# Critical Report

## **Abbreviations**

1., 2. first, second note

81/85 measure number in original/revised version

bt(s) beat(s)

corr. corrected or correction

NMA KB Neue Mozart-Ausgabe Kritischer Bericht (Critical Report)

orig. original, originally

ps paper stain (paper manufacturing defect)

Str. strings

TS total span (top staff, 1st line—bottom staff, 5th line, in mm)

u1 upbeat to measure 1

## Source

Autograph, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Kraków (formerly Prussian State Library [Preußische Staatsbibliothek], Berlin), bound together with the Horn Concerto in E flat major, K. 417, call number *Mus. ms. autogr. W. A. Mozart KV 412. 417.* Light brown half leather binding, oblong format, ca. 33 x 24.5 cm. Paper label pasted on the upper left of the front cover with the inscription in black ink *Mozart / Aut. K. 412. / 417.*, underlined in red ink. The spine of the binding stamped in gold: *MOZART I Horn- I concerte // KV 412. 417 // Auto- I graph*: the Köchel numbers on black background, the rest on red background.

The paper types of the two movements, notated entirely on twelve-staff paper, are as follows:

First movement: fols. 1–4 paper type 82 (Vienna, from 1785, TS 186–187<sup>-</sup>), a gathering of two bifolia; fols. 5–6: paper type 102 (Vienna, 1791, TS 189–190<sup>-</sup>), a bifolium (quadrants 1a, 4a); fols. 7–8 and second movement, fols. 1, 2, and 4: paper type 100 (Vienna, from 1789, TS 181–183), a gathering of two bifolia plus a single leaf (quadrant 4a) – but see below.<sup>1</sup>

Second movement, fols. 1, 2, 4 see above; fol. 3: paper type 91 (Vienna, from 1787, TS 187–188.5), a single leaf (quadrant 4a).<sup>2</sup>

Fols. 1–5, numbered by Mozart, comprise the score of the first movement; fol. [6] is unnumbered and empty.<sup>3</sup> Fol. [7] contains a particella of the oboes and the horns (first movement, mm. 22–end), and fol. [8] is empty. Mozart entered the numbering quickly after the movement had been completed, turning the pages after the notation of each number before the ink had dried, smudging the numbers and creating ink traces on the *verso* side of each previous leaf.

Mozart's draft of the Rondó is foliated anew by him from 1–4; fol. 4 was originally labeled 5 and corrected to 4;<sup>4</sup> fol. 4v is empty.

Notations in handwritings other than Mozart's on fol. 1r of the first movement: No 13. in upper left corner (packing crate inventory number when Mozart's autographs were sent to Johann Anton André in 1799); title: Concerto a Corno principale in dark red ink (Franz Gleissner);<sup>5</sup> to its right, von Mozart und seiner Handschrift [by Mozart and his handwriting](Georg Nikolaus Nissen). On the right outer margin, 1782. (Johann Anton André); underneath it № 159 (Gleissner catalogue number<sup>6</sup>), gut. [good], below it aber manque [but missing]—these three notations in the same red ink as the title (Franz Gleissner). The latter has been crossed out in black ink. In the right margin slightly below the third-from-last staff, K 412 in pencil (perhaps entered when the manuscript was taken over into the Royal Library, Berlin – the former name of the Preußische Staatsbibliothek). In the center of the bottom margin 190 in pencil (André handwritten catalogue);<sup>7</sup> to its right 256, framed by a rectangular box, all in pencil (André published catalogue).

Notations in handwritings other than Mozart's on fol. 1r of the Rondó: *No 17*. in upper left corner (packing crate inventory number when Mozart's autographs were sent to Johann Anton André in 1799); in upper right corner, *von Mozart und seine Handschrift* (Georg Nikolaus Nissen); below Mozart's numbering of fol. 1, 9 in pencil in a recent hand (=continuation of through foliation from the first movement, though subsequent leaves are not correspondingly numbered). The individual packing number and Nissen's authentication confirm that the two manuscripts were separated no later than when Nissen prepared the inventory of Mozart's manuscripts, and that they remained separated at the time they were shipped to André; otherwise there would not have been a separate, nonconsecutive packing number for the Rondó.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, the fact that the Rondó does not have separate André and Gleissner catalogue numbers, with corresponding notations on fol. 1, demonstrates that André realized the two manuscripts belonged together and reunited them.

The twelve staves of both movements are divided into two braces of six staves each. Mozart's tempo markings and instrumental designations are as follows:

#### First movement

No tempo marking. <u>2 violini</u> (between staves 1 and 2), <u>Viole</u> (staff 3), <u>2 oboe</u> (staff 4, with double treble clef to indicate two instruments on the same staff), <u>2 fagotti</u> (staff 5, with single bass clef), <u>Bassi</u> (staff 6). This apportionment is used for the opening ritornello. There is no <u>staff</u> for Cor princ. It enters at the upbeat to m. 22, from which point the six-staff brace is reapportioned as follows: *Corno* 

Solo (staff 1, new treble clef without the key signature of two sharps, to denote Cor. in D), Violino 1<sup>mo</sup> (staff 2), Violino 2<sup>do</sup> (staff 3), Viola (staff 4). Staff 5 contains whole rests for Fg. through the end of the line (mm. 22-25), after which the 5th staff of each brace (staves 5 and 11 of the page) are blank. Bassi remain on staff 6 and are not relabeled; and Ob. and Fg. are relegated from here onward to a separate particella (see below). At the beginning of fol. 2v, which coincides with m. 51 - the first measure of the middle ritornello - Mozart omits Cor. princ. (whose quarter note on written  $g^2$  on the downbeat is not notated but is indicated by a custos in the Cor. princ. part at the end of the previous page, to the right of the bar line ending m. 50). From here the apportionment is Violino 1<sup>mo:</sup> (above staff 1), <u>Violino 2<sup>do</sup></u> (staff 2), Viola (staff 3), staves 4 and 5 blank. After the first beat of m. 72 (fol. 3r, m. 2), at the entry of Cor. princ., Mozart reverts to the previous apportionment: Corno (staff 1), Violino 1<sup>mo</sup> (staff 2), Violino 2<sup>do</sup> (staff 3), Viola (staff 4), labeled above the respective staves; staff 5 is blank and the Bassi, unlabeled, continue to occupy staff 6. This carries through the end of the movement

#### Second movement

Tempo designations: <u>Adagio</u>. above the upbeat to m. 1 in Cor. princ. staff (clearly intended humorously), <u>Allegro</u> above the upbeat to each of the four Str. staves (2-5 [<u>Allegro</u>. over the Bassi staff]), slightly running over the bar line. <u>Rondó</u>. (sic) above m. 1 in Cor. princ. staff. Instrumental designations to left of brace, <u>Corno I principale</u>. (staff 1), <u>Violini</u> (between staves 2 and 3), <u>Viole</u> (staff 4), <u>Bassi</u> (staff 5). Staff 6 is left blank, and this apportionment carries through the rest of the movement, with two five-staff braces followed by a blank staff (staves 6 and 12 of the page).

