

## MOZART'S CONCERTO FOR SECOND HORN: K. 370b AND 371

ANDREW KEARNS

Among the most fascinating of Mozart's unfinished works are the draft scores of two movements for horn and orchestra in E $\flat$  major, K. 370b and 371.<sup>1</sup> They date from the period immediately following the composer's arrival in Vienna on 16 March 1781 in answer to the summons of his employer, the Archbishop of Salzburg. Although not yet fully orchestrated, Mozart signed and dated the draft of the *Rondeau*, K. 371, on 21 March, possibly in anticipation of a performance that never materialized. It is not even certain for whom these movements were intended, but most scholars have ruled out Mozart's old friend Joseph Leutgeb, who had never seen them when Constanze sought his advice about the manuscripts in 1800.<sup>2</sup> Largely on circumstantial evidence, some have put forward the name of Jacob Eisen, a highly regarded second-hornist with the Viennese Hofkapelle from 1782 until 1796.<sup>3</sup>

Apparently conceived as the opening allegro and concluding rondo of what would have been Mozart's first horn concerto, these two movements met very different fates. Since its publication in the old Mozart *Gesamtausgabe* in 1882, K. 371 has been widely known and performed in various completions as the *Concert Rondo*, even though the manuscript lacked a bifolium containing sixty measures of music to the rondo's first episode that was not discovered until 1988.<sup>4</sup> K. 370b, on the other hand, has until recently been known primarily to specialists as a series of tantalizing fragments preserved in several different locations, a good portion of the manuscript having been cut into small pieces by Carl Mozart to be given away to acquaintances during the centennial year of his father's birth in 1856.<sup>5</sup> The recent publication of a facsimile edition of K. 370b and 371 by Harvard College Library, containing manuscript fragments of both movements discovered since the publication of the horn concerto volume of the *Neue Mozart-Ausgabe* in 1987, reveals that today K. 371 is complete in draft score while K. 370b lacks only a few bars of the recapitulation and the final orchestral tutti. It is thus possible to come to firmer conclusions about several aspects of these movements, including their treatment of horn technique.

My own study of the draft scores of K. 370b and 371 leads to the conclusion that both movements exhibit clear characteristics of the second-horn style of the eighteenth century, that is, the kinds of characteristic melodies and figures within the low-horn range that a second hornist like Eisen would have been expected to master.<sup>6</sup> Recognizing how the second-horn style informs K. 370b and 371 gives an important perspective on the horn technique used in this work and how that technique differs from Mozart's concertos for Leutgeb, who was a first hornist. It helps shed light on some of the structural anomalies of K. 370b, such as the lack of a development section or the introduction of the second theme in the dominant key, rather than the expected tonic, during the recapitulation.<sup>7</sup> It

may also reinforce a theory advanced by Christoph Wolff and Robert Levin of the possible abandonment of K. 370b before the composer signed and dated K. 371. Finally, this investigation will at least acknowledge the plausibility of Jacob Eisen as the intended recipient of one or both movements.

### The Second-Horn Style

During the eighteenth century it was customary for the four-octave range of the horn, which extended from written *G* below the second partial to twenty-fourth-partial *g'''*, to be divided between specialists in the high and low registers, designated as first and second players.<sup>8</sup> Musicians regarded this division of labor necessary because of the differences in the size of the mouthpieces used by each type of player; that of the first was narrower while that of the second was wider.<sup>9</sup> Both first and second players employed somewhat specialized techniques in their respective ranges, and both were called upon to play solos appropriate to their respective styles. Those styles were fully evident by the 1750s, and were founded primarily upon the first horn's role as melodist and the second horn's role of accompanist to the first, roles determined to a large extent by the instrument's natural series of partials that permitted a diatonic scale to be played only in the high register. The two types of horn players not only specialized in a particular register, but produced distinct tone qualities that the lexicographer Ernst Ludwig Gerber likened to the effect of "a flute accompanied by a gamba."<sup>10</sup> Example 1 shows the characteristic features of the first- and second-horn styles as they emerged in mid-century in excerpts from a concerto for two horns by Franz Xaver Pokorny, written at Mannheim in 1754.

Example 1: Excerpts from the *Concerto da Camera* for two horns and orchestra by Franz Xaver Pokorny (Mannheim, 9 February 1754).

Example 1a. Allegro Moderato (first movement), opening theme (mm. 27-30)

The first-horn style was based on the further development of the clarino horn and trumpet techniques inherited from the Baroque. It was characterized by *cantabile* melodies and florid passage-work in the clarino octave of *c''* - *c'''*; excursions into the extreme up-

The image shows two systems of musical notation. The first system consists of a treble clef staff with a melodic line and a bass clef staff with a rhythmic accompaniment. The second system continues the piece with more complex rhythmic patterns in the bass staff. The key signature is indicated as 'In Eb'.

Example 1b. *Allegro Moderato* (first movement), continuation (mm. 32-35)

The image shows a single system of musical notation. The treble clef staff features a melodic line with wide leaps, and the bass clef staff features a rhythmic accompaniment. The key signature is indicated as 'In Eb'.

Example 1c. *Finale. Presto* (mm. 48-51).

per register, and occasional fantases and triadic figures in the middle register between  $g'$  and  $c''$ .<sup>11</sup> The second-horn style came to be characterized by virtuoso passages employing rapid arpeggios and wide leaps between registers, stereotypical figures of the kind found in Example 1b, an expanded lower range that included a series of “factitious” tones lipped down from third-partial  $g$  as seen in Example 1c, and the gradual introduction of notes from outside the harmonic series, such as the pitches  $f\sharp'$  and  $b'$  in Example 1b, obtainable through hand-stopping, a technique that had developed among second-horn players.<sup>12</sup>

Horn technique underwent a rapid development during the second half of the eighteenth century, but the basic functions and specialized techniques of first and second horn were preserved to a great extent, especially in music for two horns. The later eighteenth

century was the heyday of the two-horn concerto, but virtuoso music featuring a pair of horns was not limited to that genre. Example 2 shows that the same basic functions of first and second horn observed in Pokorný's concerto were retained, albeit in an updated musical idiom, in the obbligato horn parts to Mozart's aria, "Per pietà, ben mio, perdona" from *Così fan tutte*.

