the summer of 2017. What finally convinced me to apply myself to the task at hand was the possibility of opening up the potential of Mozart’s phrasing a little: to inject a touch more breadth without running roughshod over the premises of the first solo section. This third way is narrow and precarious.

A more fundamental disincentive to attempting a completion of Fr 1779b is, why bother at all if one is so critical of the fragment in the first place? What I have described as problematic and challenging in the fragment are relative shortcomings, measured against the exceptionally high bar of K. 364. (And which concertos for multiple instruments, from whatever era, emerge especially well from comparison with that paragon?) When compared with the *sinfonia concertante*s of Mozart’s contemporaries, Fr 1779b shines brightly. This leads me to propose an alternative hypothesis to Konrad’s about the relative chronology of Fr 1779b and K. 364. Might the two pieces have been work-in-progress (at least in Mozart’s mind) at the same time (a pattern noticeable in the 1780s with contemporaneous pieces like K. 515 and K. 516, or K. 550 and K. 551)? Or might Mozart even have

started with the simpler scenario of a *sinfonia concertante* for two solo instruments, and – following the brilliant success (on paper) of that work – proceeded to tackle the more complex scenario of a three-instrument ensemble, only to find that it did not come up to scratch in comparison with the earlier finished piece?¹⁹

This question has had some bearing on the premises of my two completions. Version 1 is an attempted completion as if Mozart were working on K. 364 and Fr 1779b simultaneously. Its style is as 1779-centric as I can make it, and while it does not follow the example of K. 364 point by point, it does react to it in that fashion. Version 2, however, imagines an opportunity for a performance in Vienna in the early 1780s: what might Mozart have made of the fragment had he returned to it a few years later? In particular, how might this later stylistic approach effect the treatment of the new theme that appears at the end of the fragment and the formal and stylistic consequences for the movement's later sections (including the *cadenza*)?

Despite these contrasting premises, and the inevitable divergence in detailed compositional decision making as work on the completions progressed, the major challenges of undertaking both versions of Fr 1779b were essentially the same:

- The compositional issues that faced Mozart about balancing the hierarchies, functional variety, discourse and display of the solo ensemble (see page vi above).
- How to compose an idiomatic accompaniment for the orchestra in bars 52–119?
- What to make of the implications of the new theme that closes the fragment, with its broader approach to phrasing and period building? How should this new theme be integrated into the rest of the movement? Should it occur only at the start of the second solo section, or should it dominate the entire second solo section in the manner of a sonata-form development, or should it reappear in the tonic during the recapitulation (in the manner of the Piano Concerto K. 488's first movement)?
- How to relate the recapitulation to the movement's earlier sections? In particular, how to combine elements from the Opening Ritornello and First Solo Section so that no essential material is omitted, nothing feels redundant, and the music flows convincingly?
- How to write a stylistically plausible *cadenza* for the three solo instruments?

Commentary on the two completions

Version 1

The orchestral accompaniment in bars 52–119 is based on the principle of transferring parallel from the first movement of K. 364 but with detailed modifications to underline the 'contrasting pair' hypothesis described above:

- Bars 52–60: the start of the First Solo section dramatises the contrast between the *tutti* and the solo ensemble; the solo ensemble writing is functionally self-contained, so there is no support from the orchestra.

¹⁹ I must acknowledge that the crux of my conjecture does not necessarily conflict with the crux of Konrad's: it is possible that Mozart started writing Fr 1779b earlier than he started writing K. 364, but the composition (in his head) of K. 364 overwhelmed (either with its superior qualities, or the greater flow of the mental process, or a combination of both) the partly-written Fr 1779b.

- Bars 61–70: the solo writing coalesces into a composite persona (violin and viola in tenths in bars 61–3, viola and cello in sixths at bar 66 and complementary contours in bar 67) requiring just the addition of a bass line. The solo writing in bars 66–7 implies the harmonic progression V–IV–I. Did Mozart really intend a plagal cadence in those bars? Or is the dyad d^2/f sharp meant to form a 9-7 chord over the dominant, preparing the double expressive appoggiatura over the tonic in the next bar? Neither solution seems particularly elegant. I have chosen to underpin the phrase with a perfect cadence, but have used a diplomatic rest in the added bass line to soften the effect of the 9-7 in bar 66.
- Bars 71–3: the cadential punctuation is given to the winds in order to create some timbral space around the low cello writing in bar 73.
- Bars 78–88: the different registers of the solo lines are reflected in the distribution (and register) of the accompaniment in the strings.
- Bars 88–96: the oboe pedal sustains the outer pitches in the violin solo's passagework, while the pizzicato basses and syncopated figures in the upper strings intensify the rhythmic buoyancy of the passage. The chord in bars 90 and 92 is a 6-4 rather than a 5-3 in order to maintain harmonic tension before the perfect cadence into the second subject at bar 96. Taken as a whole, the orchestral writing in this 11-bar section is designed to echo the rapid changes of colour and texture that characterises the accompaniment of K. 364.
- Bars 101–4: the solo texture is self-contained in these bars, so the orchestra is silent.
- Bars 105–15: the underlying concept of the orchestral writing in this passage is to maintain a thread of imitative dialogue within the orchestra while the solo instruments go about their virtuoso business. Naturally, the colours are varied from phrase to phrase so that the discourse is always moving forwards.
- Bars 116–19: in these last four bars of the first solo section the orchestral texture develops from silence (b. 116) to the tutti that starts the ritornellos in bar 120.

