

The PRINCE LICHNOWSKY Newsletter

Anniversary Double Issue Nos. 3 & 4. . . .6 March 1992

Dedicated to the Memory of Constanze Weber Mozart
(who died on this date 150 years ago)

I.

The correspondence ledger of the *Hofkammer* in Vienna contains an entry dated 12 November 1791 that reads as follows:

"N: Ö: Court advises under the date of the 9th and recorded on the 12th of November 1791 that Prince Karl Lichnowsky in his case against *K.K.Hof Kappelmeister* Wolfgang Amade Mozart, owing to indebtedness of 1,435 Gulden 32 Kreuzer along with court costs of 24 Gulden, has shown cause for both attachment and withholding of the half of his salary."

This is the first fact.

The entry was discovered in late 1990 by Walther Brauneis of Vienna. It had been there for 200 years and overlooked all this time. The subject of the entry -- Prince Karl's suit to force payment of a debt and the court's ruling against Mozart -- was not previously known to or even suspected by Mozart biographical research. This is the second fact.

It is the thesis of this report that these two facts are related and must somehow be reconciled. Any attempt to interpret the meaning and significance of the first fact is incomplete without some consonant, plausible explanation for the second. Presumably there are other knowable facts related to both which, if known, would make the link between them understandable. That is the work of future research, and this report is offered as a contribution to that end.

Neither Prince Karl Lichnowsky nor Wolfgang Mozart were solitary persons, nor did they lead isolated lives. They were both sociable and gregarious, and they were members of a fairly small and circumscribed urban society. Although it was a society marked by deep social and financial divides between the classes, there were many points of mutual contact, particularly between the wealthy nobility with its passion for musical entertainment and the musicians who met the demand. The Mozarts and the Lichnowskys had many friends, acquaintances, and colleagues in common, a circumstance that did not end when Mozart died. And as in any closely woven society, gossip was often the order of the day, tales were told and stories made the rounds, as any reading of letters (such as Mozart's own) and journals from the times makes clear.

With this as background, this issue of the *Prince Lichnowsky Newsletter* is devoted to looking at some of the people in Vienna who could reasonably be expected to have learned of Fact One -- the Lichnowsky lawsuit and the judgment against Mozart -- and to considering them in relation to Fact Two -- the subsequent bare historical record.

II.

First, let us consider *the family of Wolfgang and Constanze Mozart*.

— — —

The last surviving letter of **Wolfgang Mozart** was written on Friday, 14 October 1791, 25 days before the notice of the *N:Ö: Landrecht* to the *Hofkammer* dated Wednesday, 9 November, and 28 days before the *Landrecht's* notice was logged in the *Hofkammer's* correspondence ledger on Saturday, 12 November. Some time on or after Tuesday, 15 November, Mozart entered the *Kleine freymauerer=kantate* (K623) in his *Verzeichnüss aller meiner Werke*. Apart from the Requiem's score, these are the last examples of Mozart's writing we have. It may be that by 15 November Mozart knew of the court's judgment against him, but that naturally would not have figured in making his *Verzeichnüss* entry. It is possible that references to the Lichnowsky lawsuit lie embedded in Mozart's clandestine remarks in his letters to Constanze in Baden regarding some "business" that was troubling him in June and July of 1791, and we will come back to this later on.

— — —

Constanze Mozart was the recipient of the only five surviving letters of the entire canon of Mozart family letters in which Prince Karl Lichnowsky is mentioned directly: those of 8, 10, 13, and 16 April 1789 and 23 May 1789, written during Mozart's trip to Berlin with Lichnowsky. (Mozart's letter of 23 May informs us that he had written Constanze eleven times between 8 April and 23 May; six letters which could also have mentioned Lichnowsky have been lost.) After Mozart died, Constanze's first letter is a petition to Emperor Leopold II for a compassionate pension; it is dated 11 December 1791 and was obviously drafted for her (and may even have been signed for her) by an unknown hand (van Swieten?). Not surprisingly, given its purpose, the petition emphasizes the new widow's "*höchst mißliche Lage*" -- her extremely precarious situation -- but it naturally does not name Lichnowsky or anyone else. Nor is the recent court judgment or Lichnowsky's name mentioned in the subsequent extensive exchange of memoranda in the *Hofkammer* that deals with Constanze's petition and leads to the granting of a small pension -- as shown in a review of these bureaucratic proceedings in the first *Prince Lichnowsky Newsletter*.