Example 2: Excerpts from Mozart, "Per pietà, ben mio, perdona" (No. 25) from *Così fan tutte*.

In E *p*

Example 2a. Adagio, mm. 21-24.

Example 2b. Adagio, mm. 29-30

Example 2c. Allegro moderato, mm. 46-48.

*p*

Example 2d. Allegro moderato, mm. 76-78.

Example 2e. Allegro moderato, mm. 116-117.

In solo concertos, on the other hand, the distinctiveness of the two styles was mitigated somewhat by the widespread adoption of hand-stopping that allowed both first- and second-horn players to play diatonic and even chromatic melodies in the middle register. But, although they often transcended the limits of range and specialized techniques, even the greatest virtuosos of the period retained a firm grounding in one of the two styles of horn playing. Jan Vaclav Stich, who under the name Giovanni Punto gained renown as the century's greatest horn virtuoso, built his technique solidly on the second-horn style, as a look at the sonata composed for him by Beethoven, op. 17, will show; yet he is said to have perfected his high register as well as most first hornists.<sup>13</sup> Joseph Leutgeb, trained as a first hornist, had control of a slightly lower register than was usually the case, and Mozart's music for him makes frequent use of third-partial *g*. In his late fifties Leutgeb even seems to have suffered the loss of his highest notes, as the restricted range of K. 412, composed in 1791, the hornist's fifty-ninth year, implies.<sup>14</sup> Yet the first-horn style is fully evident in the emphasis on *cantabile* melody, stepwise passagework, and, in the works up to K. 495, a range extending to *c'''*.<sup>15</sup> The similarities and differences in first- and second-horn styles in solo concertos may be observed in the selection of melodies from opening allegro movements of works by Danzi, Mozart, Rosetti, and Beethoven in Example 3.<sup>16</sup> First-horn melodies did not always need to rise into the high register, as Rosetti's Kaul III/36 shows. Second-horn melodies might partake of a *cantabile* style, but in the middle register, as in Rosetti's Kaul III/43, or retain a more virtuoso second-horn style as in Kaul III/41. Beethoven's op. 17 prefaces the main theme with a repetition of the opening fanfare, and mixes the *cantabile* style with a more virtuosic style based on wide leaps and arpeggios during the course of the movement.<sup>17</sup>

Example 3: First and Second Horn Melodies

In E

The image displays three staves of musical notation in E major. The first staff, labeled 'In E', shows a first-horn melody starting with a whole rest, followed by a series of eighth and quarter notes: G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, F#4, E4, D4, C4. The second and third staves show second-horn melodies. Both start with a sixteenth-note arpeggio (G4, A4, B4, C5) followed by a series of eighth and quarter notes: G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, F#4, E4, D4, C4. The second staff ends with a quarter rest, and the third staff ends with a whole rest.

Example 3a. Franz Danzi, Concerto in E Major (First Horn)



In E $\flat$

Example 3e. Antonio Rosetti, Concerto in E $\flat$ , Kaul 41 (Second Horn).

in F

Example 3f. Beethoven, Sonata for Horn and Piano, Op. 17, first movement, mm. 1-20.





of  $b''$  in Kaul III/38, which otherwise observes the upper limit of  $a''$ .) It is instructive to compare these ranges with the ranges found in the music Mozart composed for Leutgeb, particularly the Horn Quintet, K. 407, and the concertos K. 417 and 495, written before the hornist began to experience difficulties with his high register in the later 1780s. (See the Comparative Table at the end of this article.) These works extend from third-partial  $g$  to  $c'''$ , a range also typical of first horn concertos by Rosetti and others.<sup>20</sup>

Example 5: Ranges of Five Works for Second Horn.

In  $E\flat$     In  $E\flat$     In  $E$     In  $E$     In  $F$     In  $F$     (.)

Mozart:    Rosetti:    K. 42    K. 44    K. 43    K. 38    Beethoven:  
 K. 452    K. 41                                                          Op. 17

That Mozart may well have been aware of an upper limit around  $g''$  and  $a''$  is suggested by the solo statement of the first theme of K. 370b (see Example 6a). The first phrase is played as it was introduced in the orchestral ritornello, but at the beginning of the second phrase the first violins take over the melody for two measures while the solo horn drops down an octave to repeated tones on  $c'$  before regaining the melody. Now, the complete melody would be possible on horn, but would require the use of  $c'''$ , the sixteenth partial of the  $E\flat$  horn, well above the usual second-horn range. (See Example 6b.)

It is possible that this perceived upper limit to the soloist's range might also be behind the unusual dominant-key return of the second-key theme in the recapitulation of the same movement. (See Example 7a.) After the soloist plays the first phrase of the theme in the dominant, the first violins take it over with an abrupt shift to the tonic key, after which the soloist continues with new material. Levin points out that to present the entire theme in the tonic key, Mozart would have had to use the high clarino register (as hypothetically reconstructed in Example 7b), ascending to  $d'''$ . This note was certainly within the abilities of many first hornists, and Mozart himself used it along with even higher pitches in the horn duos, K. 487, although it does not appear in the music for Leutgeb. It would have been equally possible to begin the theme an octave lower (as in Example 7c), which would have been more in keeping with the character of the movement, but then the third and fourth measures would require the prominent use of stopped  $d'$ , a relatively weak note rarely encountered in music of the period, and, to my knowledge, never used by Mozart in any work. Whatever other reasons Mozart may have had for this unusual moment, horn technique may well have contributed to the decision.<sup>21</sup>

Example 6: Main Theme of K. 370b.

Solo Horn in E $\flat$

Violin I

The image shows two systems of musical notation. The first system has two staves: the top staff is for the Solo Horn in E-flat and the bottom staff is for Violin I. The Solo Horn part consists of four measures with trills (tr) and slurs. The Violin I part is mostly empty in this system. The second system also has two staves. The top staff continues the Solo Horn part with slurs and ties. The bottom staff continues the Violin I part with a melodic line featuring slurs and ties.

