

## Comments

*pf u* = piano upper staff; *pf l* = piano lower staff; *M* = measure(s)

### Sources

- A Roughly half of the autograph survives today. It originally comprised two double leaves placed one within the other, plus a single leaf. The original inner double leaf has survived (A<sub>1</sub>, see below; this was only discovered in 2014; see the *Preface*), as has the single leaf (A<sub>2</sub>, see below). The inaccurate description and reconstruction of the autograph in the Neue Mozart-Ausgabe was first corrected by Wolf-Dieter Seiffert in his *Weitere neue Erkenntnisse zum Autograph der Klaviersonate A-dur KV 331*, a blog entry of 26 October 2015 available at [www.henle.com](http://www.henle.com). The other double leaf of the autograph remains lost, and would have contained movement I, M 1–54; movement II, from M 59; movement III, M 1–57.
- A<sub>1</sub> Partial autograph. Budapest, National Széchényi Library, shelfmark Ms. Mus. 15.289. Double leaf with four written pages, landscape format, ten lines drawn with a rastrum. Contains movement I starting at M 55 to movement II, M 58, inclusive.
- A<sub>2</sub> Partial autograph. Salzburg, Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum, Bibliotheca Mozartiana, shelfmark KV 300i. A leaf written on one side, landscape format, ten lines drawn with a rastrum. Contains M 58–64 of the last movement, including the da capo marking for M 65–96, which are not written out; then the Coda M 96–127. On the right, next to the conclusion sign, Mozart subsequently notated 2½ measures with upbeat in

*pf u*; these correspond to M 89 (with upbeat) to M 91 (1<sup>st</sup> half). They are notated in treble clef and thus probably represent a later, spontaneously notated idea. Mozart presumably wrote down the 2½-measure model with broken octaves in the autograph in order to instruct the copyist of [C<sub>EC</sub>] (see below) to correspondingly render the following measures. See *Individual comments*, comment on movement III, M 89–96.

- C Undated copyist's manuscript of the Sonata K. 331, Vienna, ca. 1780. USA, private collection. Title: *Sonata | per il | Clavi=Cembalo | Del Sig<sup>tez</sup> Mozart*. *Pf u* is notated in the soprano clef. The anonymous copyist ("KRa-Hofmann-C4"), unequivocally identified by Dexter Edge, was a professional copyist working primarily in Vienna in the 1760s and 1770s. This hastily-written copy, made for performance purposes (see the *Preface*), only became known in 2016. It contains numerous textual mistakes that remained uncorrected. C was first described by Edge and Seiffert in: *Buch- und Kunstauktionshaus Zisska & Lasser, Katalog Auktion 68, 10.–12. Mai 2017*, pp. 13–15, lot 34. Cf. also the considerably more extensive evaluation of this new source in Wolf-Dieter Seiffert, *Zu einer bislang unbekanntem zeitgenössischen Abschrift von Mozarts Klaviersonate A-Dur KV 331*, in: *Mozart-Studien 27, Bericht über den Prager Mozart-Kongress 2018*, ed. by Manfred Hermann Schmid, Vienna, 2020, pp. 193–213.

- F<sub>1</sub> First edition, 1<sup>st</sup> issue of K. 330, 331, 332 as "Oeuvre VI". Vienna, Artaria, plate number 47, published 1784 (advertisement in the *Wiener Zeitung*, no. 68, of 25 August 1784). K. 331 as *SONATA II* on pp. 15–24. Title: *TROIS SONATES | pour le Clave-*

*cin ou Pianoforte | composées par | W. A. MOZART. | Oeuvre. VI* | [bottom left:] *C.P.S.C.M.* [bottom centre:] *Publiées a Vienne chez Artaria Comp.* [below in the centre:] 47 [to the right:] *prix. f. 2.30 Xr.* *Pf u* in treble clef. Copy consulted: Hohenlohe-Zentralarchiv Neuenstein, shelfmark LA 170 Bü 140.