In the years ahead, Constanze would become a prolific letter writer, aided and abetted by Georg Nikolaus Nissen, as she negotiated with music publishers, responded to Mozart's growing band of admirers, sought to help Nissen in his preparation of a Mozart biography, and stayed in touch with her sons. Her letter writing activity reached one peak at the turn of the century; of some 34 letters written in 1799, 23 survive; from the year 1800, 32 out of 34 letters have been preserved. Her last known letter is dated 14 October 1841 and was written five months before her death in March 1842. In 50 years of correspondence after Mozart's death, Constanze made no known direct reference to Prince Karl Lichnowsky.

— — —

When Mozart died, **Sophie Weber Haibel** was 28 years old, unmarried and living with her widowed mother in a Vienna suburb near Schikaneder's theater. She and her next older sister, Constanze, were close; later, after her husband and George Nissen had both died in 1826, she would go to live out her life with Constanze in Salzburg. After the court official had knocked on the door of the Rauhensteingasse apartment and obtained Mozart's or Constanze's signature for the registered letter notifying them of the court's judgment in the Lichnowsky suit (if that is in fact what happened), sister Sophie almost certainly was one of the first to hear Constanze's outbursts of exasperation and rage -- at Lichnowsky, at the world, perhaps at Mozart too -- over the shame of it all and over the loss of half of Mozart's annual salary. It is hard to imagine how it could have been otherwise between the two sisters, especially when only some days later Mozart took to his bed ill and Sophie was pressed into service, helping Constanze with the nursing. Sophie Haibel went on to earn her place in Mozart history by writing a lengthy letter in 1825 at Nissen's request in which she recounts the circumstances of Mozart's last days and his death as she, 34 years later, recalled them, remarks that she would amplify somewhat when she was interviewed in Salzburg in 1829 by Mary and Vincent Novello.

Now that we are able to read to read Sophie's 1825 letter with knowledge of the Lichnowsky suit and the court's judgment in mind, one goes back through the original German text, line by line, knowing there will be no direct mention of Lichnowsky or the lawsuit and its outcome, but hoping to find a phrase, a word even, that will suggest -- in hindsight -- a hint, a last, lingering echo of the turmoil wrought by that registered letter (if there was one) only days before Mozart died. In vain. We learn of the nightgown made so Mozart could put it on from the front, of the omen of the dying candle, of the taste of death on Mozart's tongue, of Süßmyer and the score of the Requiem on the bed, of Mozart's instruction to Constanze to keep his death a secret until Albrechtsberger had been informed, of Constanze's frantic despair. But if in fact the court's judgment hit the little family in the Rauhensteingasse like a thunderclap and hastened the demise of the *Hausherr*, not the slightest vibration remained in the memory of Sophie Haibel when she wrote her letter 34 years later.

— — —

Constanze's two older sisters, **Josepha Hofer** and **Aloisia Lange**, both living with their husbands in Vienna, do not figure significantly in the documentation of Mozart's last days. In her 1825 letter, Sophie Haibel mentions that, at one point while helping to take care of Mozart (the chronology is unclear), she went to spend the night at the Hofers. Of course, Josepha and Aloisia were both active professional singers -- Josepha was then singing in the opening run of *Die Zauberflöte* -- with families to attend as well. There can be no doubt that Franz and Josepha Hofer and Joseph and Aloisia Lange were well informed about what was going on in the Rauhensteingasse. If an unsigned obituary published in 1827 for Benedikt Schack (who had died in December 1826) can be believed, **Franz Hofer** was one of the quartet -- Schack himself, Mozart, and Franz Xaver Gerl, the other three -- who rehearsed the still uncompleted Requiem at Mozart's bedside the day before he died. The Hofers and the Langes almost certainly were in the procession that walked with Mozart's casket from the Rauhensteingasse to St. Stephen's for the consecration prior to burial.