Example 6a. mm. 35-42 of draft score.

The image shows a single staff of musical notation for a horn in E-flat. It contains a melodic line with slurs and ties, representing the transposition of the Violin I melody from Example 6a.

Example 6b. mm. 39-40: melody (Violin I) transposed for horn in E $\flat$ .

**Characteristic figures.** The second-horn style displayed a number of characteristic figures, mainly based on the development of virtuoso accompaniments across the lower and middle registers. Leaps between registers are common in second-horn parts, as are rapid arpeggios and scales, and the frequent use of  $\sharp$ ,  $b$ , and  $\sharp'$  as neighbor tones to the open third, fourth, and sixth partials. Often these kinds of figures were organized in stereotypical patterns. Some typical second-horn figures from the works of Rosetti, Mozart, and Beethoven may be observed in Example 8. The “factitious” tones lipped down from the second and third partials found in these excerpts are frequently encountered in second-horn music, especially toward the end of the century, but do not always appear. Rosetti’s second-horn concerto, Kaul III/41, whose virtuoso main theme is quoted in Example 3, makes no use of “factitious” tones, although it does reach second-partial  $c$  several times.

Example 7: Second Theme in the Recapitulation of K. 370b, mm. 99-106.

Example 7a. Transcription in concert pitch.

Example 7b. Alternatives for mm. 99-102 as written for Horn in  $E^b$ .

K. 370b and 371 also eschew the low “factitious” tones. (Mozart’s most extensive use of them occurs in the last movement of the Quintet for Piano and Winds.) The low *c* appears only once, at the end of K. 371; how, then, do these movements reflect the low-horn style? Example 9 shows several passages of K. 371 that seem to be based on, or derived from, characteristic second-horn figures. Most notable are the rapid arpeggios descending to the second partial at the end of the movement. (Example 9a.) Other passages display a virtuoso style in the middle register, requiring fluid manipulation of the hand in the bell to produce stopped notes, approaching the kind of second-horn melody found in other concertos of the period. (Examples 9b and c.) On the other hand, stepwise passagework more in keeping with the first-horn idiom, yet within the second-horn range, also appears. (Example 9d.) Such figures seem to have been characteristic of their respective horn styles, not exclusive to them.

## Example 8: Characteristic Passages in Works for Second Horn.

in F

Example 8 consists of three staves of music in F major. The first staff is in bass clef and contains two measures of music with dynamics *pp* and *p*. The second and third staves are in treble clef. The second staff contains two measures with dynamics *p*, *f*, and *sf*. The third staff contains two measures with dynamics *sf*, *cresc.*, and *ff*.

Example 8a. Beethoven, Sonata, Op. 17, mm. 164-180.

In F

Example 8a consists of two staves of music in F major. The first staff is in treble clef and the second is in bass clef. Both staves contain two measures of music.

Example 8b. Rosetti, Concerto in D Minor, K. 43, first movement, mm. 232-238.

In E $\flat$ 

Example 8b consists of two staves of music in E-flat major. The first staff is in treble clef and the second is in bass clef. Both staves contain two measures of music.

Example 8c. Mozart, Quintet for Piano and Winds, K. 452, first movement, mm. 117-122.

An unusual use of  $\sharp$ ' and  $\flat$  as neighbor tones in thematic construction occurs in the second-key theme found in the first and third episodes of K. 371. (Example 10a and b.) The neighbor-tone figure followed by a leap to the upper octave is reminiscent of the use of similar figures in conjunction with virtuoso passagework of the second-horn style (represent-

In E



Example 8d. Rosetti, Concerto in E Major, K. 42, first movement, mm. 186-196.

Example 9: Characteristic Passages in K. 371 (Horn in E $\flat$ ).

Example 9a. mm. 272-279.



Example 9b. mm. 53-56.



Example 9c. mm. 245-253.



Example 9d. mm. 229-233.

Example 10: Second Theme and Lead-in to Rondo Theme, K. 371.



Example 10a. Second Theme, First Episode, mm. 68-74.



Example 10b. Second Theme in Tonic Key, mm. 206-214.



Example 10c. mm. 167-174.

tative examples may be found in Pokorny's concerto in Example 1 and Rosetti's concertos in Example 8), although in Mozart's movement the rhythm has been slowed down and the figure thematized. Its appearance in the third episode (Example 10b) is particularly noteworthy, as lower, middle, and upper registers are all contrasted within the theme. This reflects a calculated contrast of registers encountered several times in this movement (a trait Mozart was to carry over into his concertos for Leutgeb); consider especially the lead-in to the return of the rondo theme at the end of the central episode, again making use of alternating neighbor-tones. (Example 10c.)

**Melodic style.** Both K. 370b and 371 have a rather different melodic style from the concertos for Leutgeb. Each of the later concertos introduces the solo horn with a *cantabile* melody, and, indeed, virtuosic passagework often becomes subordinated to, or subsumed in, melody. K. 370b and 371 certainly have *cantabile* phrases, but in general the melodies are based on more explicit march and dance rhythms. The main theme of K. 370b begins with four measures of a march topos, more reminiscent of Mozart's early Viennese piano concertos than the later horn concertos. (See Example 6a above.) The *cantabile* potential of the second theme (Example 7 above) is mitigated by staccato markings and the octave grace-note leap from *a'* to *a''*. K. 371 uses a 2/4 dance meter rather than the 6/8 hunting meter of the concerto rondos for Leutgeb, and the rondo theme itself contains a great many skips. The continuation of the second phrase is a motive based almost entirely on arpeggios<sup>22</sup> (see Example 9c above).

