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Abstract

This thesis investigates paternal influence in the compositional techniques of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756-1791) and Richard Strauss (1864-1949). Although the two composers lived a century apart, similarities in their relationship with their fathers, Leopold Mozart and Franz Strauss are apparent. In Part One, research demonstrates paternal involvement in both composers’ upbringing and education. Part Two of this thesis will analyze two concertos, one by each composer: Wolfgang Mozart’s Violin Concerto No. 1 in B-flat Major, K. 207 (1773) and Richard Strauss’s Horn Concerto No. 1 in E-flat Major, Op. 11 (1883). In each concerto, similarities between the compositional techniques of the composer and his respective father show the extent of paternal influence in composition. Finally, comparisons examine the similarities and differences between the two father-son relationships. Through the investigation of these relationships, we may acquire a clearer understanding of their music, making performance and listening more meaningful and personable.
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Introduction

As a musician and a future music educator, I have always been fascinated by music history, including musical conventions and trends, music’s function within society, the interaction between music and other arts, and the unique lives many composers lead. These components are directly related to the study and performance of a piece of music. Understanding the motivation and inspiration behind a composer’s work ultimately guides the performer and listener to a more meaningful musical experience.

For that reason, I have chosen to explore the lives and compositional techniques of the Austro-German composers, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Richard Strauss. I selected these two composers for two reasons. First, I have always been drawn to the ways that Mozart and Strauss exemplify the musical style of their respective eras. Second, as a horn player, I am intimately familiar with their works for my instrument and I feel compelled to learn more about them and their music, which has contributed so much to the French horn’s repertoire.

In addition to my personal preferences, I first noticed a similarity between the two father-son relationships in a music history course. Two letters I found in my research revealed further similarities between both composers and prompted this thesis topic. The first letter, written from Mozart’s father Leopold, concerns Wolfgang’s travels in Europe, October 1777, and serves as an example of Leopold’s management in his son’s life. Leopold writes:

Immediately after your arrival in Munich, you should try to find a copyist and that you should do this wherever you stay any length of time. For you must really endeavor to get ahead with your composition, and that you can do if you have in readiness copies of symphonies and divertimenti to present to a Prince or to some other patron…Your main object, however, should now be to have something
ready for Prince Taxis…Further, the Abbot of Kaysersheim would certainly reward you well for your music; and there you would have the no small advantage of not having to pay anything for food, drink and the rest, in respect of which landlords’ bills usually make heavy inroads on one’s purse. Now you understand me. These steps are necessary and are to your interest. All complements, visits and so forth are only incidental and should not be taken seriously. For you must not lose sight of your main object, which is to make money. All your endeavors should thus be directed to earning money, and you should be very careful to spend as little as possible…Thank God we are well; and I should be even better, if I were one of those light-hearted fathers who can forget their wives and children in three weeks. That I could not do in a hundred years, nay, even during my lifetime.¹

This letter demonstrates the dynamic of Leopold and Wolfgang’s relationship. Leopold was very involved in his son’s life and decisions, and he wanted Wolfgang to succeed in his work.

The following letter reveals a similar dynamic of Franz Strauss’s relationship with his son Richard. Franz was also very concerned with the success of his son, and he frequently voiced his opinion towards Richard’s decisions as well. The letter displays Franz’s reaction to his son’s tales of his social encounters in Berlin, 1884. Franz writes:

It gives me great pleasure to hear that you are moving in such good social circles, it will be of extraordinary benefit to you in your general development; nothing else gives such refinement to the mind and the sensibilities as association with cultivated men and women of refinement and nice feeling. What is an artist without a refined mind and warm sensibility?...Don’t give offence, your tongue is liable to run away with you, so think before you speak.²

The two letters are a testament to the paternal involvement in both the lives of Wolfgang and Richard. As observed from the letters above, both fathers maintained a strong grip on their sons’ life decisions, and both fathers were concerned with their sons’

education. Leopold and Franz’s apparent role in their sons’ education and life leads to the question of influence in terms of musical development and compositional technique. Leopold Mozart and Franz Strauss worked closely with their sons. In addition, Leopold and Franz held positions as professional musicians, Leopold as a violinist in the Salzburg court orchestra, and Franz as principal horn of the Munich court orchestra. As virtuosic composers, both musicians influenced their son’s development and compositional styles by demonstrating musicianship and instrumental skills at home. The fathers oversaw their sons’ compositions and exposed them to musical culture in their respective centuries. Because both fathers were themselves composers and musicians, their contribution in their sons’ musical education affected each young man’s success.

Accordingly, this thesis investigates Leopold Mozart and Franz Strauss’s role in the compositional technique of a concerto by each son. First, Leopold and Franz’s education will be examined in terms of its relation to the upbringing of their sons. Second, an analysis of compositional technique in specific concertos will be illustrated. The concerto selections intentionally retrieved from the first concerto written for the respective instrument of each father, Wolfgang’s Violin Concerto No. 1 in B-flat Major, K. 207, and Richard’s Horn Concerto No. 1 in E-flat Major, Op. 11, demonstrate the extent of paternal influence on compositional technique.
Part One: Historical Information

Leopold Mozart’s Role in his son Wolfgang’s Education

In January of 1756, Johannes Chrysostomus Wolfgangus Theophilus Mozart, better known today as Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, was born in a small room at 9 Getreidegasse in Salzburg, Austria. His mother, Anna Maria Pertl Mozart, and his father Leopold, prided themselves in their two musically talented children. Mozart and his older sister, Nannerl, demonstrated advanced musical abilities at a young age.

Wolfgang achieved impressive musical success, unusual for his age. Robert L. Marshall, the author “Mozart Speaks,” as well as many other Mozart publications, remarks:

He was described as “a wonderchild,” “a prodigy of nature,” “an extraordinary phenomenon.” His talent was similarly characterized as “incredible,” “unheard of,” “a veritable miracle,” “surpassing all understanding or imagination,” an “extraordinary gift” bestowed by God. The numerous eyewitness accounts of Mozart’s public appearances leave no doubt that he was already an accomplished performer and composer by the age of seven.