In 1808, **Joseph Lange** published his memoirs on his life as an actor and touched on his remembrances of his brother-in-law, Wolfgang Mozart. There is, of course, nothing in them having to do with a lawsuit by Prince Lichnowsky against Mozart. But the Langes and the Hofers are important to our considerations in another way: they are the conduit by which knowledge of the court's judgment against Mozart would have passed out of the family circle to the dozens of persons who made up the companies of the Theater auf der Wieden and the Burgtheater. In addition to Josepha Hofer as the first Queen of the Night, Benedikt Schack was the first Tamino and his wife, one of The Three Damsels; Franz Xaver Gerl was the first Sarastro and his wife, the first Papagena; and presiding over the troupe and playing Papageno was the man who wrote the book Mozart had set to music, Emanuel Schikaneder. Schikaneder and his fellow theater-director, Joseph von Bauerfeld, later paid for the requiem mass for Mozart held at St. Michael's church in Vienna on 10 December 1791, when the first performance of the then completed portions of the composer's Requiem apparently took place.

— — —

Consider now the case of Maria Anna Reichsfreiin von Berchtold zu Sonnenburg, in a word, Mozart's sister, **Nannerl**. She was living in St. Gilgen on the Wolfgangsee when Mozart died and had been since her marriage in 1784; after her husband died in 1801, she returned to Salzburg and lived there until her death in 1829. Mozart stayed in touch with his sister primarily through his letters to his father in Salzburg, who would pass on news of Mozart's doings in his frequent letters to Nannerl. After Leopold Mozart died in May 1787, there is a series of brief letters to Nannerl from her brother, mostly concerned with the settlement of Leopold's estate and with regaining possession of the scores that Mozart had sent his father over the years. So far as we know, Mozart's last letter to Nannerl was written in August 1788 (the last time they had seen one another was in October 1783 in Salzburg). While in St. Gilgen, Nannerl stayed in touch with friends in Salzburg still active in the music scene surrounding the Archbishop's court and, through them, she appears to have been kept informed about her brother and his wife in Vienna.

Some time in early 1792, perhaps March, Nannerl received a list of questions about the life of the recently deceased Mozart. The list had been sent by the young German academic Friedrich Schlichtegroll to a friend of hers in Salzburg, who then forwarded them to St. Gilgen. Schlichtegroll was pursuing a hobby that would result in his writing obituaries of several prominent composers, such as J.C.F. Bach and Georg Benda as well as Mozart. With two things at hand, the questions from Schlichtegroll and her trove of family letters and documents going back some forty years, Nannerl set about preparing a response, one that runs some 417 lines as printed in the Mozarteum collection of Mozart family letters. The response is undated but appears to have been completed in late April or early May 1792.

In this lengthy letter, Nannerl provides details of Mozart's life from birth on, through to his journey from Munich to Vienna in March 1781 at Archbishop Colloredo's command. "As for his life after that," she writes, "you will have to make inquiries in Vienna. . . ." But then she adds: "According to information received from Vienna, he died on 5 December 1791 of an acute miliary fever." And there is a note in the margin: "At 55 minutes after midnight" (this being the

sole source in Mozart biographical literature for such a precise indication of the time of Mozart's death). Nannerl would later write (in a 4 August 1799 letter) that she had had it "on good authority and from an eyewitness that at [Mozart's] apartment [in Vienna] his scores were forever just lying around under the piano."

Obviously people talk and the word gets around, even from Vienna to St. Gilgen, in just a few weeks' time. There is no reason to think that if the other Mozart relatives and their friends had known about Lichnowsky and the lawsuit, Nannerl would not, in time, have learned of it too.