The melodies of K. 371 are especially well-rooted in the middle register where hand-stopping is needed to produce some of the notes. This is also true of K. 370b, but the melodies in that movement rise repeatedly to *a''*, often reached on a strong beat. That note occurs only once in passing (and on a weak beat) in K. 371, and is rarely used prominently in Mozart's later horn music, and for good reason. *a''* was a notorious note on the natural horn; Domnich warns that, along with *f#''*, it is the most difficult note on the instrument to produce with accurate intonation.<sup>23</sup> It is quite flat as the thirteenth partial, and in the hand-horn period was frequently played as a stopped or half-stopped note, lowered from the fourteenth partial.

It will be noted that K. 371 displays stronger, or more conventionally recognizable, second-horn characteristics than K. 370b. Robert Levin has also noted slight differences in the overall range between the two movements and use of a greater number of stopped notes to facilitate modulation in K. 371, noting the "striking contrast between the highly chromatic writing of K. 371 (the horn actively participates in a modulation to C $\flat$  major) and the conservative writing in K. 370b, in which only the chromatic pitches between written *c''* and *g''* are required (apart from the muted note *f#'*, derived from the natural overtone *g'*)."<sup>24</sup> (See the Comparative Table for the open partials and stopped notes used in these movements and other horn works by Mozart.)

The topic of hand-stopping deserves further consideration, for while Levin is surely right to point out the importance of hand-stopping in facilitating modulation, this is but one of four primary ways in which the technique expanded the resources of the instrument. The first and most important function of hand-stopping was to fill in the gaps in scales and arpeggios, allowing for the dominant arpeggio and diatonic melody to be played in the middle register. The second important use of stopped notes was to alter pitches within a key, usually in the context of partially chromatic melodies. This kind of chromaticism occurs frequently in Mozart's horn music, including the main theme of K. 370b. (See Example 6 above.) Third, was the use of stopped notes to expand the modulatory capacity of the horn by allowing the player to negotiate many different keys on the same instrument. And finally, stopped notes were sometimes employed for their coloristic effects; although eighteenth-century writers emphasize the need to equalize the difference in sound between stopped and open tones, differences were acknowledged to exist and there do seem to be instances of composers choosing stopped notes for their particular color.<sup>25</sup> Indeed, hand-stopping provided for an almost infinite gradation in color between fully open and fully stopped notes, a shading that was doubtless considered part of the instrument's charm.

The actual stopped and altered notes used in K. 370b and 371 are quite similar. (See Comparative Table.) K. 371 uses four notes not found in K. 370b: *b*, *g#'*, *ab'* and *ab''*, the last two used in the C $\flat$  major section of the rondo's second episode.<sup>26</sup> Most of the altered pitches are in fact used to play in the dominant key or for chromatic embellishment. Yet, for these slight differences, the two movements are actually closer to each other in the vocabulary of stopped notes employed than with the later music for Leutgeb, which also shows an internal consistency. The note *f'*, in particular, is found in both K. 370b and 371, but is not encountered in Mozart's other horn music.

### The Jacob Eisen question

The range, technique, and characteristic style of the horn writing in K. 370b and 371 are, then, fully consistent with the second-horn style. Yet it has been suggested that these features are strongest in K. 371, while K. 370b contains less characteristic, even awkward, treatment of the solo instrument. Differences in range and the use of stopped notes have led Levin to speculate that K. 370b was drafted before K. 371, perhaps before Mozart was fully aware of his performer's capabilities, of which he then proceeded to take full advantage in the *Rondeau*. Wolff, too, supports this thesis, noting that K. 371 reached a greater state of completeness than K. 370b. Both suggest that Mozart's signature and date on K. 371 may indicate that movement had assumed an independent status in the composer's mind. This investigation of the second-horn style is certainly compatible with those conclusions. But, however one reads such evidence, the question remains: for whom were these movements originally conceived?

The name of Jacob Eisen has been proposed by several scholars, presumably based on the reference to Eisen in Constanze Mozart's letter to Johann Anton André of 31 May 1800. André, who had recently acquired the greater portion of Mozart's autograph scores, was particularly concerned about missing portions of several manuscripts, including the horn concertos K. 417 and 495, and Constanze obliged with a list of fragments for sale, including four from horn concertos. After the list of fragments, Constanze writes that "the widow Eissen, Eizen or something like that, widow of the National Theater hornist, should have original scores for horn. Wranitzky will know her. Mozart himself had given her husband original manuscripts."<sup>27</sup> This passage seems to be the origin of the notion that K. 370b and 371 could have come into Constanze's possession via Eisen's widow and may have been intended for Eisen himself.<sup>28</sup>

The major difficulty with such an interpretation is the wording of the letter itself: her remarks about Eisen's widow clearly imply that she had had no personal contact with her at the time the letter was written, yet the horn concerto fragments listed earlier in the letter already seem to have been in her possession, or at least known to her through the inventories prepared by Maximilian Stadler and Georg Nicolaus Nissen, and they clearly include K. 371, and possibly K. 370b as well. A similar list of fragments is to be found in an earlier letter of 12 May 1800 to Breitkopf und Härtel, which seems to include the same four horn concerto fragments. In any event, the first two works on both lists are clearly the draft score to the rondo of K. 412, with its now famous series of humorous comments written over the horn part, and K. 371, the only other rondo among the fragmentary horn works, and appropriately described as "with orchestral accompaniment" as the draft score included the wind parts, unlike that of K. 412. The two lists are shown in Figure 1.<sup>29</sup>



Letter of 12 May 1800 (*Briefe*, No. 1297)

9. Rondò fürs Horn, nicht ganz instrumentirt.  
(9. Rondò for horn, not completely orchestrated.)

10. dito mit Orchesterbegleitung, nicht ganz instrumentirt.  
(10. ditto, with orchestral accompaniment, not completely orchestrated.)

[durchgestrichen: 11. Concert fürs horn. Von dem ersten Allegro sind 8 Seiten in partitur vollstimmig geschriben.]  
(struck through: 11. Concerto for horn. From the first allegro 8 pages are fully scored)]

11. Angelegtes erstes Allegro zu einem hornconcert. heivon sind 8 Seiten grösstentheils instrumentirt geschriben.  
(11. Drafted first Allegro to a horn concerto. Of this 8 pages are almost completely orchestrated.)