There are two details of this layout that deserve attention:

- 1. Mozart's abbreviation (*Violini* rather than *2 Violini*) reflects his frequent practice for a later movement of a work.
- 2. The lack of wind instruments in the Rondó reflects Mozart's prior decision to notate Ob. and Fg. in a separate particella, as he had for the first movement from m. 22 onward. Fate prevented him from finishing the Str. scoring in the main score, which would have preceded the notation of the second-movement particella.

As mentioned in the Preface, Mozart notated a string of insults in Italian above the Cor. princ. staff, directed at the hapless Leutgeb. These are reproduced in the edition

The original draft of the first movement encompasses fols. 1–4; but Mozart proceeded to revise the movement before he had finished the scoring. He struck the last measure of fol. 4r (m. 119 in the original version, m. 128 in the corrected one) and 11 more measures of Cor. princ. (punctuated by responses in VI. I but otherwise not orchestrated) on fol. 4v, leading to the final trill and its resolution on the downbeat of the 12th measure (original version, mm. 120–132, first beat). He then used fol. 5 for two revisions:

- 1. A 12-measure orchestral interpolation after m. 80 (mm. 81–92 of the revision), replacing the original 4-measure tutti (mm. 81–84 of that version), cued with the letters  $\it A/B$ .
- 2. A replacement for mm. 120ff. of the original version, cued with the letter C of which two measures are on the *recto* side of folio 5 and the remaining 13 measures, including the final ritornello that was not notated in the original version, on the *verso* side.

These alterations will be described in detail within the list of readings below.

As mentioned above, the following leaf, fol. [6], is blank; fol. [7] recto/verso, which follows, contains the particella for Ob. and Fg., beginning at m. 22 and labeled by Mozart "beym Solo". The two Ob. are labeled 2 oboe (staff 1, with double treble clef to indicate two instruments on the same staff), 2 fagotti (between staves 2 and 3): Mozart uses a staff for each of the two Fg., with four three-staff braces on the recto side and three on the verso side. As the wind particella was prepared after the revision of the first movement, it reflects the expansions and cuts of that revision. The wind parts to the original version have been derived from it; additions by the editor necessitated by the restoration of passages deleted in the revision are labeled "E."

Other notations entered into the score by Mozart in the course of the movement will be described within the list of Individual Readings below.

The only other sources for the two movements are manuscript copies prepared by Aloys Fuchs and Köchel from the autograph. As such they have no intrinsic source value and have not been consulted for this edition.

# Individual Readings

Paper discolorations are not enumerated unless there is evidence of smudging or erasure in conjunction with corrections. Tiny paper stains, usually red or redbrown, are enumerated only where their staff location could be mistaken for a whole rest, which Mozart notates as a dot within the third space of the respective staff. Readings of particular consequence to performance are indicated in **bold type**.