- F<sub>4</sub> First edition, 4<sup>th</sup> issue of K. 330, 331, 332 as "Oeuvre VI". Publisher, plate number, title as in F<sub>1</sub>, but new price *f 4.30 Xr.* K. 331 has here been engraved completely anew (cf. Gertraut Haberkamp, *Die Erstdrucke der Werke von Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart*, Tutzing, 1986, text volume, pp. 136 f.). Copy consulted: Salzburg, Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum, Bibliotheca Mozartiana, shelfmark Rara 616/2,3an. Changes of page identical with F<sub>1</sub>, the changes of line, however, occasionally deviate. According to Haberkamp, three different music engravers can be distinguished; for example, F<sub>1</sub> sets staccato throughout as a drop-let, F<sub>4</sub> throughout as a dot; for ♯ F<sub>1</sub> uses × and F<sub>4</sub> ♯.
- C<sub>PR</sub> Copyist's manuscript of the Sonatas K. 332 and 331 in an unknown hand. Prague, National Library of the Czech Republic, Music Department, shelfmark XXXII-A-406. K. 331 starts on p. 25 of the source. Title page: *Due | Sonate, per il | Clavicembalo. | Del Signore Mozart*. The paper is of Czech manufacture from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (information kindly provided by Zuzana Petrášková). *Pf u* in soprano clef.

### Lost sources

- [C<sub>EC</sub>] Direct or indirect copy of A, in which Mozart himself made additions and corrections for the engraver of F<sub>1</sub>. Mozart did not transfer these revisions back to A. [C<sub>EC</sub>] served either directly or indirectly as the engraver's copy for F<sub>1</sub>.

[C<sub>MA</sub>] If the manuscript that Mozart sent to his sister Maria Anna Mozart in Salzburg was A (see the *Preface* for Mozart's letter of 12 June 1784), it would have had to be sent back to him in Vienna at some later date; however, if it was not A, then he must have sent her a now-lost copy.

#### *About this edition*

The primary sources for the present edition are F<sub>1</sub>, A<sub>1</sub> and A<sub>2</sub>. C and F<sub>4</sub> are secondary sources.

Before the publication of F<sub>1</sub> Mozart made selective improvements and additions to the musical text of the A major Sonata K. 331, especially to the dynamics, in an engraver's copy [C<sub>EC</sub>] that has since been lost. This is proved by comparing A (and C) with F<sub>1</sub>, which also reveals that the placing of slurs in F<sub>1</sub> is occasionally imprecise. F<sub>1</sub> otherwise contains very few real errors, which must have either been copied from the lost engraver's copy [C<sub>EC</sub>] or were made during the engraving process. These mistakes went undetected because Mozart proofread neither [C<sub>EC</sub>] nor F<sub>1</sub>. F<sub>1</sub> thus presents an authorised text that goes beyond A (and so is the last authorised version); and it serves alongside A<sub>1</sub> and A<sub>2</sub> as the primary source for the present edition.

This evaluation of the sources corresponds completely with that of the two companion works in F<sub>1</sub>, the Sonatas K. 330 and 332. The text of the first edition of the Sonata in C major K. 330 has far more extensive dynamic markings than the autograph; more importantly, the four closing measures of the slow movement are only found in F<sub>1</sub>. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> movement of the Sonata in F major K. 332, F<sub>1</sub> offers a considerably more ornamented version of the da capo (from M 21 onwards) than is found in the autograph. All these additions can only have been made by Mozart.

C was intended for purposes of performance but was probably never actually used thus, because its many obvious scribal errors remained entirely uncorrected. This source is interesting from a compositional history perspec-

tive, given that it was made in Vienna ca. 1780 and thus stands in chronological and geographical proximity to Mozart himself. It thereby also raises broader questions about when the Sonata in A major was composed. In editorial terms, the source is interesting because the copyist must have copied it either directly from Mozart's autograph (A) or from a now-lost copy of it. We know this because C – despite being written carelessly and inaccurately – transmits the text of A and can help us reconstruct those parts of A that remain lost. Given these errors, C must in principle be viewed with mistrust when its readings diverge from F<sub>1</sub> in those passages not present in A. As a rule, these readings (including all obvious writing errors) are merely listed in the following *Individual comments*, since they are made obsolete by F<sub>1</sub>. Only in exceptional cases does the present editor consider C as a source, presenting a reading from A that has presumably been corrupted in F<sub>1</sub>; such cases are given in the *Individual comments* below and also on occasion in footnotes to the musical text.

Artaria's third reprint of the Sonatas K. 330–332 (F<sub>4</sub>) served as the crucial albeit very faulty source for the further transmission of K. 331 up to the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and is thus mainly relevant for the work's reception history. F<sub>4</sub> presents quite a few changes when compared to F<sub>1</sub>, some of which are mere engraving errors, while others are self-evident corrections, made by an unknown person, of obvious engraving mistakes in F<sub>1</sub>. We can exclude any possibility that Mozart had a part in preparing F<sub>4</sub>. The most important errors in it are merely listed in the *Individual comments*.