12. Angelegtes hornconcert. nur 4 Seiten geschriben.  
(12. Drafted horn concerto. Only 4 pages are written.)

Letter of 31 May 1800 (*Briefe*, No. 1299)

6.10. Rondo fürs horn mit scherzhaftr Ueberschrift. dieses hat Leutgeb mir in Copie versprochen. herausgegeben ist, glaube ich, gar nichts von diesen Sachen.  
(6.10. Rondo for horn with joking title. Leutgeb has promised me a copy of this. Nothing at all from these pieces has been published, I believe.)

12. Rondo fürs horn mit Orchesterbegleitung kennt Leutgeb gar nicht, und schließt daraus, daß es nicht vollstimmig existirt.  
(12. Rondo for horn with orchestral accompaniment. Leutgeb does not know it at all and concludes therefore that it does not exist fully scored.)

14. angelegtes erstes allegro beurtheilt Leutgeb auf dieselbe Art.  
(14. Drafted first allegro. Leutgeb judges it the same way.)

15. angelegtes horn concert gleichfalls.  
(15. Drafted horn concerto, the same.)

**Figure 1:**

Lists of horn concerto fragments from Constanze Mozart's letters of 12 May 1800 and 31 May 1800 (translations mine)

The identity of the third and fourth fragments is less certain, but if both lists refer to the same works, the most likely candidates are K. 494a, the eight-page fragment of an allegro in E major in which the orchestration of the opening ritornello is very nearly complete, and the bifolium containing the opening measures of K. 370b, although the vague description in the letter of 12 May 1800 might just as well refer to another part of K. 370b (which seems to have been separated into two or three units by May 1800) or the separated bifolium of K. 371.<sup>30</sup> Curiously, Constanze's master list of fragments, sent in a letter to Breitkopf und Härtel on 1 March 1800, and later published as part of the appendix to Nissen's biography of Mozart, lists only two horn concerto fragments, identified as "II. bruchstück eines Corno Concerts. III. Ein anders von eben dieser Gattung."<sup>31</sup> It is, of course, impossible to know whether these fragments are the same as some of those included on the later lists, but it is certainly possible that they represent additional portions of K. 370b and 371.<sup>32</sup>

What seems clear by a close reading of the letters and consultation with facsimiles of the horn concerto autographs, is that by May 1800 Constanze had in her possession several horn concerto fragments that would be bought by André: the rondo draft K. 412, K. 371, a separated bifolium of K. 371, K. 494a, and one bifolium of K. 370b.<sup>33</sup> Two further units of K. 370b remained with Constanze. Combined with the autograph material already in André's possession, this accounts for all of the autograph sources for Mozart's horn concertos (completed works, drafts, and fragments) known to us except for a small fragment of K. 370b later cut from the manuscript and never recovered and K. 514, Süßmayr's completion of the rondo of K. 412, which would only later come to be regarded, wrongly, as a Mozart autograph.<sup>34</sup> It seems unlikely, then, that any of these scores could have come to Constanze via Eisen's widow.

On the other hand, Constanze's letter does attest to the probable collaboration between Mozart and Jacob Eisen, and the composer's probable esteem for the hornist. Eisen was certainly the kind of player for whom Mozart would have written a concerto. Although the secondary literature exhibits some disagreement as to whether Eisen was a first or second hornist, the weight of evidence suggests that he was a low-horn player.<sup>35</sup> He was a member of Joseph II's Imperial *Harmonie* from its founding in 1782, and a member of the National Theater orchestra from 1783 until his death in 1796.<sup>36</sup> The *Harmonie* was an octet of some of the finest wind players in Vienna, consisting of clarinetists Anton and Johann Stadler, the oboists Georg Tribensee and Johann Vent, the bassoonists Wenzel Kauzner and Ignaz Drobny, and the hornists Martin Rupp and Jacob Eisen, to follow the official listing in the *Hof- und Staats Schematismus*.<sup>37</sup> A contributor to Cramer's *Magazin der Musik*, who heard the ensemble in 1783, praised this "society of virtuosi containing only wind instrumentalists who have reached a high degree of perfection," saying specifically of Eisen, the "second hunting horn," that he "is supposed to be even superior to [first horn] Hr. Rupp."<sup>38</sup> Eisen's reputation is further confirmed by Lichtenstern's glowing appraisal of Rupp and Eisen as "outstanding masters of the horn" in his guide book of 1791.<sup>39</sup> During the Lenten concert season of most years between 1784 and 1789, the *Harmonie* gave an academy at the National Theater, and members of the ensemble frequently participated in concerts given by other musicians. Eisen played a concerto on an academy of 23 June 1791.<sup>40</sup>

Eisen, then, emerges as one of the most important horn players in Mozart's Vienna, and was doubtless one of the players with whom the composer worked. It would seem likely that Mozart recruited the wind players for the Quintet for Piano and Winds, K. 452, from members of the Imperial *Harmonie*, and because the horn part is written for a second hornist, it most likely would have been played by Eisen. In addition, Rupp and Eisen may have participated in performances of Mozart's piano concertos, and, as members of the opera orchestra, would have played the Viennese performances of *Le nozze di Figaro*, *Don Giovanni*, and *Così fan tutte*. Indeed, the obbligato horn parts of the aria "Per pietà, mio bene, perdona" may have been specially conceived with their abilities in mind.

It is tempting to speculate that Mozart met Eisen at one of the private concerts he attended shortly after his arrival in Vienna. Unfortunately, Eisen's career before 1782 remains undocumented, although he may well have been working in or near Vienna, perhaps employed in one of the private orchestras or wind ensembles in the city. It is to be hoped that future research will shed light on his early career, including his whereabouts in March of 1781.