First movement					beamed 12. together. Bar line at 46–47
u1–21 bt 3	Cor. princ.	Omitted from score; takes over VI. I staff from 21 bt 4.		VI. II	redrawn to right to squeeze in final <b>1</b> Tie 2.–3., <b>#</b> and <b>7</b> . smudged, likewise ink
u1 2	Va., Fg. Vc. e Cb.	corr. from 7 1. i smudged.	49	VI. I	ran 47, 1., no evident corr. Smudge before 1., orig. <i>a</i> or <i>a</i> <sup>1</sup> ?
7	VI. I	Cf. facsimile p. 41. Bt 3 $c\#^2$ corr. to $d^2$ . The first of the two upper arcs is not a slur, but	49–50	Cor. princ.	50 bt 1 indicated only by <i>custos</i> (direct) after 49 (end of brace); Cor. princ. not no-
		rather the slash of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{A})$ ; the second arc slurs			tated from 51–67/71.
		7–10. There are two lower arcs. The first, nearly flush with the middle staff line, slurs	50	VI. I	Oblique smudge/paper stain from top right to lower left; no evident corr.
		bts 3 and 4; the position of this slur, which	51–54	all	= fol. 2v 1–4: horizontal brace and <i>bis</i>
		is missing from other editions, implies that it was entered after the \$\infty\$ appoggiatura.			above Cor. princ. indicating repetition of these four measures, further indicated by
		The second slur links the appoggiatura to			12 short, steep diagonal lines from upper
8	VI. I	bt 4. Bt 4 light brown stain, erasure? Tiny dot be-			left to lower right both before 51 and after 54. It is evident that these indications were
		low 9., orig. c# <sup>2</sup> ?			squeezed into the score after VI. I had been
11 bt 3 13	VI. II, Va. VI. I	corr. to – Slur appears to extend to 5., but all slurs			notated, but probably – given the spacing – before the notation of the remaining Str.
		in 12–14 extend beyond their intended last			The repetition is thus part of the revision
		note, confirmed by the starting point of the second slur in 12 and 14; corr. according			and has been deleted from the original version. Given that the third and fourth of
		to unequivocal reading at parallel passage 101/113.			these measures are repeated (55–56/59–60), the effect of the further repetition of
14	VI. I	Slur 7.–8. corr. to 7.–10.			51–54 in the revision as 55–58 is tautologi-
15	VI. II, Va., Fg.	VI. II last $\mathcal{I}$ orig. notated with flag, together with $f$ , the previous notes were evidently			cal by Mozart's standards and challenges the hypothesis that the revision constitutes
		notated afterwards and the last two 8ths			an improvement.
		were then beamed together; likewise Va. and Fg., where Va. 3.–5./Fg. \$7 squeezed in	51/51, 55	Vc. e Cb.	Smudge at 6., perhaps to add # before notehead.
16–18	VI. II, Va.	before already notated <b>f</b> .  The missing strokes and slurs compared	61/65	Va.	Smudge at 2. (including $\boldsymbol{p}$ ), no apparent revision.
		with VI. I, 12–14 may be due to the char-	63/67	Vc. e Cb.	Oblique (similar to those in 61/65) to left of 2. Omitted as not notated for rest of pas-
		acter difference between $p$ (grazioso) and $f$ (vigoroso) and have therefore not been			sage nor in VI. II Va.
18	Fg. II	added by potentially false analogy.  Heavy tie arc to left of 1. (= beginning of	65–66/69–70	Fg. II	Tie notated on Fg. I staff rather than that of Fg. II.
10	19.11	system) but not from 17 bt 4 (end of previ-	65/69	VI. II	Orange-brown ps to right of 1., no corr.
		ous system), This tie, missing in other editions, is included in the present one.	66/70	VI. I VI. II	<ul><li>4. smudged, no corr.</li><li>2. stem redrawn, no corr.</li></ul>
21	Ob.	Large delta-shaped paper stain (1v), also	67/71	VI. I	
		visible on 1r; possible erased notehead $f_{\#}^{*}$ ; but the size and imprint of the stain, cover-			69/73, 1.), perhaps to distinguish between change of instruments in next measure,
		ing more than three staves, exceeds what			where Cor. princ. takes over VI. I staff;
		would have been caused by Mozart's typi- cal corr. procedure, which was to smudge		Va.	crossed out.  1. written as if in $\frac{4}{9}$ , smudged and reno-
		away the original reading with a flick of his		[Vc. e Cb.]	tated in 🛭 .
	Fg. I	thumb. The beam notation of 1.–4. shows that Fg.		[VC. e Cb.]	Brace to left of system orig. drawn to one staff too high; crossed out and extended to
		was notated after Ob. and was squeezed in later.	68/72	Cor princ A/LL	accommodate Vc. e Cb. VI. I $\int f \#^2 \ =$ initially notated; then Cor.
29	VI. II	1. J corr. from J	06/72	Coi. princ./ vi. i	princ. notated on same staff (cf. Source de-
31	VI. I	Mozart notated the continuity draft of the movement passing from Cor. princ. to VI. I;			scription above) with <i>Corno</i> above staff, § between bts 1–2, VI. I bt 2 serving as Cor.
		he began notation of VI. I in this measure			princ. bt 1 \$\forall \text{ with bts 2-4 notated above}
		with 2.; here and in subsequent appearances of this dialogue 1. is usually squeezed	71/75	Cor. princ.	and to right of VI. I -  to left of 2. stem is likely to be a slip of the
		in, attesting to its later notation during the	7 1,7 3	con princ.	pen in drawing the stem; a true would be
	Vc. e Cb.	Str. scoring stage. Bt 4 paper stain reaching across bar line;	72/76	Cor. princ.	drawn opposite the notehead.  2. \$\forall \corr. \text{ from } \forall .
		<sup>7</sup> unnaturally thick at both beginning and		VI. II	k written over 1., which was then notated
36–37	Ob.	end of stroke, but no evident corr. Here and in all subsequent passages to be	75/79	Vc. e Cb.	to its right. Smudge before 2., corr.?
		executed a 2 (42–43; 53–54 bt 1/53–54	78/82	Va.	5. ( $\sharp$ ) $g$ corr. from $a$ (cf. following 2 mea-
		bt 1 and 57–58 bt 1;/91, 2.–94; 100– 101/112–113; 134–135, 1./139–140, 1.;	79/83	Cor. princ.	sures). Smudge below 1., possibly for notehead a
		136 1./141, 1.) there is no double stemming.			3rd below; given that the principal theme is being quoted, the only explanation for a
37	VI. I	Bar line 37–38 redrawn further to right to			corr. would be a slip of the pen (transposi-
	Vc. e Cb.	fit in 16ths.  Bar line 36-37 smudged at bottom; bt 3	80/84	VI. I	tional error?).  # below notehead, evidently added later
		notehead written over smudge, followed		** *	(18th-century principles of notation provide
		by 4–5 smudged out noteheads without stems, orig. $g[\#]$ $f[\#]$ e $f[\#]$ $g[\#]$ ?			that # in previous bar would continue its validity); 4. orange-brown ps, no corr.
43	Va.	2.–4. orig. 3x a; smudged and corr.	81/[85]	all	4 deleted measures (= original version, 81-
46	Fg. II Vl. I	1. redrawn. Cf. 31; at the continuity draft stage Vl. I			84) after fol. 3r, $15 = 80/84$ , signaled by cue letter $\boldsymbol{A}$ above brace, with corresponding $\boldsymbol{A}$
		was notated only from 2., with flag; at the			(slightly smudged) at fol. 5r, 1: 12 measures
		scoring stage Mozart added the first 🎝 and	I		orchestral interpolation (= revised version,