On the one hand, C<sub>PR</sub> (with pf u notated in soprano clef, as in A) displays striking similarities with F<sub>1</sub>, but on the other hand also has readings that are independent, divergent from it or that agree only with A, but not with F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub>. On the whole, C<sub>PR</sub> indeed contains a relatively large number of scribal errors and slips of the pen, but had to be consulted as an additional secondary

source for the edition because it can both confirm errors from F<sub>1</sub> (in sole concurrence with A) or allow the assumption of such errors in F<sub>1</sub> (where A is missing and C<sub>PR</sub>, F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub> offer a different reading). Thus, in as far as readings of C<sub>PR</sub> and A agree and simultaneously differ from F<sub>1</sub>, the reading F<sub>1</sub> is considered defective. If C<sub>PR</sub> deviates uniquely, this in turn is evaluated as an error in transmission (and not mentioned). Occasionally, F<sub>4</sub> even confirms the reading from C<sub>PR</sub> as opposed to F<sub>1</sub>.

Some 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century prints that are important for the reception of the Sonata were consulted by way of comparison for our edition; only the most striking incorrectly transmitted passages (often even found in modern Urtext editions) are given below.

Staccato marks (dot and dash) are rendered in accordance with Mozart's writing habits. In the sources, dynamics are frequently given both in pf l as well as in pf u; where these are merely doublings, they are simplified to a single dynamic marking between the staves (but cf. the comment on M 19 f. in movement II). A slur is tacitly added to each grace note, if it is missing from the sources, since grace notes are always to be slurred to the main note. Only in the last movement has the consistent notation without slur in the theme been taken over from the sources. In rare cases, grace notes display incorrect note values; as a rule, they have been corrected without comment to the modern manner of notation (“half the note value of the main note”). Mozart's manner of notating arpeggios



irregular beamings as well as old or inconsistent clefs have been modernised. Mozart's latent “part” notation, that is to say, the separate stemming, for example, of parallel thirds in a staff, has not been taken over. Polyphonic passages, however, have been notated in accordance with the sources. Cautionary accidentals have occasionally been added without comment; superfluous accidentals have been deleted. Alignments with parallel pas-

sages have been undertaken only very sparingly and are then commented upon. Parentheses indicate editorial additions.

### Individual comments

#### I Andante grazioso

##### Theme

1 f., 5 f., 9, 13 f. u: In  $F_1$  slur often not clearly placed, however presumably intended on 1<sup>st</sup>–2<sup>nd</sup> notes, except in M 2, 13, where it is on 1<sup>st</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> notes. No slurs in C. In  $F_4$  slur predominantly, in  $C_{PR}$  throughout (although fleetingly notated at times) on 1<sup>st</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> notes. Slur standardised in accordance with  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  on 1<sup>st</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> notes. In most later editions, slur on 1<sup>st</sup>–2<sup>nd</sup> notes.

4 u: 2<sup>nd</sup> slur only in C.

7:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have *sf* erroneously on the penultimate chord (and only in pf l).

$C_{PR}$  has *f* instead of *sf* before the last chord. *sf* rendered in accordance with the parallel passage M 15. Neither passage has any dynamics in C.

8 u: In many later editions, 2<sup>nd</sup> chord additionally with  $e^1$ ; not in the sources. Cf. also comment and footnote on M 26 u and M 54 u.

11 f.: C has *fp* three times instead of *sf*. l: C has *fp* chords three times with an additional  $e^1$ .

18 u: Slur only in C.

##### Variation I

24 u: In C 3<sup>rd</sup> chord is  $e^1/g^\sharp/b^1$  (as preceding chords). Penultimate third lacks  $b^1$ .

26 u: In  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  3<sup>rd</sup> chord is a triad with  $e^1$  instead of  $d^1$ , but C has  $d^1$  instead of  $e^1$ , which is musically more plausible. See the parallel passages M 8, 13, 36, 44 (all with  $d^1$ ). An engraving error in  $F_1$  and, respectably, a scribal error in [ $C_{EC}$ ] is likely. (In  $C_{PR}$ , 1<sup>st</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> notes erroneously have only upper voice, without chords.) Most later editions have  $d^1$  and  $e^1$ . Cf. also comment on M 54 u.

l: C,  $C_{PR}$ ,  $F_4$  lack staccato; added in accordance with  $F_1$ . Most later editions erroneously have slur instead of staccato (correspondingly also in M 36).

28 u: C,  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  lack  $\natural$  on 8<sup>th</sup> note; this was also added in  $C_{PR}$ .

28–30: *sf* and *p* in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ . C has no dynamics,  $C_{PR}$  has *f* instead of *sf* in M 28 f., but placed as in  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ; M 30 does not have any dynamic marking. In a number of later editions, erroneous *sfp* in M 29 f., on beats 1 and 4 each time.