In Mozart's fragment the middle ritornello consists of eight bars (bs 120–27). This is a very brief and light punctuation of the form, and it does not sound entirely satisfactory to my ear. In the first movement of two of his later piano concertos (K. 491 in C minor [March 1786] and K. 595 in B flat [completed in January 1791]) Mozart decided retrospectively to give more weight to a ritornello by adding an extra passage which he notated later in the manuscript and 'dropped into' the earlier section by means of shorthand symbols.²⁰ Following this precedent, I have inserted a new eight-bar period (bars 120–27 in the completion) at the start of the middle ritornello. The new bars are a varied transposition into E major of bars 31–8 from the opening ritornello. This music was chosen for various reasons: it has an appropriate celebratory style; it enables a formal rhyme at the end of the final solo section, since this is the material that will make up the short ritornello that introduced the cadenza (cf bars 267–75); and the continuity with Mozart's original bar 120 (now bar 128) is smooth, given that the violin 1 line in bar 128 is almost identical to that in bar 39. The formal advantages of expanding the middle ritornello in this way are that it provides a weightier punctuation to the form and it acts as a transitional to the broader paragraph with which Mozart began the second solo section (now bar 135ff).

²⁰ See the autograph manuscript of K. 491 (GB-Lcm MS 402), f2^r, f3^r and f3^v; and the autograph manuscript of K. 595 (PL-Kj Mozart Aut K. 595), f3^v, f23^r and f23^v.

In this version the second solo section is designed in three phases: the first continues a train of thought established in the last eight bars of the fragment and moves towards a subsidiary tonal goal with an imperfect cadence in F sharp minor at bar 166; the second phase (bars 166–183¹) is more process-driven and progresses through a descending circle of fifths to reach the section's second subsidiary goal, a perfect cadence in D major at bar 175; the final phase of the section arrives on a dominant pedal at bar 183 and resolves into the tonic at the start of the recapitulation in bar 195.

The first task in completing phase 1 (bar 135ff) was to invent an orchestral accompaniment for the solo lines in the last eight bars of Mozart's fragment. Drawn from K. 364, my solution was to use bassetto scoring with a registral pattern to match the contrasting registers of the solo violin and viola. The next task was to make a decision about where this period is leading. Since the new theme in the violin at bars 135–9¹ is repeated with only slight variation by the viola in bars 139–43¹ smooth continuity is provided by a four-bar variation of this idea for the solo cello in bars 143–7¹. But to have a third contiguous statement of theme in E major, and ending with an emphatic cadence in that key, would have been tedious. Instead, the formula STATEMENT – VARIED RESTATEMENT – DEVELOPMENT seemed most appropriate to the context. So, while the cello takes over the motivic substance of the violin theme, it initiates a change of mode to E minor and modulates through the course of the phrase to B minor (established by a perfect cadence) in bar 147. My instinct at this point (but also drawing on the rather different scenario at the start of the parallel section in K. 364) was to interrupt the solo statements with a short tutti drawing on the opening bars of the movement.²¹ This tutti (bars 147–50) modulates from ii to V/iii and is answered by the solo viola in a two-bar phrase that draws on cello's closing contour in bar 146. The pattern is varied in bars 153–8: the tutti progresses from iii to V⁷/vi in third inversion, while the two-bar appendix in the cello converts to chord to its root position and cadences into F sharp minor at bar 159. In the following four-bar phrase the solo violin attempts to reconcile the contrasting motives of the orchestra (bar 159) and its fellow soloists (bar 161). Thus far there has been no interaction between the solo instruments, but the tension increases through the last four bars of phase 1 as the other solo instruments are added one-by-one to the texture (quoting the orchestra's head-motive) and the harmony becomes more chromatic as it moves towards the subsidiary goal of V/iii at bar 166. Phase 1 is the longest and most complex component of the second solo section: as I hope to have demonstrated here, it has a logical *filo*, but the chain of cause and effect is loose and the music covers a lot of rhetorical ground while progressing harmonically only from E through B to F sharp.