<b>10.1</b>		85–96) designed to give Leutgeb additional time to breathe. The jump is further cued by the indication <i>sie</i> = (fol. 3r, 14–15 = original version, 80–81) and = <i>he</i> (fol. 5r, 1 = revised version, 85) below the respective braces. The cut is delineated by horizontal braces spanning fol. 3r, 15–18 = original version, 81–84, above Cor. princ. staff and below Vc. e Cb. staff, together with cross-hatching. The upper brace partially obscures the slur in 81 in Cor. princ., 1.–2. From the two ink tints of the passage it is clear that Vl. I and Vc. e Cb. were notated first, with Vl. II, Va. coming later. The articulation in Vl. I, 94, 2.–95, 1., and Vc. e Cb., 94–95, was notated at the scoring stage.			problematic: the passage at 47 is at the very end of the solo exposition and appears on bts 1–2, whereas here it appears before the iteration of the orchestra's second theme (not heard since 12–15) and appears on bts 3–4. The horn's trill within the cut at 111 of the orig. version is a half-measure long, and no Mozart concerto ever precedes a middle or final ritornello with a trill less than an entire measure in length. It is clear from the ink and the appearance of the autograph that at no time did Mozart intend to end the recapitulation at this juncture. The reason for the cut is not aesthetic, but to accommodate Leutgeb's reduced endurance. The cut also encompasses the final
/91 /92	Vl. I Ob., Fg.	Smudge under 7., no evident revision. horizontal brace and <i>bis</i> above and below wind particella indicating repetition of this measure, further indicated by mostly vertical dotted lines at beginning and end of measure.	110/	Cor. princ.	written $c^2$ in 112/121, which Mozart forgot to delete. The deletion is delineated by cross hatching that has been considerably smudged, and two ink blots below 109, VI. I ( $\tau$ and 1.–2.).  9. slightly smudged, no corr.; cf. previous
/93	VI. I	Smudged ink spot below staff under 13.– 14. below staff; no corr.	112/121	VI. II	entry. 1. corr. from $d^1$ (orig. version without cut)
85/97	Vc. e Cb. all	1. smudged, no corr.  Cue letter <b>B</b> over beginning of fol. 3r, 19 = 85/97, indicating end of replaced passage, corresponding to cue after fol. 5r, 12 (= revised version, 96). The jump is further cued by the indication <i>vi</i> = below brace at the same measure, connecting to = <i>de</i> below 85/97.	115/124	VI. II	to f#1+a (revised version without cut). Given that orig. version was smudged (as is corr.), this note was probably written down after the following passage. Such polyphonic passages were normally notated by Mozart at the initial drafting stage, whereas purely accompanimental voices were added later. 5. ink ran, no corr.
	Cor. princ.	lauß (=Laus?: louse) notated above staff over second half of measure coinciding with Cor. princ. entry; perhaps an insult aimed at Leutgeb of the kind found run- ning throughout the second movement.	118/127	VI. II Va.	Orig. (not deleted).  1. notehead and lower stem smudged, dot above fifth staff line and the equivalent of flag; nonetheless the standard reading is surely correct.
86/98	Cor. princ.	This, the first measure of the recapitulation and of fol. 3v, was notated a second time (in Cor. princ. only) prior to Mozart's filling in the scoring. It is canceled through crosshatching.	119/128	VI. I	→ it smudged, probably at the later scoring stage after the deletion beginning in the next measure; only the final if were notated in the initial continuity draft – a fact corroborated by 121, where these rests are
87–88/99–100	VI. II	13. sloppily notated; several noteheads look as if corr. from $c\#^1$ – which, however, is highly unlikely.	120/[129]	all	missing.  Cue letter <b>C</b> above brace in original version, deleting the remainder of the draft
92–93/ 104–105		Small <i>X</i> over bar line above Cor. princ.			score (120–132, 1. of orig. version), with corresponding <i>C</i> at fol. 5r, 13: 15 mea-
93/105	VI. I	f overwritten (but not changed), bt 4 7777 beams crossed out and overwritten, no revision.			sures (129–143 of the revised version) fully scored, including the final ritornello. The cut material is crossed out with diagonal
95/107	Ob. I Vc. e Cb.	<ol> <li>ξ added later (squeezed in).</li> <li>B corr. from C (ξ), blot under following</li> <li>abutting f probably caused by corr.; remaining noteheads also thick.</li> </ol>			lines from bottom left to upper right, and the jump is further cued by the indication <i>vo</i> = and <i>=yez</i> below the respective braces. Once again the ink tints reveal that Cor.
96/108	Fg. II	1. = ‡ (♪?), standardized as per Ob., Fg. I.			princ. Vl. I and Vc. e Cb. were notated ini-
100/112 100–101/112–113	Va.	J, col Baßo, entailing corr. of 1. to Doblique slash on bar line below Vc. e Cb.			tially; VI. II and Va. were scored up later. Giegling correctly characterizes the revision
102/114	Cor. princ.	12. corr. from written $d^2$ .			as a simplification (in terms of the horn
102, 104/114, 116 <b>108/120</b>	VI. I Cor. princ.	4. corr. from 7 Orig. version deleted in conjunction with three-measure cut from following measure in revised version.			writing) but also as made in the interests of concision ("Konzentrierung") (NMA KB, p. e/61); once again the goal was practical, not aesthetic.
	VI. I	$\tau$ at end of measure (orig. version) replaced by $\int a^{1}$ in conjunction with cut (revised version).			The draft of the original version was re- placed before the orchestration of the movement was completed. It consists of
109/[121]	all	3 deleted measures (= original version, 109–111). This revision constitutes a later alteration than the rewriting at 81 of the original version: unlike the earlier passage, these measures are fully scored for the Str. (The winds were not notated onto their separate particella until the principal score comprising Cor. princ. and Str. was completed.) Giegling asserts (NMA KB, p. e/60) that this deleted passage corresponds to 47ff. of the solo exposition. Although there is indeed a similar ascending octave scale in Cor. princ. from written g¹ to written g², the analogy is	/129 /131 /132 /133	Vc. e Cb. Cor. princ. Cor. princ. Cor. princ. VI. II Cor. princ.	Cor. princ., 120/132, 1. (the resolution of the final trill) and the following measures in VI. I: 120, 121 (last 月)–122, 127, 2.–128, 1. Passages in original version labeled "(M.)" are taken over from Mozart's scoring of revised version, 129–130. Ink spot above 2. 6.–10., 12. small inkspots and smudges. 7. redrawn as orig. notehead too low. 3.–4. small smudges. 4. 1, deleted by editor (no counterpart in VI. I Va.) 9.–13. smudges and ink blot, no corr.; further smudges over next three measures.
			•		and sindages over heat time measures.