34 u: In C beats 4–6 have even eighth notes instead of a dotted rhythm.

36 u: 3<sup>rd</sup> chord in C lacks  $g^\sharp$ .

##### Variation II

37 f., 50 u: In  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  slur on beats 3–4 only on the first three notes of the figure each time; changed to match the other passages (M 39, 39/40, 45/46, 46/47, 49, 51, 51/52). No slurs in C, in  $C_{PR}$  slur mostly only on the 32<sup>nd</sup> notes.

37/38 u: In  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  the slur ends at the measure transition erroneously before the bar line; 1<sup>st</sup>–2<sup>nd</sup> notes in M 38 lack staccato. The parallel passages M 38/39 and 49/50 in  $F_1$  are as given here. In  $F_4$  in M 38/39 with short slur and without staccato; M 39, beat 5, and M 40, beat 2 also lack staccato; M 49/50 with long slur but without staccato. C,  $C_{PR}$  has slur always only on 32<sup>nd</sup> notes, staccato is mostly missing, however it is present in M 50 on the first two notes. Changed to match M 38/39, 49/50 in  $F_1$  and the other correctly engraved parallel passages there.

41 l: No grace notes in C.

42 u:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have slur on 1<sup>st</sup>–9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> notes; changed to match M 41. In C,  $C_{PR}$  no slurs in M 41–43 u.

48 l: Octave given here without lower note  $e$  in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ . Most later editions add octave, analogous to M 12, 30.

50 l: 13<sup>th</sup> note in C erroneously given as  $g^\sharp$  instead of  $b$ ; cf. M 38.

52 l:  $F_1$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack the augmentation dot on  $a$  in the chord on beats 4–6; both augmentation dots are absent in C. Adopted here from  $F_4$ . Cf. also correct notation in M 106 l (both dots also absent in C).

53 u: 8<sup>th</sup> note in C  $b^1$  instead of  $g^\sharp$ .

54 u: In  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  9<sup>th</sup> note is  $e^1$  instead of  $d^1$ ; C has  $d^1$  instead of  $e^1$ , which seems musically more plausible; cf.

M 44. Most later editions have  $d^1$ .

Cf. also the comment on M 26 u.

##### Variation III

58 u:  $A_1$ , C lack 2<sup>nd</sup> slur; placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ .

59 u:  $A_1$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  lack slur; placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ .

59 f. l:  $A_1$  has continuous slur over both measures; changed to match  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  and M 55 f. In C,  $C_{PR}$  M 55–62 lack slurs.

62 l:  $A_1$  has staccato dot on last note; deleted in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ , C,  $C_{PR}$ .

64 l:  $A_1$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have whole-measure slur, changed to match pf u; slur in C only on 1<sup>st</sup> half of measure. In  $C_{PR}$  erroneous whole-measure slur in pf u and divided slur in pf l.

67–70 l:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack slurs (C has one slur each for each half-measure only in M 67); placed in accordance with  $A_1$  and analogous to M 59–62 ff.

70 u: Two slurs in accordance with  $A_1$ , C;  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have whole-measure slur,  $C_{PR}$  lacks slur.

72 l:  $A_1$ , C lack slur; placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ .

##### Variation IV

73–90 u:  $A_1$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  lack slurs on the chords notated in pf u in the left hand (with exception of M 88, cf. comment); placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ .


75, 79, 87–90 l:  $A_1$ , C have only single notes, without the lower octaves (however, in M 79 octaves are present on beats 5 and 6); placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ .

76 u:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack 2<sup>nd</sup> slur; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ , C.

84: Chord  $a/c^\sharp/d^\sharp/a^1$  on beat 3 in accordance with  $A_1$ , C,  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ . The alternative from  $C_{PR}$  (cf. footnote in the musical text) is not authorised by the other sources, but mitigates the harsh dissonance (cf. also Paul Badura-Skoda, *Neue Erkenntnisse zum Text der Klaviersonate A-Dur KV 331 von Wolfgang Amadé Mozart*, in: *Mozart-Jahrbuch*, 2012, pp. 3–19). In  $A_1$  Mozart scratched out the  $\sharp d^\sharp$  originally notated in pf l and moved it to



pf u. Many later editions have chord  $a/c\sharp^1/a^1$  (i. e. without  $d\sharp^1$ ). –  $A_1$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  lack **fp**; placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ , –  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack staccato; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ , C.





l:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack slur; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ , C.