Although Wolfgang possessed innate talent, his talent was clearly nurtured by his father through discipline and teaching. The nature of Wolfgang’s childhood environment and the educational role of his father contributed to his pursuit and success in music. As biographer Eric Bloom points out, “the music for which we can never cease to thank Leopold Mozart is that which we owe to him as a father and teacher of Wolfgang.”

---

To gain a clear perception of Leopold’s role in Wolfgang’s musical development, a few factors must be pointed out. First, Leopold’s own education connects to how and what he taught his children, as well as the environment in which they were raised. Second, Leopold’s educational beliefs and pedagogical methods relate to Wolfgang’s compositional technique, in particular his first violin concerto. Third, the effect Leopold’s decisions about Wolfgang’s lifestyle had on his musical education must be considered.

As biographer Maynard Solomon confirms, “The course and content of Leopold Mozart’s education is important to understand because he was to be his son’s main instructor in virtually every branch of learning.”

Leopold was born into a family of artisans, not musicians, and the Catholic Church remained the center of the Mozart family’s life. He began preparatory studies before he was five, and proceeded to attend the St. Salvator Gymnasium where he studied logic, science, theology, and rhetoric. Leopold developed a strong interest in his studies of logic, which influenced his thinking and writing. Also at St. Salvator’s, he participated in many of the school’s annual celebratory performances, as he was an outstanding singer and proficient violinist. Leopold grew to be an intelligent man, and he graduated magna cum laude. Louis Biancolli remarks, “He became an educated musician, who had ideas not only about the world and his fellow-men, but also the rules of his art.” Also, partly due to his extensive education, musicologists recognize experimentation and invention as compositional characteristics in many of Leopold’s compositions. In fact, some scholars have

---

5 Solomon 22.
6 Solomon 21-22.
7 Solomon 22
considered Leopold’s musical style as ahead of his time, originally ascribing Leopold’s Symphony in G as Wolfgang’s composition due to its advanced stylistic features. As for Leopold’s other works, some are programmatic instrumental works, such as his *Schiltenfahrt* (Sleigh Ride) and *Pastoral Symphony*, and some contain avant-garde instrumentation and techniques, such as dog calls and shot guns in his *Sinfonia da Caccia*, or the use of bagpipes, hurdy-gurdy, and dulcimer in *Bauernhochzeit*. Cliff Eisen notes, “he was a thoroughly up-to-date, competent composer whose works were comparable in style and quality to Wolfgang’s earliest symphonies.”

At the time of Wolfgang’s birth, Leopold held a position as deputy Kapellmeister to the court orchestra of the archbishop of Salzburg, and remained a well-known violinist. Additionally, he possessed the skills of an excellent violin teacher and a composer. Although Leopold’s compositions never gained the fame or recognition that Wolfgang’s works did, he composed in several genres, including concertos (trumpet, bassoon, oboe, and transverse flute), trios, divertimentos, oratorios, symphonies, serenades, opera, dances, and minuets. No evidence of a violin concerto or sonata by Leopold Mozart exists.

In the year of Mozart’s birth, Leopold completed *A Treatise on the Fundamental Principles of Violin Playing* (1756). Today, the treatise remains as one of Leopold’s most recognized accomplishments. Solomon affirms, “His violin method, written mostly in 1755 and published in 1756, was very well received.” He goes on to explain that Goethe’s friend Karl Friedrich Zelter, acknowledged the treatise was a book which will be “useful as long as the violin remains a violin” and Solomon confirms, “it is studied to

---

9 Solomon 31
10 Solomon 32
this day by all serious interpreters of eighteenth-century violin music.”¹¹ It was primarily because of this book that, from 1758 on, Leopold Mozart’s name began to appear with some frequency in dictionaries and work on music and musical pedagogy.”¹²

Leopold’s education and musical activities also directly influenced the upbringing of his own children. As for Wolfgang’s childhood environment, music surrounded his home life, particularly, the sound of the violin being played by his father. In fact, Marshall writes:

We may be sure that hearing the sound of the violin constituted one of Mozart’s earliest musical experiences. We may be just as sure that he received his first and probably only instruction on the instrument from his father.¹³

But Mozart’s musical exposure was much more involved than merely hearing and learning the violin. As Mozart biographer Peggy Woodford describes:

The house was filled with musical instruments in every corner: three members of a family of four were full-time musicians. There were violins, harpsichords, clavichords, recorders, and probably sheets of music everywhere, from the day of Mozart’s birth.¹⁴

Just as Leopold began his education at a young age, both his children did as well. Leopold taught Nannerl to play the Klavier (piano) at age seven, and when Wolfgang was about three, he began interrupting her lessons. According to Maynard Solomon, “there is no record that either of the Mozart children ever received instruction from a tutor or attended any school. Their father appears to have been their sole teacher.”¹⁵ Leopold was

---

¹² Solomon 32
¹³ Marshall 15
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his son’s main instructor in virtually every branch of learning. Because Leopold was so well versed and successful in his schooling, he was well qualified to educate his children. This was a common approach and understanding in the 18th century, though it is not the dominant pedagogical understanding of today’s education system. Consequently, in Wolfgang’s younger years, Leopold proves to be the primary source of his son’s knowledge, both musical and non-musical.

Since Wolfgang began composing and playing at such an early age and under his father’s close watch, another way to observe Leopold’s musical impact may be through Wolfgang’s early compositional techniques. Around age five, Wolfgang composed *Andante and an Allegro for clavier, K. 1a and 1b*, his first compositions among many others, and Leopold anxiously recorded these early compositions. Wolfgang also attempted to teach himself to play the violin at the age of six, although with wrong and irregular positioning. Nevertheless, this thrilled Leopold and made him extremely proud. Leopold, the author of a violin treatise, was well fit to provide his son with a proper education on the violin, and he was known to be an excellent teacher. As Biancolli describes, “The better side of Leopold’s nature is indicated in the general principles he laid down for his pupils. He demands of them unselfishness and patient application.” Bloom writes, “Leopold worked him hard. When it was not music, it was some other lesson, and his games were music again.”