/136	VI. II, Va.	cresc. (VI. II) and upper voice ‡ (Va.) written on top of one another.			are present), with cross hatch and small arc
132-138/137-143		The text of the final ritornello for the earlier version is taken from 137–143 of the revision, as the ritornello is not notated in the original version.			at top of bar line segment. Horizontal brace spanning these measures and <i>bis</i> denoting 4-measure repeat. (2) 45–48 of orig. version deleted with cross hatching; VI. I upbeat, <i>f</i> , to 49 inserted at
133/138 134/139 135–140	VI. II Ob. I Vc. e Cb.	<ul> <li></li></ul>			u45 to make cut. In fact, the deleted bars in Str. would be $p$ , necessitating the $f$ , with the cut the entire passage is $f$ , making the $f$ at u45 superfluous.
135, 2.–136/ 140, 2.–141	Ob. II	Added after Ob. I notated; noteheads 135/140, 2. added to Ob. I's downward stems; 136/140 from 2. both sets of stems drawn downward.			(3) Added bar line before u53/u49, 3 short strokes to right of bar line 48–49/44–45 and 4 to left of added bar line (Cor. princ.–Vl. I) with horizontal brace and bis denoting 4-measure repeat.
136/141 138/143	VI. II Va.	1. middle voice (f#²) notehead indistinct. Smudge from above staff to below 4th staff line below VI. II \$, no corr.			(4) 15 Jausen added above Cor. princ. straddling bar line, 42–43, referring to pause in Cor. princ. (15 whole measures plus the final and containing the unbest to the part
Second moveme					nal one containing the upbeat to the next passage) created by these alterations.
u1	Cor. princ.	# (for f# as part of key signature) smudged away (Corno in D); tempo marking <u>Adagio</u> (Str. Allegro).			The <i>NMA</i> edition of the draft counts the two 4-measure passages twice and numbers 45–48 of orig. version 48a–48d; hence
3 <b>16</b>	VI. II Cor. princ.	2. loop on stem.  5. If lag smudged away: = I as in the edition, despite I in Str. The correctness of this reading is confirmed at 40 and 117/109, where Cor. princ. again has I whereas the only Str. notation is I upbeat			its bar numbers are 8 higher than orig. version and 4 higher than revised version of the present edition: 45/ = NMA 48a, 49/45 = NMA 49, 53/49 = NMA 57. See also commentary to 101–104.
		in VI. I to next measure, implying a foregoing $\tau$ in analogy to 16 and 40. Standardized to $\redsymbol{\mathfrak{I}}$ $\redsymbol{\mathfrak{I}}$ in <i>NMA</i> edition of draft at 16 but not at 40, with no note in <i>KB</i> ; Süßmayr, who	43	VI. I	12. in NMA erroneously d <sup>1</sup> (recte: e <sup>1</sup> ), correct at 51/47 [51 (55) in NMA-numbering]; not corrected in Berichtigungen und Ergänzungen zum Notenband, NMA KB, p. e/75.
19	VI. I	worked only from a copy of Cor. princ. part, notates	53–60/49–56	Str.	Fully scored; Va. tie over bar line at 55–56/51–52 (end of fol. 2r); 56–60/52–56 only Cor. princ., Vl. I/II; thereafter only Cor.
		pulled up short ("stehengeblieben") in notating tie over bar line; but is clear and	53/49	Cor. princ.	princ. and VI. I. Small ink blot below 8. below beam (excess
		most definitely applies to 6., not 5. (though the latter alternative, suggested in <i>NMA</i>			of ink on quill), below it smudged vertical stroke between staves (Cor. princ.–Vl. I).
		KB, is plausible); the tie, not the 1, was retraced. Perhaps the remark refers to 26, where the 1 in VI. I last note (3., not 6.) is	55/51	Va.	Last measure of f. 2r; tie over bar line in darker ink, whereupon Va. and Vc. e Cb. break off.
21–22	Cor. princ.	notated obliquely. Ink dot unconnected with musical text before bar line, zig-zag pencil line (resembling a <i>W</i> rotated 45° to right), with a similar squiggle in pencil below Vc. e Cb., surely not in Mozart's hand; a cue sign? No corresponding sign in the manuscript, except for four oblique lines above Cor. princ. at 120/112.	57/53	VI. I	1. $(d^1)$ smudged (cf. following measure); the smudge, evidently made by Mozart's thumb, seems larger than what would have been engendered by the ink of a single note. Mozart must have intended to replace the $d^1$ but did not do so. Given that the identical reading in following measure is unaltered, it is likely that Mozart intended a difference in scoring between the two
	VI. II	Small ink spots extending from first 7 obliquely upward past bar line between VI.			measures. The unison doubling between VI. I and Cor. princ. is unexceptional within
		I and VI. II.			a four-part accompaniment but more prob-
25 27	Cor. princ. Cor. princ.	4. slightly smudged. Orig. , VI. I response not taken into account; smudged, first half of measure crossed out, corr. with rests redrawn above staff.			lematic in a two-part accompanimental texture with only the violins. The editor has therefore provided a corrected reading here ( $b$ rather than $d^{\dagger}$ ) to justify Mozart's corr.; performers may prefer two successive itera-
28-29	Va.	Ink spot to right of bar line (final measure of brace).	58/54	VI. I	tions of the reading in 58/54. Slur smudged; cf. previous measure.
29	Cor. princ. Vl. I	Ink ran on " <i>bravo</i> " above staff. Small rastering ink run to right of 2 <sup>nd</sup> <sup>y</sup>	60/56	Cor. princ.	Smudge before 5. (unnecessary \$\dagger\$ or transpositional error); 5. \$\begin{array}{c} added later (squeezed)
31, 2.–32, 1.	Cor. princ.	Transposed up an octave in revised version to stay within Leutgeb's desired range; this solution also used by Süßmayr.	63/59	Cor. princ.	in).  Orig. version crossed out, octave leap from <i>g</i> <sup>1</sup> to <i>g</i> <sup>2</sup> eliminated (simplification for Leutgeb). The respective readings are repro-
35 40	Cor. princ. Str.	Ink dot to left of 1. Full Str. scoring ends with this measure, but see 53/49 below.	65–71/61–67	Cor. princ.	duced in the text of the two versions.  Defective rastering, lines 1, 3 perhaps traced
40-52/40-48		Three structural alterations as part of revision, all to give Leutgeb more time to breathe:	68/64	Cor. princ.	by hand; no corr.  First 7 added later below 1. and between it and }
		(1) Full bar line inserted before u41 with 3 oblique lines to its right from above to below Cor. princ. staff, and bar line spanning	68–69/64–65		/ connecting to top of bar line, perhaps re- lated to the ongoing verbal text above Cor. princ.
		only Cor. princ. and VI. I (the only instruments notated) before u45, overlapping final 's of 45 in Str. (all of which, however,	83/79	VI. I/II	Small oblique ink stroke VI. I between 1. and 2., two small ink spots below VI. II beneath VI. I, 1.; no corr.