88 u: In  $A_1$  beats 4–6 are ; C has no articulation; rendered in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ .

#### Variation V

91 u:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  lack staccato dash on 1<sup>st</sup> note; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ .

95 u: In  $F_1$ ,  $C_{PR}$  1<sup>st</sup> chord has erroneously  instead of -beam; rendered in accordance with  $A_1$ , C,  $F_4$ . Cf. also following comment.

95 f. u: Last beat in  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  transmitted corruptly each time; changed here in accordance with  $A_1$  and C (though in the latter, the last note each time is given erroneously as  instead of )  $F_1$ ,  $C_{PR}$  each time have ; presumably already given incorrectly thus in [ $C_{EC}$ ].  $F_4$  changed each time incorrectly to ; given thus in many editions to this day.

96 u:  $F_1$ , C,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack 2<sup>nd</sup> slur; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ .

97 u:  $F_1$ , C erroneously has staccato dot on 3<sup>rd</sup> note of beat 4. Thus also in  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ , but there additionally with slur only on 1<sup>st</sup>–2<sup>nd</sup> notes. Given here in accordance with  $A_1$ . Parallel passage M 105 in  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  correct;  $C_{PR}$  lacks slur, but staccato dots on 2<sup>nd</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> notes (the 4 notes that follow lack staccato dots). C notates M 105 as M 97.

98<sup>a</sup> u:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  lack staccato dash; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ .

98<sup>b</sup> u:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  lack slur on beat 2; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ .

101 f.: **sfp** not in  $A_1$ , C; placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ . Corrupt in  $C_{PR}$ : not **sfp**, but **f** in M 101 on 1<sup>st</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> notes and in M 102 on 1<sup>st</sup> note; **p** in M 101 on 6<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> notes and in M 102 on 5<sup>th</sup> note.

104 u: 2<sup>nd</sup> slur placed in accordance with  $A_1$ , C,  $F_4$ , and analogous to M 92. –  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack staccato dash on 5<sup>th</sup> note; taken over from  $A_1$ ,  $F_1$ , C. In  $F_1$  the last five notes lack slur and staccato

dash; rendered in accordance with  $A_1$  (cf. also M 103).  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  only lack staccato dash.


l: In all sources no  $\sharp$  on the notes  $d^1$  in the whole measure, it is only present in the following measure. Nearly all later editions add  $\sharp$  on 3<sup>rd</sup> note to match M 92.

105 u:  $A_1$  lacks 1<sup>st</sup> slur.  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  in turn lack the following tie;  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  have slur on all four notes of beat 2. 1<sup>st</sup> slur in accordance with C,  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  and analogous to M 92 f., 97; tie rendered in accordance with  $A_1$ . –  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have a portato slur on beat 5 in addition to dots,  $C_{PR}$  has no articulation. Given here as in  $A_1$  and C and in analogy to M 97.

l:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack slur; two slurs in C, placed cursorily, separately, on beats 1 and 2. Placed in our edition in accordance with  $A_1$ .

106:  $A_1$ , C no **fp**;  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have **f** on beat 3, **p** on beat 4 (for reasons of space, only under the staff);  $C_{PR}$ , however, has **f** on beat 4, **p** on beat 6, which is more plausible musically. In [ $C_{EC}$ ] Mozart presumably added a **fp** on beat 4 somewhat imprecisely; edited correspondingly. Many later editions have **f** on beat 1, **p** on beat 4.

u: In all sources third-to-last upper note is  $d^2$ ; in  $A_1$ , C double dotted.




however, in  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  ; it is possible, but not very probable, that Mozart subsequently changed the double dot to a single dot in [ $C_{EC}$ ]. Most later editions correct  $d^2$  to  $b^1$  to adapt the melody to that of all parallel passages and to avoid parallel octaves with the middle voice in pf l.

107 u:  $A_1$ , C lack 1<sup>st</sup> legato slur (C instead has short slurs on the triplet groups, clearly a misinterpretation of the triplet figures in  $A_1$ ); placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  (tie is missing there).

l:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack 1<sup>st</sup> slur (C has three slurs, one per beat); placed in accordance with  $A_1$ .

107 f.:  $A_1$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  lack **f** and **p**; placed in accordance with sources  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ .

108<sup>b</sup> u:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  lack staccato; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ . –

On beats 4–6 in  $A_1$  apparently  (however, pf l lacks the corresponding  usually found in Mozart); the dot in , however, is possibly an ink splatter as it cannot apply to any particular note. The mark probably signifies a legato slur on  $b^1$ – $a^1$ ; thus in  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  and also correspondingly edited.