The job of the next two phases is to condense and refocus the direction of the music, reintroducing interaction between the three soloists and bringing sequential harmonic processes to the fore so that the final drive towards the dominant pedal at the end of the solo section is carefully prepared. Phase 2 (bars 167–74) spins regularly through a descending circle of fifths, but overshoots the tonic to cadence into D major at bar 175. Based on bars 89–92, the sequential expansion of the original pattern allows for a larger number of permutations to appear in the textures and functions of the solo instruments (which is the reason why the accompanying textures are kept so deliberately plain).

Another sequential and permutational series of solo interactions begins Phase 3 (b. 175ff), underpinned by fourth-species counterpoint in the orchestral strings. This passage has obvious

²¹ This is, of course, the common rhetorical trope of *hypostrophe*: returning to a primary argument after a digression.

resonances with the parallel section of K. 364 (bars 202–9), but what really drives it is an unusual feature of Mozart’s instrumental writing from the late 1770s in which the foreground of the music abandons a line of motivic thought, but the contrapuntal substrate continues as if the motives were still animating the surface.²² To demonstrate this rather abstruse concept, Example 1 (see page 13 below) reconstructs a hypothetical version of bars 175–82 with the foreground motives left in. The chain of imitative entries shown in the example, though unsounded in the actual score, is what motivates the return of the foreground idea in the oboes (answered by a fanfare in the horns) in bars 183–6.

Example 1 Hypothetical reconstruction of motivic foreground of bars 175-183 in Version 1



In the last eight bars of the final phase’s V pedal (bs 187–94) I attempted to build a climax through the high register of the solo lines and through the density of the discourse: bars 187–90 take the complete orchestral texture of bars 16–19 and overlay a three-part dialogue of virtuoso material in the solo instruments.

It might be objected that at 60 bars this second solo section is too long. Certainly the ratio of the lengths of the first and second solo sections in this completion (c. 10:11) is out of kilter with the 9:5 ratio in the first movement of K. 364. Were a 9:5 ratio applied to Fr 1779b, its second solo section would last 37 bars. A hypothetical completion of precisely this length, using the same materials as version 1, is given in short score in Example 2 below. I think the music in Example 2 has a logical thread but its pacing is not especially elegant, in particular, the rate of harmonic change accelerates too abruptly after the nine bars of unchallenged E major at the start of the section. Ultimately, I prefer the broader unfolding of the 60-bar section in my completion and would justify its distinct ratio with the length of the first solo section on the basis of my ‘contrasting pair’ hypothesis outlined earlier in this introduction.

²² See Leonard B. Meyer, ‘Process and Morphology in the Music of Mozart’, *Journal of Musicology*, 1 (1982), pp 67–94.

Example 2 Hypothetical 37-bar Second Solo Section for Fr 1779b

The main challenge of the recapitulation is how to synthesise the contrasting materials from the opening ritornellos and first solo section so that (a) there is the strongest possible logical thread; (b) no material is wasted; (c) no material is redundant; (d) as little material as possible changes its formal function. Table 3 gives an overview of the origins of the recapitulation's music. As the table shows, all the music from the opening ritornello and the first solo section is reprised in the recapitulation, with the exception of bars 20–21 (which were reprised in the phrase immediately before the start of the recapitulation) and bars 52–6 (whose function is fulfilled by the reprise of bars 9–12). The dovetailing of some of the disparate material from the opening ritornello and first solo section was seemingly pre-engineered by Mozart: for example, the ascent to e^3 in the first violins in bars 11–12 makes a very smooth contrapuntal and registral join with the solo ensemble's theme at bar 56ff; and the emphasis of a second-inversion tonic chord at the end of bars 31–8 seems designed to lead into the cadenza in the recapitulation.

While the interleaving of different sections is fairly straightforward in the recapitulation, the opportunities to rework details when each section is reprised gives rise to more complex patterns involving texture and register. The first solo section tonicises E from bar 77, but in the recapitulation A remains the tonic, so the two sections have different registral patterns which encourage the textural reworking of the music for the solo ensemble and, as a consequence, bring further options into play (though by no means the complete set from the list of 44 described in Table 2).

Table 3: Thematic Origins of the Recapitulation in Fr 1779b Version 1

<i>Opening Ritornello</i>	<i>First Solo Section</i>	<i>Recapitulation</i>
1–12		195–206
	57–73	207–20
13–16	74–6	221–3
	77–95	224–42
22–30	96–104	243–51
	105–19	252–66
31–8 ¹	120–27 ¹	267–75 ¹
		CADENZA (276–300)
[16–19]		301–4
39–51		305–17

The biggest compositional decision in the recapitulation was whether to reprise in the tonic the new theme from the start of the second solo section. In this version I took the lead from K. 364, in which the tragic couplet from the start of the second solo section (bars 174–94¹) never reappears. This decision means that the most thematically independent section of the recapitulation is the cadenza. Other than the Concerto for Three Pianos K. 242, there are no direct models for writing a three-instrument cadenza in Mozart. For my cadenza I took the lead from the length and style of the first-movement cadenza from K. 364, in particular the facts that it uses some solo figuration from the movement but alludes to themes rather than citing them. (My cadenza gets closer to citation, but only with regard to motives, not entire themes.) In the spirit of indeterminacy that governs the content of classical cadenzas, I have included some alternative cadenzas in Appendix 1.

