

Preface

1. Historical and Biographical Background

In the context of the present work, Mozart appears to have used the term “symphony” in a broader sense than is customary today. Initially, the term still unequivocally designated a serenade.¹ It was not until Mozart sent his father a reminder to return the “symphony of the last hafner=*Musique* [Hafner Music]”² on 4 January 1783 that he used the term “symphony” in the sense we are familiar with today.³ Mozart seems to have been very much aware of the ambiguity of this concept, for in a later letter he again specified: “and remember to put in the minuets.”⁴ In order to avoid any misunderstandings, we shall henceforth use the neutral concept “Hafner Music” (“hafner=*Musique*”⁵) favored by Mozart himself. In the present edition, it refers to the work in all of its versions and variants. More on this in Section 2.

Genesis

The Hafner Music K. 385 is one of the few works by Mozart for which there is a wealth of documents on its origins. After the Singspiel *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* K. 384 had been given its first performance at Vienna’s Burgtheater on 16 July 1782, and its first repeat performance three days later, Mozart reported to his father in a letter dated 20 July: “Well, I am up to the eyes in work, for by Sunday week [28 July], I have to arrange my *opera* for wind instruments. If I don’t, someone will anticipate me and secure the *profits*. And now you ask me to write a new symphony! How on earth can I do so? You have no idea how difficult it is to arrange a work of this kind for *wind instruments*, so that it suits these instruments and yet loses none of its effect. Well, I must just spend the night over it, for that is the only way; and to you, dearest father, I sacrifice it. You may rely on having something from me by every post. I shall work as fast as possible and, as far as haste permits, I shall turn out good work.”⁶ On 23 July Mozart moved into new lodgings at the *Zum roten Säbel* house (today in Vienna’s 1st District, Wipplingerstr. 19 / Färbergasse 5).⁷ It is hardly surprising that Mozart was unable to keep the promise he formulated in his congratulatory words of 24 July on his sister’s name day: “Forgive me, dear sister, for not sending you a formal letter of congratulations, but I really have no time. Besides you know that, as it is, I wish you daily every good thing. It was impossible for me to find a moment today to write to my father. But I shall certainly do so next post-day.”⁸ He sent off the first parcel of music on 27 July: “You will be surprised and disappointed to find that this contains only the first *Allegro*; but it has been quite impossible to do more for you, for I have had to compose in a great hurry a *Nacht Musique*, but only for *wind instruments* (otherwise I could have used it for you too). On Wednesday the 31st I shall send the two *minuets*, the *Andante* and the last movement. If I can manage to do so, I shall send a *march* too. If not, you will just have to use the one in the Hafner *Musique* [K. 250], which hardly anyone knows – [Incipit of March K. 249] – I have composed my symphony *in D major*, because you prefer that key.”⁹ As to the aforementioned “*Nacht Musique*,” Mozart is most likely referring to the Serenade in C minor K. 388 or to the new version of the Serenade in E-flat major K. 375, which was expanded from six to eight instruments. In the same letter, Mozart took up another urgent matter with his father: “Dearest, most beloved father, I implore you by all you hold dear in the world to give your consent to my marriage with my dear Constanze. Do not suppose that it is just for the sake of getting married. If that were the only reason, I would gladly wait. But I realize that it is absolutely necessary for my own honor and for that of my girl, and for the sake of my health and spirits. My heart is restless and my head confused; in such a condition how can one think and work to any good purpose?”¹⁰ In his letter of 31 July, Mozart again had to admit that he was unable to fulfill the expectations that he himself had raised: “You see that my intentions are good – only what one cannot do one cannot! I am really unable to scribble off inferior stuff. So I cannot send you the whole symphony until next post-day. I could have let you have the last movement, but I prefer to dispatch it all together, for then it will cost only one postage. What I have sent you has already cost me three gulden.”¹¹ Could it be that Mozart was using the fulfillment of this urgent Salzburg commission as a means to pressure his father into giving him his consent to marry? Unfortunately, all of Leopold Mozart’s letters from this period have been lost.¹²