#### Variation VI

113 l: In  $F_4$  1<sup>st</sup> chord erroneously

; rendered in accordance

with  $A_1$ , C,  $F_1$ ,  $C_{PR}$ . The incorrect reading in  $F_4$  was falsely amended to  $A/c\sharp^1/e/a$  in many later editions.

116 l:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have chord  $A_1/C\sharp^1/E$  instead of single note  $A_1$ , as in  $A_1$ , C,  $C_{PR}$ ; presumably erroneous in [ $C_{EC}$ ]; edited in accordance with  $A_1$ , C,  $C_{PR}$ . Many later editions have wrong chord as in  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ .

124 u:  $F_1$ , C have upper slur only to  $b\sharp^1$ , lower slur is missing;  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack both slurs; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ .

127–136: Not written out in the sources, but rather indicated as a repetition of M 117–126.

136: In  $A_1$  **p** in pf u is notated a little too far to the right (on beat 4), **p** in pf l clearly on beat 3; only on beat 4 in pf l in C. In  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  **p** erroneously on beat 4, in  $C_{PR}$  there is no dynamic marking; **p** rendered in accordance with  $A_1$  pf l and placed in the middle. l:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  and many subsequent editions to the present day have third  $a/c\sharp^1$  instead of  $a$  on beat 3;  $A_1$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  only have  $a$ . Rendered in accordance with  $A_1$ , C,  $C_{PR}$ .

137 u: Both slurs in accordance with  $A_1$ , missing from  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ ; C has three slurs, one per beat.

138 u:  $F_4$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  lack staccato dash on 10<sup>th</sup> note; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ ,  $F_1$ . Presumably meant to follow the 16<sup>th</sup> notes in M 139 f.

## II Menuetto – Trio

### Menuetto

2, 32 u:  $A_1$  has slur on 1<sup>st</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> notes (M 31–37 not written out by Mo-