### Conclusions

K. 370b and 371 are informed by the second-horn style of the later eighteenth century. Even though Mozart did not choose to feature the lower register in a special way or to employ overtly stereotypical second-horn figures, the basis of much of the horn writing in these movements demonstrably derives from the second-horn style. Recognition that the work was written for a second-horn player and uses second-horn technique is, of course, a consideration in any attempt to complete the remaining gap in the solo part of K. 370b, but it affects our approach to study and performance in several more important ways. It helps to separate those elements of horn writing that are based on a general eighteenth-century horn technique from those that might be attributed to the personal abilities of a particular player. It helps to put into perspective the differences between these two movements and the later horn concertos; it is not so much a question of a change in approach to writing for horn as it is a question of horn writing for players whose techniques were founded in different idioms. In one sense, this study of the second-horn style and technique may be seen as reinforcing Wolff's and Levin's thesis regarding the chronological relationship of K. 370b and 371, and the eventual abandonment of the former. For it has been noted that many of the most characteristic features of the second-horn style are stronger in K. 371 than K. 370b. Add to that the problematic aspects of K. 370b, above all the prominent use of the treacherous *a*, and the idea the Mozart drafted the movement before becoming fully acquainted with the technical, and perhaps musical, capabilities of his player gains in credibility. Who this player was remains uncertain; Jacob Eisen remains an attractive candidate, but cannot be confirmed beyond doubt. Nor can all the fascinating questions raised by these movements be answered by an analysis of horn technique alone. But it is clear that, shortly after his arrival in Vienna in March of 1781, Mozart met a horn player of superior ability who inspired him to conceive and draft two movements of a work that remains unique in the composer's oeuvre—a concerto for *second* horn.

Coparative table of ranges and pitches used in selected horn works by Mozart

Whole notes represent open partials and filled-in notes represent pitches produced or altered by hand-stopping.

The hand positions shown are from Heinrich Domnich's *Méthode de Premier et Second Cor* (Paris, 1807).

+ represents fully stopped, 0 fully open (hand against the side of the bell rather than cupped) and fractions represent varying degrees of closure. ↓ represents a "factitious" note "lipped" down from the nearest open partial.

K. 370b (1781)

+ 1/2      1/2 3/4      3/4      3/4 +      + 1/2      1/2

K. 371 (1781)

1/2      + 1/2      3/4 + 1/2 0      3/4      3/4 +      +      + 1/2      1/2

K. 407 (1782)

↓ or 1/2

K. 417 (1783)

K. 447 (ca. 1787)

+

K. 495 (1786)

+

*Andrew Kearns lives in Greenville, SC, where he has taught music history and appreciation at Furman University. A graduate of the University of Illinois at Urbana, his research has centered on the genres of the concerto and orchestral serenade from the second half of the eighteenth century. He has published articles in The Journal of Musicological Research and The Horn Call Annual. He is currently working on an edition of orchestral serenades.*

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Both are typical of Mozart's draft scores in that they consist of the complete melody line (divided between the solo horn and first violin), parts of the bass line, and various degrees of detail in the inner voices. The most substantial discussions of K. 370b and 371 are the introductory essays by Christoph Wolff and Robert Levin in the facsimile edition *Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. Concerto for Horn and Orchestra in E $\flat$  Major, K. 370b + 371, A Facsimile Reconstruction of the Autograph Sources* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard College Library, 1997). Other important discussions are: Richard Dunn, "Mozart's Unvollendete Hornkonzerte," *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1960/61*, pp. 156-167; Marie Rolf, "A New Manuscript Source for Mozart's Rondo in E $\flat$ , K. 371," *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1991*, pp. 938-945; and Franz Giegling's foreword to the horn concerto volume in the *Neue Mozart-Ausgabe*, VI/14/5 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1987), especially pp. xv-xvi.

<sup>2</sup> Constanze Mozart's letter of 31 May 1800 clearly states that Leutgeb had no knowledge of K. 371 or two other horn concerto fragments listed in the letter. The relevant passage is quoted in Example 11 below.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Franz Giegling, "Vorwort," pp. x and xvi. Several other scholars cite Giegling in making this connection. The evidence linking Eisen's name with K. 370b and 371 will be investigated below.

<sup>4</sup> See Rolf, "A New Manuscript Source."

<sup>5</sup> For a full discussion of these fragments and their provenance see Christoph Wolff's introductory essay, "The Autograph Scores of Mozart's Horn Concerto in E $\flat$ , K. 370b + 371," in the Harvard College Library facsimile edition, pp. 5-13. There have been several performing editions of K. 370b, most notably by Herman Jeurissen (1978, recorded in 1980) and Barry Tuckwell (recorded for Decca/London in 1983), but, unlike K. 371, the movement has never become a repertory piece. Robert Levin is preparing a new performing edition of both movements that takes into account recently discovered fragments.

<sup>6</sup> While Giegling, Rolf, and others have noted that Eisen was a low-horn player and that K. 371 ends with a low concert *eb*, none analyze the work for other possible characteristics of the second-horn style.

<sup>7</sup> Robert Levin has persuasively argued against the theory of a missing development section in his introductory essay, "Structural and Textural Issues in Mozart's Horn Concerto in E $\flat$  major, K. 370b + 371," Harvard College Library facsimile edition, pp. 16-18.

<sup>8</sup> I have preferred the more widely used designations *first* and *second* to the French *cor alto* and *cor basse*. While frequently mentioned in the literature, the two styles of horn playing have rarely been discussed at length. Brief discussions occur in Reginald Morley-Pegge, *The French Horn*, 2nd ed. (London: Ernest Benn Limited, and New York: W.W. Norton, 1973), pp. 95-96; Morley-Pegge, Frank Hawkins, and Richard Merewether, "Horn," in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, Vol. 8, p. 700; and Paul Bryan, "Haydn's Hornists," *Haydn Studien*, Bd. 3 (1974), pp. 54-55.