Mozart wed Constanze Weber at Vienna’s St. Stephen’s Cathedral on 4 August 1782.¹³ Leopold learned of the wedding in his son’s letter of 7 August, with which more music was enclosed, along with performance-practical ob-

servations on the Hafner Music: “I send you herewith a short march. I only hope that all will reach you in good time, and be to your taste. The first *Allegro* must be played with great fire, the last – as fast as possible.”¹⁴ A comment in Mozart’s letter of 24 August allows us to infer that Leopold indeed found the music very much to his liking: “I am delighted that the *symphony* is to your taste.”¹⁵ What is not revealed in this quotation is whether Leopold Mozart had actually heard the work by that time, or only studied it.

The Occasion

The occasion for which the work was written does not begin to emerge from the sources until Mozart’s letter to his father of 21 December 1782, when he asks Leopold to “send me by the first opportunity which presents itself the new *symphony* which I composed for Hafner at your request. I should like to have it for certain before Lent, for I should very much like to have it performed at my *concert*.”¹⁶ The Hafner family – the spelling “Hafner” instead of “Haffner” will be used henceforth for various reasons¹⁷ – had built up a successful wholesale enterprise in Salzburg. The business was already flourishing under Sigmund Hafner the Elder (1699–1772). In the last years of his life, Hafner was also the mayor of Salzburg. His son Sigmund Hafner the Younger (1756–1787) continued to manage the family business and made a name for himself as a generous patron and donor. On the occasion of the wedding of his sister Maria Elisabeth (1753–1781), he commissioned the eight-movement Hafner Serenade in D major K. 250 from Mozart; it was performed at the wedding-eve party on 21 July 1776.¹⁸

Sigmund Hafner the Younger must have presented to Emperor Joseph II his petition for his elevation into the nobility before 29 July 1782, since the patent of nobility is dated on this day. He was counting on this honor as a sign of appreciation for his successful commercial activities. Referring to the petition, the monarch elevated Hafner to the rank of “Reichsritter” (Imperial Knight), and conferred the title “Edler von Innbachhausen”¹⁹ upon him. A further document – the copy of the Patent of Nobility – dates from 29 August 1782.²⁰ In turn, the date 9 July 1782, which repeatedly recurs in secondary literature concerning the ennoblement,²¹ cannot be confirmed by any historical testimonies.

There is no doubt that the composition of the Hafner Music is to be seen in connection with the ennoblement of Sigmund Hafner. His elevation to the nobility must have been anticipated before the 29th of July, however, for Leopold Mozart would otherwise not have been able to commission the work from his son before the 20th of that month. It is still not known when the festivities took place in Salzburg. They were perhaps originally scheduled to take place on 29 July, which would explain the enormous time pressure. Yet on the other hand, in his letter of 7 August, Mozart was still hoping that the enclosed march might arrive on time in Salzburg. There must thus have been another occasion after the 7th of August when the Hafner Music could have been performed in connection with Hafner’s ennoblement.

Mozart wrote to his father that the enormous amount of work was “sacrificed to you, my dearest father [...]” (see above) and that he wrote the music “on your behalf for Hafner” (see above). Seen in this light, Köchel’s assumption that the Hafner Music had been written at Leopold’s request is perfectly plausible.²² To this day, there are no extant documents suggesting that Hafner himself ordered the music (perhaps as a well-paid commission) directly from Mozart.²³

Historical Performances

Leopold Mozart’s return dispatch of the Hafner Music from Salzburg, which his son had first requested on 21 December 1782, was delayed by several weeks. Mozart had to remind his father several times.²⁴ Even weeks later, on 5 February 1783, he was still asking his father to “send the *symphonies* [K. 204, 201, 182, 183, 385], and especially the last one, as soon as possible, for my *concert* is to take place on the third Sunday in Lent, that is, on March 23rd and I must have several *duplicate* parts made. I think therefore, that if it is not copied already, it would be better to send me back the original *score* just as I sent it to you; and remember to put in the *minuets*.”²⁵ This statement raises the question as to whether the Hafner Music had been played at all in Salzburg for the ennoblement of Hafner.²⁶ Copies of the parts would have been needed for a performance there; Mozart, however, seems to have had doubts about the existence of the parts at this time. Indeed, he considered it possible that they still would have to be made.