- zart), in  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  on 1<sup>st</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> notes (only in M 2 in  $F_1$ , in both places in  $F_4$ ) or 1<sup>st</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> notes (in M 32 in  $F_1$ ), in C,  $C_{PR}$  only on 2<sup>nd</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> notes (in  $C_{PR}$  1<sup>st</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> notes in M 32). Slur placed in accordance with  $A_1$ .
- 3, 33 u: In  $A_1$ , C,  $F_1$ ,  $C_{PR}$  in M 3 last note  $a^2$ , in  $F_4$   $a^2$  initially engraved, then additional ledger line inserted by the engraver and thus corrected to  $c\sharp^3$ . M 33 in  $A_1$  is not written out (thus  $a^2$ ), but is written out in C ( $a^2$ );  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ , on the other hand, have  $c\sharp^3$ ; the latter presumably an error in [ $C_{EC}$ ] that was not noticed by Mozart. The  $c\sharp^3$  in M 3 in  $F_4$  is by analogy to the error in  $F_1$  M 33. Since then,  $c\sharp^3$  has been given erroneously in both places in many printed editions. –  $A_1$ ,  $F_4$  have whole-measure slur; in  $F_1$  length of slur ambiguous, in  $C_{PR}$  on 2<sup>nd</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> notes, no slur in C. Slur placed in accordance with  $A_1$ .
- 3–48: Except for  $f$  in M 11,  $A_1$  lacks dynamics; no dynamics at all in C.  $C_{PR}$  only has a few dynamic markings: M 8 *cresc.*, M 19  $p$  (although in another hand), M 21 *cresc.*, M 23 on the last note  $f$ , M 31, 41  $f$ . Dynamics are placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ , under the assumption that Mozart added these in [ $C_{EC}$ ]. Cf. also comment on M 19 f.
- 6–8 l:  $A_1$ , C lack slurs (also in M 38); placed in accordance with  $F_1$  (no slur there in M 8),  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ .
- 8 u:  $A_1$ , C lack  $\flat$  on  $g^2$ ; placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ .
- 13 l: C,  $F_1$  lack slur; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ .
- 14, 42, 44, 46 u:  $A_1$ , C lack slurs, in  $C_{PR}$  whole-measure slur (no slur in M 44); placed in accordance with M 12 and  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ .
- 17, 47 u: Grace note in accordance with  $A_1$ , C;  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  have  $\flat$  and  $\flat$ , respectively.
- 18 l:  $F_1$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack  $e^1$  on beat 1; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ , C,  $F_4$  (correction in  $F_4$  seems natural).
- 19 f.:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have  $p$  at the beginning of the measure each time; in  $A_1$ , C no dynamic marking,  $C_{PR}$  has  $p$  in M 19, however in an unknown hand (possibly subsequently added in accordance with  $F_1$  or  $F_4$ ). If Mozart supplemented the dynamics in [ $C_{EC}$ ], which our edition assumes, there are two possible explanations for the  $p$  that is seemingly superfluously doubled in M 20: either he added an (imprecisely written?)  $f$  in M 19, followed by  $p$  in M 20, or (in our opinion more plausible) he notated  $p$  in M 19 in pf u and in M 20 in pf l. If one interprets M 23/24 as a parallel passage, then one should probably play  $f$  in M 19 and  $p$  in M 20; thus in most of the later editions.
- 23: The position of  $f$  is given here as in  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  (though it is there engraved somewhat too far to the left, towards the bar line of M 22/23); C has no dynamics.  $C_{PR}$  places  $f$  at the upbeat.
- 24 f. l, 26 u: In M 24 f. all sources lack accidental on  $c^1$  each time, thus undoubtedly  $c\sharp^1$ ; Mozart even placed a cautionary accidental  $\sharp$  on the 1<sup>st</sup> note in M 26, which was very unusual for him (thus also in all other sources). In the sources A minor with  $\flat$  on 2<sup>nd</sup> note pf u only starting in M 27. An edition by André (1841) gives M 24–26 in A minor for the first time and engraves  $\flat c^1$  in M 24 f. l, and  $\flat c^2$  in M 26 u. Found thus in many later editions.
- 26:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have repetition of *cresc.* (cf. previous measure); in  $A_1$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  no dynamics.
- 28 l:  $F_1$  lacks augmentation dots; placed in accordance with  $A_1$ , C,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ .
- 36–38 l:  $A_1$ , C,  $C_{PR}$  lack slurs (in  $A_1$  in M 36 f. da capo, which is not written out, to M 6 f., but likewise no slurs there in  $A_1$ );  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have a slur over all three measures. One slur placed per measure in accordance with M 6–8 in  $C_{PR}$ ,  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ .
- 40 l:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  lack  $\flat a$  in the 1<sup>st</sup> chord and thus in many editions; added in accordance with  $A_1$ , C.  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$  likewise lack slur, placed in accordance with  $A_1$ , C.
- 43 u: Staccato on last note only in  $A_1$ ; notated there only fleetingly next to the note head.
- 47 l: Beat 1  $d/a$  in all sources. Most later editions change to match M 17 and have  $d/b$ .
- Trio**
- 54 l: Both  $\sharp$  placed in accordance with  $A_1$ ; C only has  $\sharp$  notated above pf u; missing from the other sources.
- 58 u:  $A_1$  (last preserved measure),  $C_{PR}$ , C lack tie; placed in accordance with  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ .
- 61/62 u: Slur at the measure transition in accordance with  $F_1$ .  $C_{PR}$ , C lack slur. In  $F_4$  slur from 1<sup>st</sup> note M 61 (engraved a little too far to the right, cf. also M 53) to 1<sup>st</sup> note M 62.
- 65: This measure absent in C; 2<sup>nd</sup> part of the Trio begins with M 66 (pf l empty). Either C offers the (lost) autograph version – which is at least musically possible – or this is a copyist's error.
- 65, 76–78, 85 l:  $F_1$  lacks augmentation dots; placed here in accordance with C (except for M 65, cf. comment on M 65),  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ .
- 68 u: C lacks  $f\sharp^1$  in 1<sup>st</sup> chord.
- 72: Many later editions have  $p$  starting on beat 2, which makes musical sense. Not in the sources.
- 81 l:  $F_1$  has chord  $gb/b/g\sharp^1$  instead of  $bb/d^1/g\sharp^1$ ; correct in C,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ .
- 82 l: In C 1<sup>st</sup> chord has  $e^1$  instead of  $c\sharp^1$ .
- 82/83, 83/84 l: Ties given here as in C; not in  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$ ,  $C_{PR}$ .
- 83 u:  $\sharp$  on 2<sup>nd</sup> note only in C.
- 87 u: C has writing error  $c\sharp-B-A$ .
- 88 u:  $F_1$ ,  $F_4$  have whole-measure slur, C,  $C_{PR}$  lack slur; changed to match M 92.
- 89 l: In C 3<sup>rd</sup> eighth-note value lacks  $f\sharp^1$ .
- 96 u: C lacks  $\flat d^1$ .
- 99 u: C lacks  $\flat b$ .
- 100:  $M$ :[enuetto]  $D$ :[a]  $C$ :[apo] only in C.