---

16 Ibid 22
17 Bloom 19
18 Solomon 38-39
19 Biancolli 11
20 Bloom 20
While we cannot be sure that Wolfgang specifically studied from his father’s book, his knowledge about the violin most likely stemmed from Leopold, his only violin teacher, and it mostly likely consisted of the contents found in his violin treatise. By using the treatise and some of Leopold’s compositions as a guide, we can gain further insight about Leopold’s compositional influence his son’s Violin Concerto No. 1.

Further evidence of Leopold’s musical contribution is demonstrated through his assemblage of a music book for Nannerl (Notenbuch). Nannerl’s Notenbuch consisted of minuets and other short pieces by contemporaries, arranged in progressive order of difficulty.21 Around age four, Mozart also studied from this book which soon “bore proud notations by Leopold next to several of the pieces such as ‘Wolfgang learned this minuet in his fourth year.’”22 This notebook represents Leopold’s music preference for a young musician’s educational development. The Notenbuch contained over 135 piece and some of the identified composers’ works include those by Telemann, Hasse and C.P.E. Bach. The collection contains composers primarily of the North German school, and as a result, Bloom proposes, “Germanic influences are conspicuous in his [Mozart’s] work.”23 Mozart’s use of the notebook proves a further confirmation of Leopold’s educational principles of music.

Not only did Leopold impact his son’s musical development through his teaching and techniques, but he also oversaw his son’s compositions and performance decisions, as well as his lifestyle. At only age six, Leopold decided it was time to show his children off to the world. This affair involved the entire family. As Solomon reports:

---
21 Ibid 38
22 Ibid
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Even in his adolescence and young adulthood, Mozart was not allowed to travel unless accompanied by his father, who made all the practical decisions and appraised every opportunity with a view to the family’s interests.²⁴

Wolfgang became a source of income for the family. Leopold made sure to advise his son wisely and lead him to a successful career.

When W.A. Mozart composed his set of five violin concertos, Leopold still monitored his son’s development and decisions. Previous scholarship proposed that Wolfgang composed the five concertos together in 1775, but analysis of the handwriting and the manuscript paper on which it was written suggests Violin Concerto No. 1 in B-flat Major, K. 207, was actually written in the year 1773, when Mozart was seventeen years old.²⁵ He wrote the concerto either for himself or for Gaetano Brunetti, an Italian violinist in the Archbishop’s orchestra. The concerto was premiered with the Salzburg court orchestra and Leopold as Deputy Kapellmeister. Because it is possible that Wolfgang wrote the concerto with the intentions of performing it himself, his playing abilities must be taken into consideration when examining the composition technique of the concerto.

At this time in his life, Wolfgang traveled to Vienna a few times, Paris, London, Italy, and Munich with Leopold serving as his business manager and teacher. As a result of his tours, his compositions demonstrate compatibility with a variety of musical influences in Europe. As Solomon continues:

Of course, this compatibility also shows how closely the young composer followed his models, which were chosen for him by his father from those composers whose music was finding greatest favor in the European capitals of the day. Mozart’s father took a hand in some of his son’s early works, but the extent

²⁴ Solomon 7
of his participation cannot be fully determined because many autographs have not survived.  

Leopold escorted Mozart throughout Europe, seeking recognition for his son’s talents and musical models. Mozart biographer Maynard Solomon suggests, “Mozart was the mainspring of his father’s fame, wealth, and standing, the instrument by which his father’s unfulfilled career was redeemed; he was the extension of Leopold’s own self, the source of his power.”  

While Mozart quickly picked up musical styles and compositional techniques as they traveled all over Europe, his father was simultaneously instructing him. This combination of influences worked its way into his music.  

After their grand European tour, the Mozart family returned to Salzburg in 1776. Salzburg was a bore for Wolfgang, but he kept busy by studying and composing. Through Leopold’s travel and performance plans, Wolfgang expanded his exposure to different music across Europe. Thus, travel presented more compositional ideas and options for him to consider.  

In 1777, Wolfgang was dismissed from the Archbishop’s court in Salzburg, but his father was not, so Mozart left for Munich with his mother. Until this point, Mozart had been under the strict supervision of his father. Despite his respect and love for his father, Woodford speculates, “in his heart Mozart was probably relieved not to be with his father: their attitudes had become very different, and Leopold’s narrow mindedness often got on the young man’s nerves.”

---
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Franz Strauss’s Role in his son Richard’s Education

About a century after Wolfgang Mozart’s birth, in 1864, Franz Strauss became the proud father of his newly born son, Richard. Like Wolfgang, Richard developed into a successful musician and composer with help from his father. A stubborn, strong-willed horn virtuoso, Franz was the principal horn player of the Munich Court Orchestra for almost fifty years. He also took great interest in Richard’s education. As in the Leopold/Wolfgang relationship, Franz’s upbringing and education affected Richard and the environment in which he grew up.

Franz had a harsh childhood. His father left the family when Franz was young, so his mother and two uncles raised him. One of his uncles, Johan Georg Walter, taught him to play multiple instruments, including all of the brass instruments. Because his family was destitute and he needed to help support them, Franz performed at a very young age and taught music lessons when he was only nine-years-old. According to William Melton’s record of his childhood, “He learned quickly, or he was punished.” In addition, he traveled with his uncles frequently to perform as a folk trio, and as a result, his general education was quite inconsistent.29

Like Wolfgang, Richard’s musical achievement overshadowed the compositions of his father, Franz. Although Franz composed, he made his living primarily as a performer, more specifically a horn player. As for his musical development, Franz’s performing and compositional preferences drifted to those of classical style, for instance the Mozart horn concertos. Franz was an avid admire of Mozart, and amongst his