46					
85–94/81–90		Bottom of brace (at bottom of fol. 3r) slightly smudged; below brace ffffffl in bottom margin below 85–86/81–82; the rest of the bottom margin filled with financial calcula-	109/101	Cor. princ.	1. dot missing ( , , , , )), resulting in incomplete measure; standardized as per 32. $\bigcirc$ originally only over 1.; later extended over both 7s.
		tions (figures in the right column of each computation that add up to 60 carry 1 to the left column, carrying the equivalence of	109–110/101–102 111/103	VI. I/II VI. I	Several ink spots/smudges, no notation.  Small ink stroke above middle of measure, no other notation.
		60 kreuzer to 1 gulden). Some of the calculations begin in bottom staff. According to Günther G. Bauer, Mozart was projecting income from two students (Bauer, <i>Mozart</i> .	113/105 115/107	Cor. princ. Cor. princ.	"D" of "Dio" slightly smudged. Last measure of fol. 3v, text ("[l'ul]tima vol- ta") extends beyond bar line, "a" of "vol- ta" hidden by binding process.
		Geld, Ruhm und Ehre, Bad Honnef, pp. 25–26).	119–120/111–112	Cor. princ.	Four lightly drawn oblique strokes to right of bar line.
90–94/86–90 <b>91/87</b>	(Cor. princ.) Cor. princ.	Slight smudging of ongoing verbal text. 6. 7. smudged, corr., orig. $b^1$ $c^2$ according to <i>NMA KB</i> (= 95 in <i>NMA</i> bar count) – a logical reading, though the position of the smudge with which the corr. was made suggests that the noteheads are $c^2$ $d^2$ (= concert pitch, with $c\#^2$ : transpositional error).	121, 122/113, 114	Cor. princ.	Orig. version $(g^2 g^2)$ crossed out with solid line in each measure, skip from $d^2-g^2$ replaced with $e^2 f^2$ notated below orig. reading (simplification for Leutgeb). The slurs from 1.–2. and 4.–5. were notated in conjunction with orig. version and do not apply to the revision. The respective readings are reproduced in the text of the two versions.
92–93/88–89		X on bar line just below VI. I bottom staff line; smudge to following bar line at same location and on next bar line (end of brace) slightly lower, no corr.; probably Mozart's	122–123/114–115 124/116 after 124/116	Cor. princ Cor. princ.	Ink ran in text "ah termina, ti prego!"  1. dot and 2. smudged, no corr.  Original foliation 5 corrected by Mozart to 4 (see above).  Text "[Oh] maledetto" in right margin.
		palm created these smudges when he	125/117	Cor. princ.	Ink ran in "a" of text "anche".
98–99/94–95	Vc. e Cb.	made corr. at 91/87 with his thumb.  Three ink smudges in otherwise empty staff.	126/118	Cor. princ.	\$ before 1. added later; 2.–6. altered in revised version by editor to stay within Leutgeb's desired range.
101–104/	all	Four deleted measures, cued with large crosses before 100–101/96–97 bar line and before 105/97 (= beginning of lower brace, fol. 3v): cut to eliminate a difficult passage	128–129/120–121	Cor. princ.	The text "- ah - trillo da beccare! -" (in NMA erroneously beccore) applies only to orig. version and has therefore been omitted from the revised version.
		and to shorten the length of Leutgeb's exertions. At upper right of leaf after 104/ incorrect fol. number (4). Within the cut Cor.	129/121	VI. I	1. unclear, ink ran and notehead could be mistaken for $d^1$ ; correct reading, $e^1$ , derived from 131/123.
		princ. is completely written out, VI. I/II are	[u129–132, 1.]/		
		notated only in 102 bt 2–103, 1., and 104, bt 2, as shown in the edition; the resolution into 105, 1. was not notated, perhaps because it begins a new brace. There VI. I has only 1., $c_*^{2}$ , which completes the passage	u121–124, 1.	Cor. princ.	Revised version notated below Vc. e Cb. on bottom staff of page, labeled <i>Corno</i> by Mozart; the ink ran on the designation. The respective readings are reproduced in the text of the two versions.
		from 100/96 and is thus part of the cut. It is possible that the commentary "ha, ha ha!"	129, 131/121, 123	VI. I	Bt 2 of orig. version does not fit revised Cor. princ.; adapted by the editor.
		in the right margin to the right of 104/ (end of first brace of fol. 3v) and the left margin to left of 105/97 (first measure of second brace) applies to Leutgeb's assumed	130–135/122–127 131–132/123–124	Vc. e Cb. Vc. e Cb.	The ink ran in most of these final measures. Smudges before 131/123, 1. and under 132/124 bt 2 (also affecting bottoms of all following bar lines), no corr.
		relief at having the foregoing passage excised. In <i>NMA</i> the deleted measures are numbered 104a–d, so that 105/97 is 105 in that edition, making its measure numbers identical to the original version within the present edition from here to the end of the	132/124	VI. I, Vc. e Cb.	The discrepancy in placement of the $f$ is unequivocal and consistent with Mozart's practice: Vc. e Cb. initiates the phrase on 1. and hence starts $f$ , whereas the upper Str. resolve a $p$ phrase on 1. before switching to $f$ on 2.
105/97	Str.	movement.  An alternative reading for bt 1, based more narrowly on 28–29, might be as follows:  Original version Simplified version  105 E. (M.) 97 E. (M.)	132–135/124–127	VI. I	Ink ran and smudges, 132/124 2.–3., 4.–6., 133/125, 1. Orig. difficult to decipher, as it encompasses the same pitches ( $f\#^1$ and $d^1$ ); perhaps due to ink running, as it did in much of the final measures, and Mozart redraw the notes



This reading has not been adopted by the edition, because it would necessitate changing 1. from Mozart's J in VI. I to (cf. 101–104/--); but performers should have no qualms about using it.

--/100, 2.–101, 1. Cor. princ.

See 31–32: transposed up an octave in revised version to stay within Leutgeb's desired range.

# **Notational Abbreviations**

Cor. princ.

all

--/125

135/127

The following passages are indicated in the autograph with abbreviations:

redrew the notes.

corr. in the edition.

Two alternate revised versions by editor to stay within Leutgeb's desired range.

Mozart notates the final measure without

subtracting the upbeat  $\rightarrow$  of the beginning;

First movement		
8–9	Vl. II, Va.	まま
10–11	VI. II	unisono (all cases of unison shorthand in
		VI. II likewise refer to doubling of VI. I), =
		over bar line, but 11 notated in full, see
		Individual Readings.
10	Va.	Col Baßo
16	VI. I	bts 2-4
18	VI. I	bts 3-4