### III Allegretto. Alla Turca

Tempo marking *Allegretto* given here as in C,  $C_{PR}$  ( $o$  corrected from  $a$ ) and  $F_1$  (shortened there to *Allgrino*).  $F_4$  corrects this to *Allgretto* (sic). *Allegretto* is otherwise unknown in Mozart, which is why A (the lost section) could quite possibly have *Allgretto* (or *Allegro*), though written either indistinctly or in abbreviated form, and which the copyist of C and [ $C_{EC}$ ] could have misread as *Allegretto*. Most later editions give

*Allegretto* as in F<sub>4</sub>. *Alla Turca* is not in C, which is why it presumably was also absent in A; we here follow F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>PR</sub>.

20, 84: C lacks dynamics.

34 l: In C 1<sup>st</sup> note erroneously *a* instead of *g*<sup>#</sup>, correct in M 50.

42 l: In C 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> eighth-note-values erroneously have *c*<sup>#1</sup>/*e*<sup>1</sup> and *d*<sup>1</sup>/*f*<sup>#1</sup>, respectively; M 46 is correct.

42–46 u: Slurs in M 42 given here as only in C, which has two slurs each in M 43, 45 and one slur on the last four notes of M 44. F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub> only have slurs in M 44 (on 1<sup>st</sup>–2<sup>nd</sup> notes) and M 46. Slurs completely absent in C<sub>PR</sub>.  
55 u: In F<sub>1</sub> 4<sup>th</sup> note indistinct, rather *b*<sup>2</sup> than *a*<sup>2</sup>; F<sub>4</sub> has *b*<sup>2</sup>; C, C<sub>PR</sub> have *a*<sup>2</sup>, rendered thus in our edition, cf. also M 39. Many later editions correct the reading of F<sub>4</sub> to *f*<sup>#2</sup>.

l: C has additional stem for *♩* at 1<sup>st</sup> note.

57 u: In C beat 1 erroneously has additional *a*<sup>2</sup>.

65–88: In A (lost section) these measures (M 65 with upbeat until and including beat 1 of M 88) were probably not written out but indicated by

a da capo marking (cf. Wolf-Dieter Seiffert, *Merkwürdige (?) Wiederholungsanweisungen im “alla turca”-Teilautograph in Salzburg*, contribution to the Henle Blog of 26 October 2015, www.henle.com). These measures are written out in C, with slurs on *♩* for the upbeat to M 65, M 67 and at beat 2 in M 87. These measures are engraved in F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub>, though without the additional slurs given in C.

89–96: These measures (M 89 with upbeat until and including M 96<sup>a</sup>) are absent in C, though M 96<sup>b</sup> is present. The copyist of C most probably misunderstood a repeat indication given by Mozart in A (lost section). Furthermore, we may assume that the playing variant with broken octaves in F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>PR</sub> M 89 ff. was not notated in A, as is proven by a subsequent annotation of Mozart's to A<sub>2</sub> (see the *Sources*). The copyist's misunderstanding means that M 88 remains incomplete in C (i.e. only beat 1), and M 96<sup>b</sup> begins immediately after the bar line. For extensive information on the discovery of C

and for an evaluation of M 89 ff., cf. Wolf-Dieter Seiffert, *Zu einer bislang unbekanntem zeitgenössischen Abschrift von Mozarts Klaviersonate A-Dur KV 331*, in: *Mozart-Studien* 27, Vienna 2020, pp. 193–213, especially pp. 207–209.

91 l: F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub> lack *♯* on 1<sup>st</sup> grace note of beat 2; present in C<sub>PR</sub>, but there the *♯* on the following main note *d*<sup>#</sup> is missing.

96: *Coda* in F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub> only at M 97, missing from C, C<sub>PR</sub>; placed in accordance with A<sub>2</sub>.

109 u: F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub> lack ledger line on grace note *a*<sup>2</sup> (thus *g*<sup>#2</sup>); correct in A<sub>2</sub>, C, C<sub>PR</sub>.

122 u: In A<sub>2</sub>, C 1<sup>st</sup> chord only *c*<sup>#2</sup>/*a*<sup>2</sup>, which is more comfortable to play. However, full chord in F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>PR</sub>, thus also in almost all later editions. Probably already correspondingly corrected by Mozart in [C<sub>EC</sub>].

126 l: F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>4</sub> lack *A* on beat 2; present in A<sub>2</sub>, C, C<sub>PR</sub>, thus probably an error in [C<sub>EC</sub>]. All later editions add *A*.

Munich, spring 2021  
Wolf-Dieter Seiffert