29 Melton 21
orchestral duties, he specialized in performing as a soloist in Mozart’s concerti, as well as his own concerti.\textsuperscript{30} In fact, similarities between Mozart and Franz’s horn concerto compositions are audible. For example, in both composers’ works, melody is of utmost importance. It unifies the piece, as melodic motives and themes are constantly reoccurring and developing. Therefore, it is no wonder Franz believed in composing simple melodies, and advocated playing these melodies with exceptional tone. At the beginning of Richard’s career, Franz wrote to his son:

Please, my dear Richard, when you create something new, take care that it be melodic, not too difficult, and pianistic. I am more and more convinced that only melodic music makes a permanent impression both on musicians and laymen. Melody is the life-enhancing element of music\textsuperscript{31}

Later, in a letter from February 2, 1886, he writes:

The greatness of a work lies solely in its lofty simplicity. Think of the ancient Greeks! That is not to say one needs to imitate, but one needs to train one’s thoughts toward noble clear simplicity.\textsuperscript{32}

Franz’s admiration for Brahms, a composer and continuer of the First Viennese School (Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven), is also worth mentioning because as a musical “conservative,” Franz favored works in a classical or traditional style, which Brahms represented in the later part of the century. Hans Pizka (a horn professor and successor of Franz’s orchestral position in Munich) affirms, “his [Franz’s] musical creed consisted in adoration to the trinity. Mozart (first of all), Haydn and Beethoven. They were followed by Schubert, Weber, and Mendelssohn.”\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid 22
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid 29
Because Franz remained an active composer and performer throughout his son’s childhood, the environment in which Richard was raised consisted of his father’s conservative musical preferences. Classical-Romantic traditions took precedence in the Strauss household. In fact, Franz even forbade Richard from studying Richard Wagner’s progressive compositions. According to Schuh, Strauss himself wrote, “the fact that his father had brought him up strictly within the bounds of classical music until he was sixteen was the reason why in his old age his love and admiration for the classical composers had remained unclouded”\(^{34}\)

Not only did Franz’s musical tastes rub off on the young Richard, but his horn playing had an effect on his compositions as well. Richard became familiar with all the famous horn solos from his early childhood. Schuh suggests, “hearing his father play, and playing with him in their home provided the happiest conceivable complement to Richard’s study of theory and reading of scores”\(^{35}\) He often accompanied his father at the piano. Richard recalled in his book, *Erinnerungen an meinen Vater* (*Memories of my father*): “I learned good musicianship from him [Franz] by accompanying countless readings of the beautiful Mozart horn concerti and Beethoven’s horn sonata.”\(^{36}\)

Consequently, Richard wrote several horn compositions during his childhood. He dedicated many compositions to “my dear father,” including etudes in E-flat and E major (AV 12, 1837), the song *Das Alphorn* (AV 29, 1876), with an unplayable horn part

\(^{34}\) Schuh 36  
\(^{35}\) Ibid 38  
\(^{36}\) Melton 103
revised by Franz), *Introduktion, Thema und Variationen* in E-flat, and the piano version of his first horn concerto.\(^{37}\)

In comparison, Richard, like Wolfgang, began his education at a young age, continuing the trend from both of their fathers. Unlike Mozart, however, Franz was not his son’s sole teacher. At age four, Richard began piano lessons with a member of the court orchestra and two years later, he explored composing—“a Christmas carol and a polka were dutifully transcribed by his father.”\(^{38}\) Despite Richard’s anxiousness to attend a music conservatory, Franz insisted on a more well rounded education and a “broad humanistic grounding” at the Gymnasium.\(^{39}\) According to Franz himself, “then you are flexible and can choose from all possibilities. If your talent suffices, it will make itself known. Even a good musician has a hard life. It would be better to be a shoemaker or a tailor.”\(^{40}\) Franz’s opinion on receiving a well-rounded education most likely stemmed from the fact that he himself did not receive an education of this kind as a child.

Although Franz considered a well-rounded education to be of great importance, and had practical expectations for Richard’s future, he never discouraged his son’s pursuit of a career in music. Because Franz was not Richard’s sole teacher, he instead supervised Richard’s educational choices, thus maintaining a say in his son’s musical education. Richard began early instruction with conservative musicians such as Franz Lachner and Joseph Rheinberger; however, he studied theory later with the Munich court conductor, Friedrich Wilhelm Meyer, at age sixteen. Meyer taught him harmony, musical form, and instrumentation. He specifically emphasized the study of counterpoint and

\(^{37}\) Ibid 104  
\(^{38}\) Ibid 103  
\(^{39}\) Ibid  
\(^{40}\) Ibid
fugues.\textsuperscript{41} Although Meyer was an exceptional teacher, to Franz’s dismay, he admired Richard Wagner’s compositional style. Nevertheless, due to Meyer’s teaching expertise, Franz overlooked his compositional preferences.\textsuperscript{42} Despite Richard’s formal training outside the family, Franz continued to assist in Richard’s studies. For instance, it was common for Franz to copy the score and parts in Richard’s new compositions and often this help would not go without opinionated comments. When looking through one of his orchestral scores, Franz remarked, “you rascal! So you persist in writing for flute up to high B-flat? If Mozart and Beethoven could get along without the B-flat then you certainly can too!”\textsuperscript{43} Franz made sure to instill his anti-Wagnerian opinions into his son’s education simultaneously and he taught his son to adhere to the classical rules of theory and harmony.\textsuperscript{44}

In his earlier years, Richard studied art history and philosophy at Munich University. After a year, he left and composed his first Horn Concerto in E-flat Major, Op. 11 (1883). Particularly during the composition of this concerto, Richard remained loyal to his father’s musical tastes and principles. The piano reduction was dedicated to his father, although Franz still found it too difficult to play.\textsuperscript{45} Franz never did play the concerto in public, and his daughter recalls when he played it at home, with Richard accompanying, he complained about there being too many high notes.\textsuperscript{46} Instead, the piece

\textsuperscript{42} Melton 105
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid 23
\textsuperscript{45} “Horn Concerto No. 1 in E-flat Major,” nyphil.org, last modified January 2005, nyphil.org/programNotes/0405_Strauss_HornConcerto1.pdf.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid
was premiered in 1885 by Gustav Leinhos, the first chair horn player in the Meiningen Orchestra, led by Hans von Bülow.