There is a break of seven years in the correspondence record relating to Nannerl after the letters written in response to Schlichtegroll in 1792. In 1799, a series of 43 letters to the music publishers Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig begins, having to do chiefly with the publishers' interest in obtaining access to the music of the increasingly popular Mozart. The series to B&H ends in 1807. In addition, there are a few other letters to other people interested in her brother, the last one in September 1824 (and signed, by the way, jointly with Constanze and Nissen). In these later letters, Nannerl touches occasionally on biographical details concerning Mozart; not one of them makes any reference to Prince Lichnowsky or a lawsuit.

-- -- --

Mozart's sons -- **Carl Thomas** and **Franz Xaver Wolfgang** -- are mentioned here to call attention to the fact that, even though the one was only seven years old and the other not yet five months when their father died, there exists some 30 letters between them and their mother (and her second husband, Nissen) and various other recipients extending into the latter half of the 19th century. The letters touch occasionally on financial matters and in one of the, from Constanze and Nissen to Carl Thomas, written in June 1810, she reminds her son that ". . .you knows your esteemed father left no fortune behind, only debts and some inconsequential personal effects. . ." There appears to be no reason why the sons should not have heard, at one time or another, about the fact of the Prince Lichnowsky suit; none of the extant letters contains any mention of it.

-- -- --

Is there no end to the litany of "no mention of Lichnowsky" in this review of the written record of Mozart family members after 5 December 1791? As a matter of fact, there is. Prince Karl Lichnowsky is mentioned by name four times and referred to once as "*Jemanden* = somebody" (in an inept effort apparently intended to disguise who was meant) in the biography of Mozart initiated and largely prepared by **Georg Nikolaus Nissen**. As Constanze's second husband and the step-father to Mozart's two sons, Nissen qualifies here as a member of the family.

Constanze and Nissen had married in 1809. They moved to Denmark in 1810 and then to Salzburg in 1820 after he retired. Around 1823, influenced by what writers had recently prepared on Joseph Haydn, Nissen began to gather materials and seek out remembrances for a biography of Mozart. At his disposal were bundles of letters written largely by Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart and

meticulously tucked away over the years, including those saved by Nannerl together with the notes she had made for her response to Schlichtegroll. Nissen wrote to former members of the Mozart circle, asking for copies of letters, anecdotes, anything that persons who had known Mozart (as he had not) could contribute. And helping him throughout his efforts was the chief source of information on Mozart, at least the Mozart of the last ten, Vienna years -- Constanze Mozart. She too wrote letters in quest of materials for Nissen. And when Nissen died unexpectedly in March 1826 in the midst of his work on the biography, she pulled the threads together and made the arrangements for a certain Dr. Feuerstein from the Dresden area to finish it. Nissen's biography with its five mentions of Prince Karl Lichnowsky was first published in the fall of 1828.

Question: how is this man who sued Mozart and secured a judgment against him in November 1791 treated in a Mozart biography prepared by Constanze Mozart and her second husband some 35 years later? Answer: for the most part, quite straightforwardly. We first encounter Lichnowsky on page 526 (of the Georg Olms Verlag 1991 edition). Beginning a new section, the first paragraph opens with: "In April 1789, Mozart made a trip through Prague and on to Berlin by way of Leipzig and Dresden with his student, Prince Lichnowsky, who had offered him a place in his coach all the way to Berlin. This trip lasted until the 4th of June, when he returned to his loved ones in Vienna." This leads immediately into an excerpt from Mozart's 10 April letter to Constanze from Prague, an excerpt that has nothing to do with Lichnowsky. The narrative then takes up various anecdotes drawn from Rochlitz and having to do with the Berlin visit before it returns, seven pages later, to reintroduce the already stated fact that Mozart had made a trip to Berlin with Prince Lichnowsky. Then comes an excerpt from Mozart's letter of 23 May from Berlin which includes the following paraphrase of what Mozart had actually written: ". . . Lichnowsky had to leave in a hurry and so I had to provide for myself in expensive Potsdam; and I lent a hundred Gulden to somebody I couldn't refuse. And on top of that, the concert in Leipzig was a failure, as I said it would be all along. But Lichnowsky had pestered me about it so, I simply had to go there. . ." And that is the last we hear of Lichnowsky in the Nissen biography.