The topic is treated frequently in passing in Horace Fitzpatrick, *The Horn and Horn Playing and the Austro-Bohemian Tradition 1680-1830* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970). English translations and some interpretation of discussions of first- and second-horn styles culled from the French tutors of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries are found in Birchard Coar, *A Critical Study of the Nineteenth Century Horn Virtuosi in France* (DeKalb, IL, 1952). Robert Levin includes a lengthy discussion of Mozart's solo horn parts classified mainly by range in *Who Wrote the Mozart Four-Wind Concertante?* (Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 1988), pp. 143-44. A fuller analysis of the first- and second-horn styles as found in concertos of the period and taking into consideration several characteristics in addition to range may be found in my article, "Clarino Horn, Hand Horn, and Virtuosity in the Late-Eighteenth Century Horn Concerto," *Horn Call Annual* 3 (1991): 6-12 and 17-22.

<sup>9</sup> Representative comments may be found in Coar, *Critical Study*, p. 11 (from the method by Giovanni Punto) and pp. 24-25 (from Heinrich Domnich). Domnich may also be consulted in the original French in the facsimile edition of his important *Méthode de Premier et Second Cor* (Paris, 1807; reprint edition, Geneva: Minkoff, 1974), pp. i-ii.

<sup>10</sup> Fitzpatrick, *The Horn and Horn Playing*, p. 225. Fitzpatrick includes a complete English translation of Gerber's article on the horn from his *Historisches-Biographisches Lexicon der Tonkünstler* (Leipzig, 1792), which is an appendage to the biography of Count Franz Anton von Sporck, who is credited with introducing the horn into Bohemia. The difference in tone quality noted by Gerber was no doubt due in part to the differences between the narrower mouthpiece of the first and the wider mouthpiece of the second.

<sup>11</sup> In addition to the sources listed above, J. Murray Barbour, *Trumpets, Horns and Music* (n.p.: Michigan State University Press, 1964) has an extensive treatment of the clarino trumpet and horn styles, including classifications of characteristic figures. While not directly discussing the issue of first- and second-horn styles, Paul Bryan, "The Horn in the Works of Mozart and Haydn: Some Observations and Comparisons," *Haydn Yearbook* 9 (1975), pp. 189-225 includes many relevant examples.

<sup>12</sup> On the development of hand-stopping, particularly as a second-horn technique, see Fitzpatrick, *The Horn and Horn Playing*, p. 88, and his translation of the end of Gerber's article, p. 226.

<sup>13</sup> Fitzpatrick, *Ibid.*, pp. 171-72. Levin, *Concertante*, pp. 144-45, prints some examples from Punto's concertos that show several aspects of the second-horn style, without, however, identifying them as such.

<sup>14</sup> Alan Tyson, "Mozart's D-Major Horn Concerto," in *Mozart. Studies of the Autograph Scores* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), pp. 259-61.

<sup>15</sup> Leutgeb had a long and productive career, emerging on the scene as a member of Prince Sachsen-Hildburghausen's private orchestra in Vienna in 1752, becoming a popular soloist on Viennese academies during the 1760s, and continuing to tour as a soloist during his tenure as first hornist with the Salzburg court orchestra. After he settled in Vienna in 1777 at age forty-five he seems to have lived in semi-retirement, performing frequently but supporting his family by running a cheese shop. Mozart's solo works for Leutgeb were all composed between the hornist's fiftieth and fifty-ninth years. The most substantial biography is Karl Maria Pisarowitz, "Mozarts schnorrer Leutgeb," *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Stiftung Mozarteum*, Vol. 18, No. 3/4 (1970), pp. 21-26. Recent evidence of his Viennese performances during the 1760s is discussed in Daniel Hertz, "Leutgeb and the 1762 horn concertos of Joseph and Johann Michael Haydn," *Mozart-Jahrbuch 1987/88*, pp. 59-64.

<sup>16</sup> Here and elsewhere, Mozart's works are identified by their traditional Köchel numbers from the earlier editions of Ludwig von Köchel's *Chronologisch-thematisches Verzeichnis sämtlicher Tonwerke Wolfgang Amadeus Mozarts* (Leipzig, 1862). Revised Köchel numbers were assigned to three of the works mentioned in this article in the third and the sixth editions of the catalog (1937 and 1964),

and are often cited alongside the traditional numbers: K. 407=386b, K. 412=386c, and K. 487=496a. Rosetti's works are identified by their numbers from the third section of Oskar Kaul, *Thematisches Verzeichnis der Instrumentalwerke von Anton Rosetti* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1968; this is a revision of the list originally published as a supplement to the Rosetti volume in the *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Bayern* in 1912, and therefore sometimes called "DTB" numbers). Although Kaul's numbers are still a standard way of identifying Rosetti's works, his catalog has been superseded by Sterling E. Murray, *The Music of Antonio Rosetti (Anton Rösler) ca. 1750-1792: Thematic Catalog* (Michigan: Harmonie Park Press, 1996). Kaul III/42, used in Examples 5 and 8, has also been attributed to Giovanni Punto and Carl Stamitz, but Murray identifies Rosetti as the "correct composer."

<sup>17</sup> While some solo parts specifically call for *cornò primo* or *cornò secondo principale*, such a designation does not necessarily indicate more of an emphasis on the specialized first- or second-horn techniques than works with more neutral designations. Mozart himself usually identified the solo part by *Cornò principale* or, on K. 417, *Cornò solo*.

<sup>18</sup> Even if one accepts the proposition that the spurious K. 297B contains some authentic material, the horn part is demonstrably a first horn part and therefore must have been extensively rewritten, as Levin points out in *Concertante*.

<sup>19</sup> Domnich, *Méthode*, p. 9. Domnich, who numbered Punto among his teachers, was a German thoroughly trained in the German-Bohemian tradition of horn playing.

<sup>20</sup> The low *f#*, used as a neighbor tone to the third partial in one passage of the Horn Quintet, K. 407, is the only occurrence of this note in the music for Leutgeb, and the only indication that Leutgeb cultivated the low-register "factitious" tones at one time. While rarely used in first-horn parts, some exceptional first-horn virtuosos do seem to have cultivated a range usually left to second-horn players. Both Haydn's Horn Concerto of 1762 and *Divertimento a tre* of 1767 include low "factitious" tones in first-horn parts. The *Divertimento* was apparently intended for Carl Franz, a virtuoso noted for his wide range. The Horn Concerto may also have been intended for Franz, although Daniel Heartz has made a case for Leutgeb (see Heartz, "Leutgeb and the 1762 Horn Concertos").