Ten days later Mozart confirmed reception of the music and added: "My new Hafner *symphony* has positively *amazed* me, for I had forgotten every single note of it. It must surely produce a good *effect*."²⁷ The concert took place at Vienna's Burgtheater on 23 March in the presence of Emperor Joseph II. Mozart reported to his father: "I need not tell you very much about the success of my *concert*, for no doubt you have already heard of it. Suffice it to say that the theater could not have been more crowded and that every *box* was full. But what pleased me most of all was that His Majesty the Emperor was present and, goodness! – how delighted he was and how he applauded me! It is his custom to send the money to the *box-office* before going to the theater, otherwise I should have been fully justified in counting on a larger sum, for really his delight was beyond all bounds. He sent *twenty-five ducats*. Our program was as follows: 1. The new Hafner *symphony* [K. 385]. 2: *Madame Lange* sang the *aria* 'Se il padre perdei' from my Munich opera, accompanied by *four instruments*. [KV 366/11] – 3. I played the third of my *subscription concertos* [KV 415]. 4. *Adamberger* sang the *scena* which I composed for Countess Baumgarten [K. 369]. 5. The short *concertante symphony* from my last *Final Musique* [K. 320]. – 6. I played my *concerto in D major*, which is such a favorite here, and of which I sent you the *rondo* with *variations*. [K. 175 and 382]. 7. *Mlle Teiber* sang the *scena* 'Parto, m'affretto' out of my last *Milan opera* [K. 135/16] – 8. I played alone a short *fugue* [K. ?] (because the Emperor was present) and then *variations* on an *air* from an opera called 'Die *Philosophen*' [K. 455] which were encored. So I played *variations* on the *air* 'Unser *dummer Pöbel meint*' from Gluck's 'Pilgrimme von *Mecka*.' [KV 398]. 9. *Madame Lange* sang my new *rondo* [K. 416]. 10. The last movement of the first *symphony*."²⁸ In the *Magazin der Musik* of 9 May 1783 the gross receipts of this concert were estimated "on the whole as 1,600 gulden."²⁹

Further performances of the work under Mozart's direction are not ascertainable, but certainly possible. Was the Hafner Music the "great symphony with trumpets and timpani" that was heard in a concert given at the National-Hoftheater on 1 April 1784?³⁰ It is also possible that Mozart conducted the Hafner Music in Frankfurt on 15 October 1790.³¹ Whereas we do know that a symphony by Mozart was played at these concerts, we also know of subscription concerts given in 1785/86 whose programs are still unknown to us today.³² One must also take these concerts into consideration as potential occasions for the performance of the work. Contemporary performances without Mozart's participation have also been documented in Bamberg (1786)³³ and London (1787/88).³⁴

The Name "Hafner Symphony"

It is not known exactly when the name "Hafner Symphony" established itself in the musical world. The name appears in Constant von Wurzbach's Lexikon of 1868.³⁵ It probably did not make its appearance much earlier, since the designation of the symphony through the use of the name Sigmund Hafner presupposes detailed biographical knowledge which most likely did not become known to a broader public until the publication of Otto Jahn's Mozart biography (Vol. 3, 1858). The reason for naming it so was provided by Mozart himself when he called the symphony the "new Hafner symphony" in his letter of 15 February 1783. However, one cannot yet speak of the "Hafner symphony" as a proper name, since this term can indicate both of the works Mozart wrote for this family, namely K. 250 (the "old" piece) and K. 385 (the "new" one).

2. Sources, Versions and Variants

Sources

We can only provide a brief summary of the detailed source evaluation here.³⁶ Mozart apparently revised the autograph score of the Hafner Music several times. Among the most important changes are the addition of flute and clarinet parts in the outer movements and the elimination of the repeat sign in the Allegro at m. 94. There are also a number of minor alterations which, however, are of little importance and barely audible.