Several months after the concerto was premiered, Richard traveled to Berlin where he secured a position as assistant conductor to Hans von Bülow. Bülow was an admirer and believer in Wagner’s compositional techniques; he premiered several of Wagner’s orchestral works. However, Richard’s compositions at the time remained loyal to his father, and his works still reflected Franz’s teachings, comparable to the techniques in his first horn concerto.

Richard’s interest in Wagner, Bruckner, and the “New German School” only grew around the turn of the century, but Franz’s pedagogical role in his upbringing is responsible for Richard’s remaining loyal to his classical predecessors. Richard later admitted to younger composers, “If you want to learn something, then get a hold of some symphonies and quartets by Mozart.” His father, who held Mozart to the highest regard, cultivated Richard’s strong respect for the traditions of the Viennese classicists.

Franz continued to control Richard’s non-musical decisions. Franz was certainly not afraid to speak his mind. For example, Richard had the opportunity to play in and eventually conduct the “Wilde Gung’l” orchestra, an amateur orchestra modeled after the Austrian composer Joseph Gung’l, who led a traveling orchestra that played light music, of which Franz Struass was a member. One orchestra member recollects:

Behind him sat his father. I can still remember how he followed his son’s every movement. No one who had seen them together could ever forget the tableau: the father, his heart brimming with pride; Richard’s exuberant temperament,

48 Melton 108
intentions far exceeding technique; his father’s subtle corrections, and if I may say so, tightly-reined restraint.49

Franz’s supervision does not exceed the involvement Leopold Mozart had in Wolfgang’s life. Leopold was far more engrossed in his son’s every move, as demonstrated by the various letters he wrote. To be fair, it seems that Wolfgang was much more in need of supervision throughout his adult life. Solomon writes, “Mozart largely lost the struggle to be regarded as something other than a child.”50 Leopold thought no differently, as Mozart scholar Edward J. Dent records, Leopold “was inwardly convinced that what really governed his son’s actions was a love of pleasure and dissipation, and that once set free from paternal discipline he would merely lead a life of self indulgence and extravagance.”51 Also, the entire Mozart family often depended on the income from Wolfgang’s compositions and performances. Richard, on the other hand, was a more independent individual, exposed to various musical and general education instructors, and free to explore them without sacrificing his family’s livelihood.

Like Leopold, Franz’s eagerness to control his son’s decisions stemmed from love and pride. Even in spite of the need of money in the Mozart family, Leopold genuinely cared for his son. Even Constance, Leopold’s resented daughter-in-law, placed her stamp of approval on Leopold’s role in his son’s life.52 Agnes Selby writes:

Letters between father and son revealed Leopold’s strict and unforgiving nature, but this failed to lessen Constance’s admiration for him as the man who grounded Wolfgang in the principles of musical composition.53

Both Leopold and Franz wanted to see their sons succeed.

---
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Part Two: Comparison of Two Concertos

The two concertos discussed in the next section, Wolfgang’s Violin Concerto, No. 1 in B-flat Major, and Richard’s Horn Concerto, No. 1 in E-flat Major, were chosen because each was the first concerto written by the composer for his respective father’s primary instrument. An analysis of the concertos, as well as works of Leopold and Franz will reveal similarities in compositional technique and suggest the extent of influence their fathers had in these works. The analysis will discuss the role of melody within the concertos, as well as the key, form, orchestration, and style. In addition, observations will show the unique qualities of Wolfgang and Richard’s compositional technique, which set them apart from their fathers.

Mozart’s Violin Concerto No. 1 in B-flat demonstrates the characteristics of an idiomatic violin solo written during the classical era. The solo’s melody, like many classical violin concertos, contains technical and virtuosic passages. The figuration in Wolfgang’s concerto part also displays some performance techniques found in the treatise, a standard guide for classical violinists who would be playing violin concertos, like Wolfgang’s concerto for instance. The technical requirements of the violin’s melodic lines shown below resemble the practical exercises and studies in Leopold’s treatise. For example, in Chapter 6.7 of the treatise, Leopold wrote a triplet exercise to practice the written bowings (Example 1). Triplet figures skipping by thirds can be found in the first movement of the violin concerto with similar bowings (Example 1a).
Example 1: Triplet exercise from Leopold Mozart, A Treatise on the
Fundamental Principles of Violin Playing, p. 107

Example 1a: W.A. Mozart, Violin Concerto in B-flat Major, K. 207, first
movement, mm. 151-153

In Chapter 4.39 of the treatise, Leopold demonstrates bow strokes in an exercise with a
pattern of repeated eighth notes (Example 2). In his exercises, Leopold also often writes
the second violin duet part with repeated eighth notes, supporting the melodic line, as
seen below. In movement II of the concerto, the orchestral first violin part also makes use
of repeated notes in support of the soloist’s melody (Example 2a).

Example 2: Bow stroke exercise from Leopold Mozart, A Treatise on the Fundamental
Principles of Violin Playing, p. 91
Example 2a: W.A. Mozart, Violin Concerto in B-flat Major, K. 207, first movement, mm. 22-26

The concerto also has technical similarities to Leopold’s violin duets. Example 3 shows an excerpt from duet No. 4. Leopold uses a pedal D with ornamental sixteenth notes moving above. Wolfgang writes something comparable in the second movement of his concerto, with a pedal E flat in the solo violin and ornamental sixteenth notes moving below the pedal (Example 3a).

Example 3: Leopold Mozart, Twelve Duets for Two Violins, No. 4, mm. 75-78

Example 3a: W.A. Mozart, Violin Concerto in B-flat Major, K. 207, second movement, mm. 16
The similarities between Wolfgang’s concertos and Leopold’s exercises suggest the possibility Leopold had an influence on his son’s compositional techniques in the violin concerto.