The orchestral pick up after the cadenza posed a problem for me in this version. I had spent the whole recapitulation setting up a reprise of Bars 39–51 as the final ritornello, but to resolve the cadenza into a *piano* passage would not be effective in this style.²³ Instead, I drew on Mozart's later practice of inserting a small linking passage between the resolution of the cadential trill and the thematic reprise from an earlier ritornello.²⁴ I seemed to me that the only four-bar phrase from the opening ritornello that would not otherwise be reprised, bars 16–19, could be adapted from their

²³ The magical effect of the *piano* pick up in the first movement of the G major Piano Concerto K. 453 (1784) is due to the double surprise of (1) just the orchestral bass line entering as the piano resolves its trill; (2) the highly dissonant diminished seventh chord that the upper strings play against the bass pedal point in the next bar. Such an audacious and subtle strategy was not in Mozart's expressive vocabulary in 1779.

²⁴ As, for example, in the first movements of K. 488 and K. 491 (both 1786).

original V-pedal function to be a I pedal after the cadenza, and that they would lead seamlessly to the reprise of bar 39ff in bar 305ff.

Having set myself some narrow parameters for this completion (in particular, a focus on stylistic concerns from 1779, and the premise that Fr 1779b is forms a contrasting pair with K. 364) in the detailed working out of the music I ended up loosening some of the constraints for the sake of the musical continuity, balance, proportion and coherent rhetoric. How far this mitigates the stylistic coherence of my completion is for others to judge.

Version 2

This completion is attempted from the stylistic perspective of 1782/83, which seems to me the most likely time after 1779 when Mozart would have had the opportunity to get the piece performed. Even though the intervening period was only three years, his compositional concerns had changed significantly after his move to Vienna in 1781. In the realm of the concerto a chamber-like turn is in evidence in the three Op. 4 Piano Concertos (K. 413, 414, 415) which, in their part-writing, owe much to the technique (if not the density) of the first three of the ‘Haydn’ Quartets (K. 387, 421, 428). This completion contrasts with version 1 in three broad respects: (1) the orchestration of the accompaniment is fuller, with more independence for the wind instruments; (2) I have attempted to develop the new theme at the start of the second solo more thoroughly throughout that section, including integrating it with material from elsewhere in the movement and testing its contrapuntal potential; (3) the cadenza is more thematic – it reprises the second solo’s new theme in the tonic, and by engaging with the movement’s opening theme it furthers the integration of ritornello and solo materials in the recapitulation.

First Solo Section

The accompanimental figuration in this section does not differ significantly from Version 1, but it is distributed in a different way. There is less bassetto writing, a greater focus on *sostenuto* inner lines, and no unaccompanied passages for the solo ensemble. The fanfare-like figures that introduce the solo instruments in bars 52–7 are now underpinned by imitation in the wind band. In the second subject at bars 96–105¹ the soloists amplify the underlying orchestral texture rather than responding with an unaccompanied phrase in bars 101–5.

Middle Ritornello

The middle ritornello (bars 120–27) completes the skeleton given in Mozart’s *particella*, but no extra material is inserted to give it more weight. This decision stems from the fact that I wanted to place more weight on the second solo (with its more complex motivic development than in Version 1) than on the orchestral punctuation of the middle ritornello.

Second Solo Section

This is the section that differs most from Version 1. It has two broad phases: phase 1 (bars 127–55¹) moves to the subsidiary goal of D major, and phase 2 (bars 155–75) sets up the V pedal that prepares the return of I at the start of the recapitulation. The two phases are bound together by an

over-arching stretto process in the solo ensemble. At the start of the first phase each solo instrument has its own four-bar phrase (bars 127–38); this is punctuated by some imitation at the bar between the violin and viola in bars 138–41; from bars 141–9 each of the solo instruments has a two-bar incise to itself; in bars 150–52 each has a one-bar segment; from bar 155 to bar 162 the distance between the imitative entries is squeezed to half a bar; and in the final period of the second phase (bars 163–75) the half-bar imitative pattern is applied to the ‘new’ theme from the start of the section, underpinned in the orchestra by motives from different sections of the opening ritornello.

Recapitulation and Cadenza