Unfortunately, it does not always clearly emerge from the autograph when these interventions were actually made. For example, it is unclear in the autograph whether the elimination of the repeat sign was made in conjunction with the expansion of the instrumentation or whether the sign was eliminated independently of it. In this and other cases, the secondary sources – copies and the first edition – provide valuable insights into the genesis of the work, for they secure the status of the work in various stages, as it was released to the public. This allows us to derive further different versions.

The copies document the Hafner Music in an early version, such as the copy Leopold Mozart ordered in Salzburg probably in early 1783 after his son's request for the material.

The first edition was published by Artaria in Vienna in 1785. It transmits a later, but not final phase of the autograph score and contains an additional variant in the Presto mm. 222–228 (VI. I), which is found only in this source.

Version A

What we call Version A in this edition is the original version of the Hafner Music, as written by Mozart for the ennoblement of Sigmund Hafner the Younger and sent by him to his father in Salzburg. This version of the Hafner Music, still without flutes and clarinets, was apparently conceived as a serenade-like work which comprised, besides the traditional four movements Allegro, Andante, Minuet (and Trio) and Presto, a March as well. This March was likely to be played both as an entrance and exit piece.

Moreover, Version A had perhaps also been assigned a second Minuet and Trio which, however, have not survived. For a performance of the Hafner Music with two Minuets one could easily envision borrowing other minuets by Mozart which would harmonize well with the Hafner Music through their key and scoring. Plausible examples are the Menuetto galante from the Hafner Serenade K. 250 or the Minuets nos. 1 and 3 from the Minuets K. 363. The last two have no Trio, however, and contain no viola parts (no. 3 also has no timpani or trumpets).

It is possible to justify a performance of Version A with only one minuet for various reasons. Whoever staunchly wants to conform to a version of the piece with two minuets but does not want to incorporate into the Hafner Music the missing minuet from another Mozartian work should consider that a similar problem also exists with the *Kleine Nachtmusik* K. 525. This serenade originally contained a further minuet (namely, the first of two), if we follow the autograph pagination (leaf 3 is missing) and Mozart's annotations in his personal work catalogue. Nevertheless, this prominent work is played without problem in its incomplete form as well.

A performance with only one minuet can also be justified through the ambiguity of the minuet concept. Did Mozart actually intend two minuets with one trio each with the term "2 *Menuett*," or only one minuet and trio? Even if the first interpretation is the most probable, the second cannot be completely discarded.

The copies which are presumably based on a Salzburg transcript ordered by Leopold Mozart in early 1783 contain divergences in the musical text of Version A – including the still valid repeat sign in the Allegro – along with the integration of the March K. 408/2 and possibly a further Minuet.

Version A as serenade without flutes and clarinets:

March	K. 408/2, as entrance march.
Allegro	M. 48 (VI. II), 1st–4th notes as VI. I. M. 94 with repeat of 1st section. M. 204 repeat of 2nd section is uncertain.
Minuet/Trio	unknown, instead, K. 250/5 or K. 363/1 or 363/3 or omit completely.
Andante	M. 23 (VI. I) last note possibly <i>d¹</i> instead of <i>c¹</i> .
Minuet/Trio	[Without changes.]
Presto	Mm. 8, 87, 146 (VI. II) only <i>c sharp¹</i> instead of double stop <i>c sharp¹+e¹</i> . Mm. 222–228 (VI. I) with grace notes.
[March	K. 408/2, as exit march.]

Version B with two Variants

The decisive characteristic of Version B is the reduction of the Hafner Music to a four-movement symphony, such as Mozart indirectly authorized in his letter of 4 January 1783. The four-movement, but compactly scored Version B can be reconstructed from the copies and the first edition. As in Version A, there are still no parts for flutes and clarinets here. The work has come down to us in two variants. The "copy variant" differs from Version A only in the number of movements. The "first-edition variant," in turn, contains two important readings that diverge from the first variant: (1) The repeat is missing in the Allegro. (2) The passage at mm. 222–228 (VI. I) in the Presto was considerably simplified through the elimination of the grace notes. While the elimination of the repeat is authorized by the autograph, the authorization of the simplification in the Presto is dubious.