The melodic character of the violin concerto represents typical conventions of “Mozartean” style. The term “Mozartean” refers to stylistic characteristics associated with the music of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. Although these characteristics are qualities associated with Wolfgang’s compositions, he was not necessarily the first to compose in this style. In fact, many of Leopold’s compositions contain “Mozartean” techniques, even though they were written before the birth of his son. Some “Mozartean” traits include a playful and light melodic quality achieved through fast moving eighth or sixteenth notes, dotted rhythms, grace notes, and trills. These rhythms and ornaments contribute to various compositional techniques used in the violin concerto. For example, Wolfgang’s rhythmic profile in the violin concerto contributes to its light nature. There are a great deal of dotted rhythms, contributing to the “Mozartean” feel of the piece, as well as trills and grace notes. In other words, the dainty dotted eighth and sixteenth rhythms and ornamentation give rise to a light and bouncy style.

Another “Mozartean” characteristic of the melody, as a result of creating a light and playful sound, is the composition’s effortless quality. The effortless sound produced by Wolfgang’s compositional techniques, however, is not lacking in complexity. The concerto is technically challenging and contains virtuosic passages, which take training and practicing to perform well. To add an additional challenge for the soloist, the concerto is written in the key of B-flat, a more challenging key, in some respect, than his other four concertos. Conversely, the rest of his violin concertos are written in keys with
sharps in the key signature (i.e. D Major, A Major, and G Major). Most violinists prefer to think and play in sharp keys, rather than flats. This is because the open strings on the violin are E, A, D, and G, and all of the major scales starting on those notes have sharps in the key signature. However, Wolfgang chooses to write his very first violin concerto with a key signature of two flats. His reason is unknown. Possibly to achieve a specific tone due to the stopped strings used in the key of B-flat. Nevertheless, despite the key signature of the violin concerto, the solo violin is still expected to sound effortless.

Techniques used in the solo line are not the only methods Wolfgang uses to achieve his compositional character. Wolfgang’s orchestral writing also contributes to his composition’s playful, light quality. For instance in the violin concerto, running eighth notes of repeating pitches in the bass throughout the first movement give the movement a bouncy momentum and excitement. Another important compositional element, achieved largely through orchestral writing in a concerto, is contrast. Wolfgang often uses contrasting articulation and dynamics. In regards to articulation, he uses various combinations of slurs, legato marks, and staccato marks. As for dynamics, large sudden contrasts between forte and piano are demonstrated throughout the whole piece in both the solo and orchestral parts. This technique adds an element of surprise to the composition. In the first movement of the concerto, Wolfgang mixes both dynamic contrast and articulation contrast, achieving a playful exchange (Example 4).

However, while Wolfgang effectively uses the aforementioned techniques in his composition, they are not all necessarily unique to his writing. Through an analysis of Leopold’s compositions, similar techniques Wolfgang uses are apparent in his father’s works. One technique both father and son use is the driving bass line in the cello and
violoncello. This technique is visible in Leopold’s *Sinfonie in G (Lambacher Sinfonie).*

Also, Wolfgang alternates the entire orchestra between *piano* and *forte* dynamics in the violin concerto, continuing traditional composition practices of baroque sinfonias.

Leopold likewise alternates between *piano* and *forte* dynamics in his *Sinfonie in G* as well. He also uses a similar combination of articulation and dynamics in the Symphony (Example 4a).

Example 4: W.A. Mozart, Violin Concerto in B-flat Major, K. 207, first movement, mm. 1-10
Example 4a: Leopold Mozart, Symphony in G Major, first movement, mm. 28-36

Similarities between the orchestral timbre and texture Wolfgang and Leopold’s compositions further support the notion that Wolfgang’s orchestration is indebted to his father’s guidance. Both write with remarkable color. Wolfgang’s Concerto No. 1 in B-flat is modestly orchestrated. The score calls for violin I and II, viola, violoncello, bass, 2 horns and 2 oboes, in addition to the soloist, an orchestration typical of the early classical era. In the concerto, even at his young age, Wolfgang wrote effectively for these small
orchestral forces. Many times the oboes double the violin or viola parts, and they float gracefully above the orchestra, while the horn adds a rich color to the texture.

Leopold Mozart composed a comparable texture in his *Sinfonie in G* (*Lambacher Sinfonie*). In fact, Leopold writes for the exact same orchestration, minus the soloist. In this symphony, he also writes for strings, oboes, and horns. The oboes also frequently double and accentuate the upper strings, while the horns support the group with sustained notes above the double bass continuo-like part. His use of instrument color and texture, like Wolfgang, is very effective. Wolfgang’s orchestral writing shows a more advanced approach. For example, his writing for the horn and oboe parts is much more active and interesting. He also creates a thick texture by varying the violin I and II parts more than his father, who frequently wrote for violin I and II in unison.

Wolfgang’s compositional skills developed quickly and his works are unquestionably more familiar than his father’s compositions. Leopold’s role lay more in Mozart’s development than in composition. Wolfgang wrote over 600 compositions in his short lifetime. He was an extraordinary and unique young man, but part of his out-of-the-box thinking and composing is indebted to Leopold. Leopold also composed innovatively for his time. Leopold wrote a piece entitled *Jagdsinfonie* (“Hunter’s Symphony”), for four horns and strings. The piece also called for dogs and shotguns. *Bauernhochzeit* (“Farmer’s Wedding”) is similarly unique, written for the bagpipes, hurdy-gurdy, dulcimer, pistol shots, and whistles. Leopold was a creative thinker and composer as well. Yet, his avant-garde ideas did not catch on. Conversely, Wolfgang’s compositions became the norm and standard repertoire in the classical period. They have stood the test of time.
Like Mozart’s Violin Concerto, Richard Strauss’s Horn Concerto, written in 1882, is a standard example of the Romantic era. Richard’s Concerto is also reflective, in many ways, of his father’s works for the horn. One of the most noticeable aspects of both Richard and Franz’s compositions is the use of melody as a primary compositional technique. Melody was a distinct feature in all of Franz’s works. He advocated the value of a strong melody in Richard’s works as well. Like Franz, Richard uses melody to unify his horn concerto. The work is constructed compactly, as its three movements are fused into a single, fluid span, lasting only about 15 minutes. The opening fanfare in the horn (Example 5) recurs throughout the piece in the orchestra parts as well as the solo line. For example, the melody at the beginning of the third movement is a variation on the opening theme of the first movement (Example 5a). In the third movement, the theme comes back, even stronger the second time, to build up to the cadenza.