19 bt 3–21 bt 3	Va.	Col Baßo, ≠ (20)
20	VI. II	bts 3–4 lower voice J
22–25	VI. I/II, Va.	bts 3-4 ţ
29, 31	Va.	bts 2–4 <i>Col Baßo</i> , $m{f}$ notated
30, 32	VI. I/II, Va.	bts 3-4 J
36–37	Fg. II	unisono (= doubling of Fg. I), = 37
36, 2.–37	VĬ. II	unisono, $m{f}$ notated
36	Va.	Col Ba $\mathcal{B}$ o from 1., $\mathfrak{t}$ and $\boldsymbol{f}$ notated
37	Vc. e Cb.	bts 1–2 ‡
42	VI. II	unisono, $m{f}$ notated
42	Va.	
40		<i>Col Baßo</i> , <b><i>f</i></b> notated bts 3–4 ナ オ
49	VI. I/II	
	Vc. e Cb.	<i>t t</i>
49 bt 3–50	Va.	Col Baßo, cresc. notated
50	VI. I/II	まま, VI. I: cresc. notated; VI. II missing
	Vc. e Cb.	0
51/51, 55 bts 2-4	Vl. II, Va.	<b>; ;</b>
52/52, 56	VI. II, Va.	VI. II upper voice 😭, lower voice and Va. まま
53	Fg. II	unisono
53 bt 2–56/	19.11	anisono
53 bt 2 50/ 53 bt 2–54,		
	A /I II	
57 bt 2-60	VI. II	unisono, = over bar line[s] 53–54/53–54,
		57–58 and in 54–56/54, 58–60
53 bt 3–56/		
53 bt 3-54,		
57 bt 3-60	Va.	Col Baßo, ≈ in 54–56/54, 58–60
/57–58 bt 1	Fg. II	unisono, - on bar line to indicate continua-
,5, 50 50 .	. 9	tion of doubling through 1. of next measure
EE E6 b+ 1/		tion of doubling through 1. of flext fileasure
55–56 bt 1/	- "	
59–60 bt 1	Fg. II	unisono, - on bar line to indicate continua-
		tion of doubling through beginning of next
		measure
57/61	VI. II, Va.	bts 3-4 ‡
58-60/62-64	Vl. II, Va.	ő
61/65	VI. II, Va.	VI. II upper voice 5, lower voice and Va. bts
0 1,7 0 5	,	3–4 <i>d</i>
7/ 76/70 00	\/     \/2	bts 3–4 ‡
74–76/78–80	VI. II, Va.	
78–80/82–84	VI. I/II <b>,</b> Va.	bts 3–4 J
/86–96	Va.	Col Baßo, repeated at 92 (new system), $m{f}$
		notated, = 88, 90, 91, 93, 94, 96
/87–90	Vc. e Cb.	3–4 –
/91	VI. II	after 1. unisono, ≥, col Baßo at 92 (= Va.),
		overwritten with unisono (new system), =
		93
/91–94	Fg. II	unisono (also in 94; ≠ in 93, which is repeat-
751 54	19.11	ed by <i>bis</i> (see Individual Readings above)
06 00/00 101	\	
86–89/98–101	VI. I/II <b>,</b> Va.	bts 3–4 J
93/105	Va.	after 1. Col Baßo, <b>f</b> notated
95/107	Va.	after bt 2 $^{7}$ Col Baßo, $m{f}$ notated
100–101/112–113	Fg. II	<i>unisono</i> , ≠ on bar line
	VI. II	after 1. unisono, = near bar line, 100–101/
		112–113, <b><i>f</i></b> notated
	Va.	after 1. (erroneously notated as J) Col Baßo,
	-	f notated, = in 101/113
102-114/114-116	VI. II	bts 3–4 <i>J</i>
103/115	v 1. 11	
	\/     \/>	
	VI. I, Va.	bts 3-4 ‡
111/	VI. II	bts 3-4 <del>J</del> bts 3-4 <del>J</del>
/129, 130	VI. II VI. II	bts 3–4 ぱ bts 3–4 ぱ bts 2–4 and 3, respectively ~
/129, 130 /135	VI. II VI. II Va.	bts 3-4 ぱ bts 3-4 ぱ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 ぱ
/129, 130	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va.	bts 3-4 <sup>†</sup> bts 3-4 <sup>†</sup> bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 <sup>†</sup> まま
/129, 130 /135	VI. II VI. II Va.	bts 3-4 ぱ bts 3-4 ぱ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 ぱ
/129, 130 /135	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va.	bts 3-4 <sup>†</sup> bts 3-4 <sup>†</sup> bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 <sup>†</sup> まま
/129, 130 /135 /136	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va.	bts 3-4 t bts 3-4 t bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 t まま t t まま
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138	Vl. II Vl. II Va. Vl. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb.	bts 3-4 t bts 3-4 t bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 t まま t t
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va.	bts 3-4 t bts 3-4 t bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 t まま はまままますます。 VI. II upper voice 5, lower voice and Va. まま
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va.	bts 3-4 \$\dagger\$ bts 3-4 \$\dagger\$ bts 3-4 \$\dagger\$ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 \$\dagger\$ \$\dagger\$ \$\dagger\$ \$\dagger\$ \$\dagger\$ VI. II upper voice \$\dagger\$, lower voice and Va. \$\dagger\$ unisono, - on bar line to indicate continu-
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va.	bts 3-4 ぱ bts 3-4 ぱ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 ぱ まま よ ぱ まま いI. Il upper voice ま, lower voice and Va. まま unisono, - on bar line to indicate continuation of doubling through 1. of next mea-
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va.	bts 3-4 \$\dagger\$ bts 3-4 \$\dagger\$ bts 3-4 \$\dagger\$ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 \$\dagger\$ \$\dagger\$ \$\dagger\$ \$\dagger\$ \$\dagger\$ VI. II upper voice \$\dagger\$, lower voice and Va. \$\dagger\$ unisono, - on bar line to indicate continu-
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va.	bts 3–4 \$\dagger* bts 3–4 \$\dagger* bts 3–4 \$\dagger* bts 2–4 and 3, respectively \$-\text{bts 1–2 }\dagger* \dagger* \da
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va.	bts 3-4 ぱ bts 3-4 ぱ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively - bts 1-2 ぱ まま よ ぱ まま いI. Il upper voice ま, lower voice and Va. まま unisono, - on bar line to indicate continuation of doubling through 1. of next mea-
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va.	bts 3–4 \$\dagger* bts 3–4 \$\dagger* bts 3–4 \$\dagger* bts 2–4 and 3, respectively \$-\text{bts 1–2 }\dagger* \dagger* \da
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va.	bts 3–4 \$\dagger* bts 3–4 \$\dagger* bts 3–4 \$\dagger* bts 2–4 and 3, respectively \$-\text{bts 1–2 }\dagger* \dagger* \da
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140 134 2.–138/	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va. Fg. II	bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively \$-\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 1-2 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\fra
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140 134 2.–138/	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va. Fg. II	bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively \$-\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 1-2 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\fra
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140 134 2.–138/	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va. VI. III VI. II	bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively \$-\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 1-2 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\fra
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140 134 2.–138/ 139, 2.–143	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va. Fg. II VI. II	bts 3–4 † bts 3–4 † bts 3–4 † bts 2–4 and 3, respectively - bts 1–2 † ##  VI. II upper voice 5, lower voice and Va. ##  unisono, - on bar line to indicate continuation of doubling through 1. of next measure.  unisono =   =    Col BaBo, = on bar lines 135–136/140–141, 136–137/141–142
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140 134 2.–138/ 139, 2.–143 Second movements	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va. VI. III  Va.  Va.  ent Va.	bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively \$\sigma\$ bts 1-2 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\frac{1}{2
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140 134 2.–138/ 139, 2.–143	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va. Fg. II VI. II	bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively \$\circ\$ bts 1-2 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\frac{1}{2}
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140 134 2.–138/ 139, 2.–143 Second movements	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va. VI. III  Va.  Va.  ent Va.	bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively \$\sigma\$ bts 1-2 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\frac{1}{2
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140 134 2.–138/ 139, 2.–143 Second movements	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va. Fg. II  Va.  Va.  Va. Va. Va. Va.	bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively \$\sigma\$ bts 1-2 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\frac{1}{2
/129, 130 /135 /136 132/137 133/138 134–135 bt 1/ 139–140 bt 1 134 bt 2–135/ 139 bt 2–140 134 2.–138/ 139, 2.–143 Second movements	VI. II VI. II Va. VI. I/II, Va. Vc. e Cb. VI. II, Va. VI. II, Va. Fg. II VI. II Va.	bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 3-4 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ bts 2-4 and 3, respectively \$\sigma\$ bts 1-2 \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\frac{1}{2