Version B as symphony without flutes or clarinets:

Allegro	Both sources: original reading in m. 48 (VI. II), 1st–4th notes as VI. I. Copies: with repeat of the 1st section, the repeat of the 2nd section is uncertain. First edition: without repeats.
Andante	Copies: m. 23 (VI. I) last note possibly <i>d'</i> instead of <i>c'</i> . First edition: m. 23 (VI. I) last note <i>c'</i> .
Minuet/Trio	[Without changes.]
Presto	Copies: mm. 8, 87, 146 (VI. II) only <i>c sharp</i> ¹ instead of double stop <i>c sharp</i> ¹ + <i>e</i> ¹ . Autograph reading in mm. 222–228 (VI. I). First edition: mm. 8, 87, 146 (VI. II) double stop <i>c sharp</i> ¹ + <i>e</i> ¹ . Simplified reading in mm. 222–228 (VI. I).

Version C

Version A and the copies- and first-edition-variants of Version B can be placed in a (chrono-)logical sequence. Version C, in turn, departs from this line of transmission and branches out from the copies-variant of Version B, as it does not contain the simplification of mm. 222–228 (VI. I) in the Presto. Version C corresponds to the autograph score as transmitted with all of its corrections and additions: with flutes and clarinets in the Allegro and Presto, the corrected reading in m. 48 (VI. II) of the Allegro, without the repeat in m. 94 of the Allegro, but without the simplification in the Presto as well.

Certain irregularities among the wind parts arose, however, in the process of Mozart's later revision of the score. In mm. 63f. of the Allegro, Ob. I resolves the dissonances one quarter-note-value earlier than the clarinets, which were composed and added later. This is presumably only a minor negligence on Mozart's part, which can easily be corrected by the performers. The same applies to the inconsistencies at m. 151 in the Allegro between Ob. II and Fl. I/Cl. II, and at mm. 263f. at the end of the Presto, where Cl. I/II are to play half notes even though the other high winds and strings play quarter notes (Va. and Fg. I/II are not fully written out and play *col Basso*).

Apart from these irregularities in the musical substance, the articulations are also missing in the flute and clarinet parts supplemented by Mozart at a later date. In his first transcript, he notated them in the oboe parts led in parallel motion: Allegro mm. 26, 29, 31, 47, 88–91, 150, 153, 169, 190 and Presto mm. 104–107 (here also Fg. I/II), 125–128, 171–177. Could it be that Mozart forgot to transfer the slurs of the oboe parts into the flute and clarinet parts while adding these new parts, or that he neglected to eliminate the oboes' slurs? Since it is most unlikely that the flutes, oboes and clarinets are to articulate differently here, the performer must choose between one of the two possibilities when performing Version C. In the musical text the articulations that are possibly missing in the flute and clarinet parts have been made recognizable through broken-line slurs. It is also equally justifiable to delete the slurs in the oboe parts as well as those added to the flute and clarinet parts along with them (in m. 26 of the Allegro, the supplemented slur in Fg. I/II would also have to be deleted).

Version C as symphony with flutes and clarinets:

Allegro	Without repeats. Later reading in m. 48 (VI. II), 1st–4th notes <i>g sharp</i> ¹ . Possible elimination of slurs in woodwinds mm. 26, 29, 31, 47, 88–91, 150, 153, 169, 190.
Andante	M. 23 (VI. I) last note <i>c'</i> .
Minuet/Trio	[Without changes.]
Presto	Mm. 8, 87, 146 (VI. II) double stop <i>c sharp</i> ¹ + <i>e</i> ¹ . Autograph reading in mm. 222–228 (VI. I). Possible elimination of slurs in woodwinds mm. 104–107, 125–128, 171–177.