<sup>21</sup> For further discussion of this passage, see Levin, "Structural and Textural Issues," p. 18.

<sup>22</sup> This motive was later used by Mozart in the Act II finale of *Le nozze di Figaro* (starting at m. 171).

<sup>23</sup> Domnich, *Méthode*, p. 10. Punto also warns of these treacherous pitches.

<sup>24</sup> Levin, "Structural and Textural Issues," p. 15.

<sup>25</sup> The stopped *eb'* in the first horn in mm. 174-78 of the first movement of the D-Minor Piano Concerto, K. 466, is an example from Mozart's orchestral music. Among several examples from the horn concertos, one might single out two from K. 447: the *eb'* in mm. 95-96 of the first movement and the *sfp db'* in m. 49 of the second movement.

<sup>26</sup> For the purposes of comparing the pitch vocabulary found in these movements, it is useful to regard enharmonic equivalents, such as *c#* and *db*, as separate pitches, as indeed they were presented in the Parisian tutors. Domnich often shows a slightly different hand position for such enharmonic equivalents, as may be noted in the Comparative Table.

<sup>27</sup> Wilhelm A. Bauer, Otto Erich Deutsch, and Joseph Heinz Eibl, eds., *Mozart. Briefe und Aufzeichnungen*. (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1962-1975). vol. IV, no. 1299, p. 358, translation mine. "Die Witwe Eissen, Eizen oder dergleichen, Witwe des Waldhornisten bey dem hiesigen Nationaltheater, soll einige Originalpartituren für das Horn haben. Wranizky wird sie kennen. Mozart hat selbst ihrem Mann Originalien gegeben."

<sup>28</sup> See Giegling, "Vorwort," p. x.

<sup>29</sup> Letters No. 1297 and 1299 from *Briefe*, Vol. IV, pp. 350 and 357, respectively. In addition to the reasons stated above, the spelling *Rondò* in the letter of 12 May 1800 matches that of the autograph



of K. 412.

<sup>30</sup> The third work is identified, correctly I believe, as K. 494a by Joseph Heinz Eibl, *Briefe*, vol. VII, pp. 542 and 546. Wolff, "The Autograph Sources," pp. 7 and 12, n. 30, identifies the third fragment as the opening bifolium of K. 370b and the fourth as the separated bifolium of K. 371. This seems to ignore the letter of 12 May 1800 as the opening gathering of K. 370b seems to have already been separated (one of the bifolia making up the gathering was acquired by André while the other remained with Constanze) leaving only four pages which in no way could be mistaken for a "fully scored" or even an "almost completely orchestrated" work. Wolff seems to be working under the assumption that the two lists do not necessarily contain the same works.

<sup>31</sup> See the letter of 1 March 1800, *Briefe*, Vol. IV, p. 328, and Nissen, *Biographie W. A. Mozarts* (Leipzig, 1828), Anhang, p. 17.

<sup>32</sup> Wolff, "The Autograph Sources," p. 12, n. 28, associates the Roman numeral "III," written in red pencil on the separated bifolium of K. 371, with the third section of Nissen's Anhang in which the horn concerto fragments are listed. The spelling *bruchstück* also occurs in Nissen's hand on the same bifolium, see Harvard College Library facsimile edition, p. 43. Wolff's conclusion seems to me not unreasonable, especially if one considers how Nissen's descriptive language from the manuscripts made its way onto the other lists of fragments (such as "nicht ganz instrumentirt.")

<sup>33</sup> The autograph scores of several of Mozart's horn works acquired by André bear numbers from the "Gleißner" Catalogue, a thematic catalogue of Mozart's estate prepared for André ca. 1800. The numbers included are 147 (K. 417), 148 (K. 494a), 149 (K. 370b bifolium), 159 (K. 412, first movement), and 206 (K. 447; this number appears to be in a different hand). This series of numbers appears on the opening pages of the first movements, so the autograph portions of K. 495, the rondo of K. 412, and the separated bifolium of K. 371 are excluded, even though they were in André's possession.

<sup>34</sup> According to *Köchel*, it was eventually acquired by Carl Mozart. The first movements of K. 412 and K. 514 were first published as a two-movement concerto in the old Mozart *Gesamtausgabe* (*W.A. Mozarts Werke: Kritisch durchgesehene Gesamtausgabe*) in 1879.

<sup>35</sup> Pizarowitz, "Leutgeb," p. 24, identifies Eisen as the first hornist with the National Theater orchestra, perhaps in light of the fact that Eisen's name appears before that of his partner Rupp on several of the court pay lists. Other possible evidence may be found in Dorothea Link, *The National Court Theatre in Mozart's Vienna. Sources and Documents 1783-1792* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 448, who publishes a pay list for 1793 that shows Eisen filled in at the Kärntnerthor Theater for four months before the arrival of Lotter, probably first hornist Willibald Lotter. His partner there was Hörmann, probably Johannes Hörmann, a celebrated second-hornist who would succeed Eisen at the National Theater and would play with Lotter for many years. See Fitzpatrick, *The Horn and Horn Playing*, pp. 201-02 and 209. This may simply indicate, however, that Eisen, like Leutgeb or Punto, was a player of exceptional ability, who had developed a strong enough high register to temporarily substitute in the first horn position at Vienna's second theater.

<sup>36</sup> Link, *National Court Theatre*, p. 209, n. 15 and Fitzpatrick, *The Horn and Horn Playing*, p. 205.

<sup>37</sup> The *Schematismus* for 1791 is printed in H.C. Robbins Landon, *Mozart. The Golden Years* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1989), pp. 256-57.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 239, n. 16.

<sup>39</sup> Fitzpatrick, *The Horn and Horn Playing*, p. 205.

<sup>40</sup> Link, *National Court Theatre*, p. 171.