Example 5: Richard Strauss, Horn Concerto No. 1 in E-flat Major, Op. 11, first movement, mm. 1-5
Example 5a: Richard Strauss, Horn Concerto No. 1 in E-flat Major, Op. 11, third movement, mm. 472-488

Throughout the work, Richard’s melodies are memorable and singable. Even the slow melody in the contrasting second movement has a beautiful cantabile style. Franz’s melodic themes qualities. As a critic from Gramophone Archive puts it, Franz’s concerto “has a Brahmsian lusciousness of melody writing.” And it is no wonder, as Brahms was one of Franz’s idols. While Franz does include technical flourishes in his compositions, for example at the ends of each outer section in his Horn Concerto No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 8, the main focus is the showiness of beautiful tone through rich sing-able passages.

Some of Franz’s actual melodies and melodic shape can even be detected in Richard’s concerto. In the first movement, the horn opens Richard’s concerto with a bold fanfare in the introduction. After the rest of the orchestral exposition (22 measures of rest for the horn), in which the orchestra builds on that theme, the horn enters with a cantabile melody similar in phrasing and style to that of Franz’s Horn Concerto No. 1 in C Minor Op. 8. This can be referred to as the solo exposition. The primary theme of the solo

exposition of both Franz’s and Richard’s concerto are broken down into large parallel period with consistent four bar phrases. The melodic lines leading to the climax in each phrase are also alike (as seen in Examples 6 and 6a).

Example 6: Richard Strauss, Horn Concerto No. 1 in E-flat Major, Op.11, first movement, mm. 25-50
Example 6a: Franz Strauss, Horn Concerto No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 8, first movement, mm. 35-51

The melodic structure of Richard’s entire first movement shares similarities with Franz’s Horn Concerto, Op. 8. After an orchestral interlude, a new melody, the secondary theme, is introduced in both pieces. In both works, the movement moves from a legato melody to one with powerful accents and articulation. This new, more energetic secondary theme begins with the same rhythmic opening and a feeling of momentum.
leading to end of the movement, as shown below. The same technique can also be found in Franz’s *Nocturno*, Op. 7. After an *andante quasi adagio* opening, there is a build up to a *più animato e marcato* section. In all three of these pieces, the melodies flow smoothly, yet the composers create a sense of urgency and agitation. The three examples can be observed below.

Example 7: Richard Strauss, Horn Concerto No. 1 in E-flat Major, Op. 11, first movement, mm. 72-81
Example 7a: Franz Strauss, Horn Concerto No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 8, first movement, mm. 85-96


In reference to melody, Richard takes more compositional risks than his father.

For example, Richard writes a majestic cadenza in the third movement. Interrupting the
orchestra before the final 6/8 section, the exposed maestoso horn part explores a large range, bringing the horn down to an E3 on the instrument. Franz however, considered this too difficult, and although the piece was written for him, he did not play its premier. Another manifestation of Richard’s distinctiveness is in the second movement. He composes a gallant forte section with five sharps for the horn. Playing in the key of B is not an easy task for the horn, especially on the natural horn. While this key seems unrelated to the work’s tonic, one possibility is that Richard was trying to capture the heavenly sound of the concert key E major. Commonly understood by many composers, the sound of the E major has a bright quality that is often used to symbolize heaven in compositions. The combination of the key and the gallant melody in this section contributes to its triumphant sound. Despite the challenging key, Richard composed for a desired timbre, even though Franz often warned him not to write too difficultly. This soaring line is a testimony to Richard’s ability to write beautiful melodies for the horn, like his father.

Another unique aspect of Richard’s composition is his ability to achieve a “heroic” sound for the horn. This compositional quality can be attributed to his father because it is clear that Richard understood how to write for the horn and capture its essence. Richard writes with the horn’s history in mind. In brief, the valveless horn was originally an outdoor instrument used for hunting, and its sound symbolized strength and bravery. Growing up with a professional horn player, teacher, and composer as a father, it is no wonder Richard possessed an ear for the horn’s bold heroic quality. The opening fanfare in the concerto is an excellent example of the horn’s “heroic” character. The

---
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fanfare suggests a hunting call, typical of a functional hunting horn. The hunting horn was also a natural horn, a horn with no valves. Consequently, the hunting horn could only play open notes in the overtone series. The first three notes of the fanfare Richard writes imitates the valveless overtone series notes.

The key of the horn concerto (E-flat Major) also contributes to the heroic quality of this work. The key of E-flat was common for solo horn works in the 18th and 19th century. In fact, both of Richard Strauss’s horn concertos were written in this key. Later in his life, Richard even composed his tone poem, *Ein Heldenleben*, which translates to “*A Hero’s Life*,” also in the key of E-flat. In a letter dated 23 July, 1898 he writes, “Bowing to a pressing need, I am now composing a large tone poem entitled *Ein Heldenleben*…in E-flat and with lots of horns, as they are the standard for heroism.”

Strauss’s choice of key is not arbitrary. Not only does E-flat symbolize heroism, but the key has a distinct timbre, specifically on the historical Waldhorn (natural horn). The Waldhorn’s tone quality is more open in the key of E-flat. The tone color of the horn was full and rich in this key. For example, Brahms, who wrote extensively for the Waldhorn, wrote all four movements of his *Trio, Op. 40* in the key of E-flat. As a virtuoso horn player, Franz Strauss was well aware of the key’s suitedness to such effects as well. He begins his *Horn Concerto, Op. 8 in c minor* (the relative minor to E-flat Major) and then wrote a section in E-flat Major. His *Introduction, Theme and Variation, Op. 13* is in E-flat Major as well.