3. Notes on the Edition

General Information

The primary sources for the present edition are the autographs of the Hafner Music K. 385 and K. 408/2 (385a). Version C was laid down by the editor as the musical text of the symphony. The sole discrepancy is the repeat in m. 94 of the Allegro, which Mozart deleted in his revision. It was included in the principal text for practical purposes, namely in order to allow the performance of Versions A and B. Logically, it must be omitted when Version C is performed.

The reconstruction of Versions A and B is based on the secondary sources. Even if their legitimacy is questionable, they nonetheless permit us to derive the chronology of Mozart's later revision. After all, it would seem likely that Mozart ordered the printing of the first edition. Unfortunately, however, it is impossible to know to what extent he was able to authorize it and take note of all the details.

The present edition offers the possibility to perform all three versions of the Hafner Music for the first time. The variants of Versions A and B have been made easier to use through footnotes and additional music staves in small type.

Editorial additions are fundamentally indicated through brackets, broken-line slurs or small type. In order not to unnecessarily weigh down the musical text, clearly missing accidentals and *a 2* instructions were supplemented without comment.

In the present edition, no distinction has been made between the staccato stroke and dot; instead, we have uniformly placed a short stroke. The editor thus guides himself on the scholarly writings of Clive Brown and Robert Riggs on this problematic matter.³⁷ Since this symbol does not necessarily alter the execution of a note (see e.g. m. 74 in the Allegro, where the symbol is found only in the string parts next to a legato, but not in the wind parts between the long notes), it was added only sparingly and in analogy to other passages. The editor is of the opinion that a consistently analogous adaptation or completion of the parts would assign too much importance to this sign.

We also proceeded just as cautiously with the accent dynamics *fp*, *sf* and *sf*. They are used with such amazing inconsistency – precisely in the Hafner Music (e.g. in the Allegro, mm. 77, 81, 83 and 185) – that one must ask oneself whether Mozart actually envisioned a systematic distinction or not.³⁸ This is why we have strictly retained the autograph notation in the present edition. The performers must uncover the significance of the signs from the musical context on their own. The multi-stem notation of the autograph was generally simplified whenever there were no obvious divisi passages (Trio, m. 12, Va.) or special sound effects (e.g. Allegro, m. 13, VI. II). For further aspects of historical performance practice, we recommend the highly informative prefaces to other Mozart symphonies by Cliff Eisen.³⁹

Individual Problems

Allegro, m. 48, VI. II

In the autograph, the unison abbreviation of VI. II which begins in m. 41 (4th note) is valid until the 4th eighth note of m. 48 inclusively. Mozart entered four *g sharp*¹ eighth notes at the beginning of the measure in much paler ink, thus adapting this measure to the instrumentation of m. 154. If we are to judge from the facsimile print, the later entry is notated in the same watery ink as the flute and clarinet parts and, consequently, also belongs to Version C. The secondary sources uniformly transmit the earlier reading (with *e*²). It should thus be played when Versions A and B are performed.⁴⁰

Allegro, m. 94, Repeat Sign

In the autograph there is a two-sided repeat sign here, which was invalidated with red crayon. In the subsequently composed flute and clarinet parts, the repeat sign is missing, which suggests that it was crossed out before the addition of these wind parts either by Mozart himself, or with his consent. However, the corresponding repeat sign for the second part is missing at the end of the movement. Did Mozart forget it in his great haste? The repeat of the first section is to be played in Version A and in the copy-variant of Version B.⁴¹ Mozart also seems to have been preoccupied with the repetition of form sections in the second movement as well. The repeat sign in m. 36, which comprises measures 36–84, was also later added by Mozart.

Andante, m. 15, VI. I/II

At the beginning of m. 13 there is clearly no dotting in VI. I/II. In m. 15 VI. I has an (augmentation) dot after the 32nd-note *b*¹, which is followed by a 32nd note instead of the mathematically correct 64th note. In this measure, VI. II plays *in 8^{tava}*: led together with VI. I and not fully written out. Due to the indication *Da Capo 16 tack*t in m. 50, the parallel passage at mm. 62/64 was unfortunately also not written out in its entirety. The analogous passages which could have helped solve the problem are thus missing. The transmission in the secondary sources is unsystematic, sometimes with and sometimes without dots.⁴² Perhaps the "problem" dot is nothing else than a meaningless ink blotch.