	Vc. e Cb.	3x <b>.</b> .
24	Vl. II, Va.	
	Vc. e Cb.	1. <b>↓</b> ., Vc. e Cb. with
31	all	3. J.(VI. II lower voice dot missing)
33–39	VI. I	Col Corno in 8 <sup>tava</sup> , ~ 35–36, 37–38, 39
	Va.	Col Baβo, <b>p</b> notated, ~ 34(–35), 36, 38–39
34	VI. II	(repeat of 33)
53-55/49-51	Str.	1. <b>.</b> .
59-60/55-56	VI. I/II	1. <b>.</b> .
100/108	Cor. princ.	4. J.

### Missing Rests

The following list of rests missing in the autograph is limited to those portions fully scored by Mozart, as the incomplete notation within passages abandoned at the draft stage or left incomplete at his death encompasses notes as well as rests (e.g., first movement, m. 81, original version, VI. I, bts 1-2: at the drafting stage Mozart proceeded from the notation of bts 1-2 Cor. princ. to VI. I bts 3-4; the accompaniment, encompassing the previous measures and m. 81 bts 1-2 in VI. I was left to a later stage). Passages indicated with abbreviations (*unisono*, *col BaBo*, etc.) are likewise excluded here. The edition clearly identifies Mozart's and the editor's contributions to all such passages.

First movement		
u1–21 bt 3	Cor. princ.	Omitted from score, hence no rests; 21 bt 4 takes over VI. I staff.
		takes over vi. i staii.

51–67/51–71 Cor. princ. Omitted from score, hence no rests; 68/72 overlaps on VI. I staff, taking it over from 69/73

108/120 Cor. princ. Orig. version crossed out (see above) without •

118/127 VI. II Orig. → (not deleted).

121–131 VI. I No rests notated in draft of orig. version. 133–138/138–143 Cor. princ. No rests notated in revised version (taken

over into orig. version.)

#### Second movement

16 Va. Final γ (drafting stage)]

109/101 Cor. princ. one 7

- 2 Cf. NMA X/33/2: Wasserzeichen-Katalog, presented by Alan Tyson, in which paper types 82, 100, 102, and 91 are inventoried in the catalogue's Textband (39, 47, 48, and 43, respectively). The fact that type 100 straddles the end of the first movement and the beginning of the second, demonstrates that the two movements belong together; cf. Tyson, Mozart's D-Major Horn Concerto (see Preface, n. 12), p. 252.
- 3 Tyson's table of the layout of the autograph erroneously states that Mozart's filiation of the first movement runs from 1 to 6 (Tyson, *Mozart's D-Major Horn Concerto*, Table 16.1, p. 251).
- 4 According to NMA KB, p. e/70 the correction was made by Johann Anton André; the determination was probably made by Wolfgang Plath, who examined the autograph in Kraków in September1980 for editor Franz Giegling; cf. NMA KB, p. e/59).
- 5 Perhaps the reason that Gleissner used red ink in the titles he inscribed on fol. 1r of K. 412, 417, and the fragmentary concertos in E-flat major K. 370b+371 and in E-major, K. Anh. 98a/494a together with the inventory numbers in his catalogue was to differentiate clearly from Mozart's handwriting. The script of the titles is identical with the handwriting in Gleissner's entries for these pieces in his handwritten catalogue, eliminating any doubt about their authorship. Unfortunately, *NMA KB* fails to realize that both this handwriting and the red ink color is the same in all these cases; indeed, it does not note the color of the ink of the titles. It attributes the title to "Mozart (?)" in the case of K. 412, gives the concerto title followed by "(?)" for K. 370b and describes the titles for K. 417 and K. 494a unequivocally as being in Mozart's hand.
- 6 Not so identified in NMA KB.
- 7 This is an apparent error, as the correct number is 191.
- 8 These facts do not contradict Tyson's description of fols. 7–8 of the first movement and 1-2 of the rondo as comprising a single sheet of paper, because in fols. 1–4 of the first movement and in the present case Mozart used each of the two bifolia derived from a single sheet in succession instead of nesting them into gatherings of two, as was his habit in earlier manuscripts.
- 9 Not "Beginn Solo," as stated in NMA KB, e/59.

<sup>1</sup> All five leaves of Süssmayr's completion of the Rondó ("K. 514") are also on this paper type. Tyson's assertion that fols. 7–8 of the first movement and fols. 1–2 of the Rondó comprise a gathering of two bifolia – that is, two double sheets, each folded vertically to create four writing surfaces (recto/verso, fold, recto/verso), nested one inside the other – is somewhat problematic; see below.