It is unclear whether Richard’s concerto was written for the Waldhorn though. According to New York Philharmonic horn player, Philip Meyers:

---
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The title page of Strauss’s horn concerto No. 1 calls the piece “Concert für das Waldhorn” (“Concerto for the Waldhorn”). Waldhorn—literally “forest horn,” suggesting its connection to the hunt—properly refers to a “natural horn.” A critical advance in horn manufacture occurred in the first half of the 19th century: the introduction of valves and thereby altering its chromatic possibilities with the flick of a finger. Despite the greater facility of the new valved horns, old-fashioned Waldhorns refused to go out of style, and some composers (Brahms among them) voiced an abiding preference for their atmospheric tones. It is a matter of dispute whether Strauss’s Concerto can be played on the Waldhorn with any degree of success or accuracy. I am unaware of a single performance or recording of this piece using the natural horn. Until that changes, I’ll cast my lot with the anti-Waldhorn camp and assume that Strauss was using the older term generically, simply to mean a horn in general.

Nevertheless, Waldhorn or not, the key of E-flat represented the heroic sound of the horn in Richard’s mind. The rich sounds he heard as a child held dear to his heart. Judging from the indication, “Concerto for the Waldhorn,” Richard desired the horn in his concerto to, at the least, emulate a horn in the forest—with a heroic and open sound.

While Franz wrote well in the key of E-flat for the horn’s heroic character, Richard takes his compositions a step further. Richard’s concerto evokes heroicism and boldness that push beyond the limits of his father’s composition. For instance, the introduction begins with an orchestral tutti tremolo and then the horn enters with a bold solo fanfare. As a convention, a listener would equate the fanfare to that of a hunting horn. The musically idiomatic fanfare begins the piece with an exciting energy. The orchestra repeats the last two notes of the horn’s opening, and the interplay between the two kicks off the introduction with vigorous conversation. On the contrary, in Franz’s Op. 8, the orchestra’s dotted rhythm and scoring is dainty and “Mozartean.” Overall, it is much more conservative than his son’s compositional technique.

Although Richard pushes the “limits” of the horn according to his father, his writing for orchestra can be considered quite modest in the horn concerto. The piece calls for pairs of flutes, oboes, clarinets, bassoons, horns, and trumpets, plus timpani and strings, in addition to the solo horn. This conventional orchestration is more similar to a typical “Mozartean” or classical concerto than some of Richard’s later works which explore larger orchestral options and colors like that of Wagner.

Also in regards to orchestral technique, Richard makes use of the interplay between the horn and solo woodwind instruments. Often Richard places a countermelody or a small melodic flourish in an oboe or flute. Franz Strauss creates a similar orchestral color. For instance in Franz’s Horn Concerto, Op. 8, nine measures after the key change in the third movement, a solo flute has an interesting counterpart interacting with the horn’s smooth line. Richard does something comparable. In his concerto, measure 34 of the second movement, the horn enters with a repeat of the entrance solo, but varied on the upbeat instead of the downbeat. Richard writes a prominent woodwind solo simultaneously, as it is more important than the solo line.

Unlike his father, Richard uses the orchestra’s color more creatively, interspersing more variations of melody and melodic themes than Franz. He often foreshadows themes as well (for instance, the third-movement cadenza appears in the orchestra before movement two), while Franz’s writing is more predictable for the orchestra. Richard’s more innovative use of the orchestra is comparable to Wolfgang’s more advanced orchestral writing than Leopold. Richard had an ear for the horn’s warm sonority among the orchestra. It is not only apparent in his horn concertos, but in his orchestral scores as
well, and it is possible his technique was developed through exposure to Franz’s orchestral horn playing and compositions.
Conclusion

Based on the aforementioned compositional and historical observations, two different outcomes of paternal influence are evident. The first outcome pertains to Leopold and Wolfgang’s relationship. Leopold reigned tighter over Wolfgang’s life decisions than he did in regards to his compositional influence. Leopold’s violin playing exerts less obvious influence on his son’s composition than Franz’s horn playing does on his son’s work. One potential reason for this could be that the repertoire possibilities for the violin were not as diverse in the 1700s compared to the horn’s repertoire in the 1800s. Research on this relationship is furthermore limited by the lack of proof that Leopold taught his son the violin using his treatise and the fact that no violin concerto by Leopold survives. As a result, it is more difficult to grasp an understanding of his impact on his son’s compositional techniques. However, considering Wolfgang’s pursuit of musical composition and success, Leopold’s musical background and knowledge was key. If Wolfgang had not grown up in a musical home, he may not have been so musically curious and encouraged.

Leopold also kept watch over Wolfgang’s musical appointments, performances, and his travel, contributing to his occupational success. Leopold instructed his son in both musical and non-musical subject matter and scheduled performances for Wolfgang at a young age. Throughout his life, Leopold advised Wolfgang in his social interactions and oversaw his relationships. Leopold occupies more of a business role in Wolfgang’s musical success.

In Richard’s case, though, we can document a more direct compositional influence from his father. It would seem that, because he was taught by a variety of
teachers, his compositional style would be dissimilar to his father’s, but, on the contrary, Richard’s earlier compositions were more similar to Franz’s style than some of the other new and innovative composing taking place throughout the country. It is clear that Richard’s compositional techniques were influenced by his father’s musical taste (in particular his anti-Wagnerian sentiment) and his horn playing.

In both cases, Wolfgang and Richard took their compositional abilities a step further than either of their fathers. Their compositions are more innovative than their fathers’ and they took more compositional risks. This is evident in that both Wolfgang and Richard became more known and accomplished than Leopold or Franz. Even so, we must not overlook the credit deserved by two fathers who supported and pushed their sons to be successful. Leopold Mozart and Franz Strauss are prime examples of the importance of a father and son’s relationship and its potential effect on musicianship and composition.
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