Andante, m. 23, VI. I

The copies uniformly transmit d^{\flat} instead of c^{\flat} . In the autograph the note head lies directly on the stave line instead of at the required position; the leger line cuts through the note head (as a makeshift diagonally from top to bottom). It is possible that Mozart passed on the autograph with the valid d^{\flat} and only subsequently corrected the note to c^{\flat} .

Presto, mm. 8, 87, 146, VI. II

In the autograph we find the double stop c *sharp*¹+ e^{\flat} here with a double stem. The stem for the upper note is – rather uncommonly – extended from the lower note head. This helps us understand the reading in the copies, which applies to Versions A and B in the copy variant. The copies, namely, have only c *sharp*¹. Mozart certainly later added the e^{\flat} – which explains the unusual stemming. In the viola part, Mozart corrected the e^{\flat} to a^{\flat} at this passage. This correction seems to be earlier than the one in VI. II, since the original reading of the viola is not found in the copies.

Presto, mm. 79, 138, Transitions to the Ritornello

The slurring in the transitions to the ritornello is ambiguous in the autograph and could be seamlessly connected to the first slur of the head of the theme (fully notated only at the beginning of the movement).

Presto, mm. 90ff.

It has become customary here to alternate between f and p on the barline at every two measures. The reading in the autograph does not support this interpretation, however, but also does not exclude it. While Mozart unequivocally notated the f on each first note in the measure, the p is inconsistent in the parts and often placed after the first note. Moreover, the multiple stops in the violins do not particularly favor a p on account of their dense sound. Also, at a surprising change of dynamics to the p on the first note in the Fg. I/II (e.g. m. 90), one would also expect a p , as in the Andante, for example at m. 44 (Ob. I/II). Perhaps Mozart had merely intended a natural fading of the dynamic to p . Similarly unclear is the change to p in the Allegro, mm. 48 and 154 (VI. I/II). Here, too, the dynamic change does not necessarily have to take place suddenly at the second note; the autograph also allows for a later placing of the p at the third or fourth notes, which can be understood as a toning down of the dynamics.

We wish to cordially thank the libraries and institutions listed in the Critical Report for placing copies of the sources at our disposal or for the possibility of examining material in situ. I also wish to thank the publishing house's editor Christian Rudolf Riedel for the excellent cooperation in the preparation of this edition.

Munich, Fall 2012

Henrik Wiese

- 1 Wilhelm A. Bauer and Otto Erich Deutsch (eds.), *Mozart. Briefe und Aufzeichnungen. Gesamtausgabe* [= MBA vol./page: letter number/lines], Kassel, 1962–2005. MBA III/213: 677/35. MBA III/216: 681/7. The quotations marked with a * before the bibliographical information are original transcriptions of the editor. English translations from *The Letters of Mozart and his Family*, chronologically arranged, translated and edited by Emily Anderson, London, 3rd 1985 [= Anderson].
- 2 MBA III/248: 719/21 (Anderson, p. 835).
- 3 The explanatory interpretation of the quotation “die *Sinfonie* von der letzten hafner=*Musique*” (“the symphony of the last Hafner Music”) is grammatically implausible in German because of the definite article before *Sinfonie*.

- 4 MBA III/254: 725/15–16.
- 5 *MBA III/248: 719/21.
- 6 *MBA III/213: 677/33–42 (Anderson, p. 808).
- 7 Ulrich Konrad, *Wolfgang Amadé Mozart. Leben – Musik – Werkbestand*, Kassel, 2006, p. 93.
- 8 MBA III/213: 678/2–5 (Anderson, p. 809).
- 9 *MBA III/214f.: 680/3–9 (Anderson, pp. 809f.).
- 10 *MBA III/215: 680/16–22 (Anderson, p. 810).
- 11 *MBA III/216: 681/5–9 (Anderson, p. 811).
- 12 See MBA III/ 679, 682 and 688.
- 13 NMA X/34 (Dokumente), p. 181.
- 14 *MBA III/219: 684/40–42 (Anderson, p. 813).
- 15 *MBA III/225: 689/29–30 (Anderson, p. 817).
- 16 *MBA III/244: 713/30–33 (Anderson, p. 832).
- 17 On the Hafner family and the orthography of their name cf. Rudolph Angermüller, *Ein 'seliger Menschenfreund': Sigmund Hafner, Edler und Ritter von Innbachhausen (1756–1787)* in: *Salzburg Archiv* 33, (2008) [= Angermüller], pp. 213–274, in particular p. 262, fn. 1. The Mozarts used the spelling *Hafner* almost exclusively. The name also appears thusly in important documents such as the patent of nobility. The occupational title *Hafner* ‘potter, stove-fitter’ has also long been written with only one <f> and spoken with a long /ā/.
 18 NMA X/34 (Dokumente), p. 141 (Tagebuch Schiedenhofen). The occasion for the work was noted on the autograph score by Leopold Mozart.
 19 Document in the Archiv der Stadt Salzburg (ASTS), Standeserhebungen und Diplome (D) 10. Maria Vinzenz Süß, *Die Bürgermeister in Salzburg von 1433 bis 1840*, Salzburg, 1840, p. 144. NMA X/34 (Dokumente), p. 180.
 20 Salzburger Landesarchiv, shelfmark: *Land 16 H-K 30*.
 21 Robert Landauer, *Hafner von Innbachhausen*, in: *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 69 (1929), p. 77. Angermüller, p. 228.
 22 KV¹.
 23 NMA IV/11/6, p. IX. Hildgund Kröplin, *Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart 1756–1791. Eine Chronik*, Wiesbaden, 1990, p. 132. Heinz Schuler, *Mozarts Salzburger Freunde und Bekannte. Biographien und Kommentare*, Wilhelmshaven, 1996, p. 198. Gernot Gruber and Joachim Brüggel, *Das Mozart-Lexikon*, Laaber, 2005, p. 248.
 24 MBA III/248: 719/21–25. III/250: 720/27. III/251: 722/14–16.
 25 MBA III/254: 725/10–16 (Anderson, p. 838).
 26 Cf. Neal Zaslaw, *Mozart's Symphonies. Context, Performance Practice, Reception*, Oxford, 1989, p. 378.
 27 MBA III/257: 728/16–18 (Anderson, p. 840).
 28 *MBA III/261f.: 735/1–22 (Anderson, p. 843).
 29 Carl Friedrich Cramer (ed.), *Magazin der Musik*, vol. 1, Hamburg, 1783, p. 578f.
 30 NMA X/34 (Dokumente), p. 198. But cf. Dexter Edge, *Mozart's Viennese Copyists*, Ann Arbor, 2001, p. 522.
 31 MBA VI/401: to 1140/3.
 32 MBA III/484: 918/23–24.
 33 NMA X/31/2, p. 110.
 34 NMA X/31/2, pp. 153 and 155.
 35 Constant von Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, Vienna, 1868, part 19, p. 282.
 36 A detailed article by the editor on the Hafner Symphony is in preparation.
 37 Robert Riggs, *Mozart's Notation of Staccato Articulation: A New Appraisal*, in: *The Journal of Musicology* 15 (1997), no. 2, pp. 230–277. Clive Brown, *Dots and Strokes in Late 18th- and 19th-Century Music*, in: *Early Music* 21 (1993), no. 4, pp. 593–610.
 38 The Serenade in E-flat major K. 375 (mvt. I) can, in turn, be considered as a model for the consistent use of varying dynamic accents.
 39 K. 112 (PB 5372), K. 504 (PB 5254) and K. 551 (PB 5292).
 40 Cf. also Norman del Mar, *Orchestral Variations. Confusion and Error in the Orchestral Repertoire*, London, 1981 [= del Mar], p. 150.
 41 Cf. also del Mar, p. 150.
 42 Cf. also del Mar, p. 152.