In those later pages devoted to Mozart's last days and his death -- the pages chronologically related to the November 1791 judgment of the Lower Austrian court -- there is no mention of Lichnowsky or of a lawsuit against Mozart at all. One P L Newsletter correspondent has suggested that this is not surprising, because "it is well known that Constanze attempted to conceal blemishes in Mozart's character." But the matter is not that simple. No doubt Constanze was disposed to be defensive, and Nissen too, but this did not take the form of just blanking out any and all remarks that might be construed as unflattering to Mozart. If, for example, an extended quotation from an essay praising Mozart's musical accomplishments contained critical comments on his lifestyle, these critical comments were included in the biography too.

There are perhaps two ways to think about the Lichnowsky lawsuit in relation to the Nissen biography. On the one hand, why should Nissen (and Constanze) want to give any publicity to this distasteful episode, and so no mention was made of it. On the other hand, if they had regarded the fact of the lawsuit as widely known, then they might have felt impelled to present Mozart's side of the matter and provided comments intended to exculpate him. Obviously they did not do so and, for whatever reason, there are no references to Prince

Karl Lichnowsky (who had died 14 years before the biography was published) other than the five made in connection with the 1789 Berlin trip.

III.

Here, we start with **the Lichnowsky family** and then turn to their links with society and the musical world of Vienna in the years before and after the death of Mozart.

— — —

Although **Prince Karl Lichnowsky** was a Viennese from birth (on 21 June 1761) to death (14 April 1814), he came from a family with its roots in Silesia, on the border between what was then Austria and Prussia. The family's elevation into the ranks of the nobility and ultimately to that of Prince (Karl's father in 1773) came about through the Prussian court and not that of the Habsburgs. Karl's mother -- "Princess Lignosky" (as Mozart spelled it in his letter of 20 March 1784 to his father, listing the subscribers to his concert series) -- was sixteen years old when she married the then Count Johann Karl Lichnowsky in May 1757; she died in Vienna in 1800. Prince Karl had a younger brother, **Count Moritz Lichnowsky** (1771-1837), and a sister, **Countess Henriette** (birthdate unknown; died "about 1830"). Alexander Wheelock Thayer's biography of Beethoven (which in its revised edition by Elliot Forbes is a main source for much of what is given here) notes the important role that all three Lichnowsky offspring played in Vienna's music life and the fact that their close relationship to Beethoven would result in his dedicating compositions to all three of them.

But the connection that reaches from Wolfgang Mozart to Prince Karl Lichnowsky does not stop with his brother and sister. In 1789, not long after he had taken Mozart with him on the trip to Leipzig and Berlin, Prince Karl married into the family of the **Thun-Hohenstein**, his wife **Maria Christiane** being one of the "three graces" of **Countess Maria Wilhelmine Thun**. Countess Thun was born in Vienna in 1744 and died there in 1800; her son, **Count Joseph Thun-Hohenstein** (1767-1810), was a Masonic lodge brother of Mozart. Countess Thun was famous for her musical soirées which even Emperor Joseph II would attend. She was also one of the subscribers listed in Mozart's 20 March 1784 letter. Her hospitality and friendship had been important to Mozart in the first months and years after making the break with Salzburg and venturing forth on his own in Vienna.

And Maria Christiane was not the only one of the three beautiful Thun-Hohenstein maidens to marry into the music-patronizing nobility. Her older sister, **Elizabeth**, had married **Count Andreas Kyrillovitch Razumovsky** in 1788. The Count's familiarity with Mozart is attested to by a letter he wrote in September 1791, bringing Mozart's name to the attention of Prince Potemkin in Russia as someone who might be disposed to go there. Early in 1792, Razumovsky was named Ambassador of the Tsar to the Viennese court and served in this capacity for twenty years. Like the Lichnowskys and the Thuns, Razumovsky was both a patron of music and himself a performer of some talent.

— — —

With the exception of Karl's father, the first Prince Lichnowsky, who had died in 1788, all of the members of the Lichnowsky-Thun-Razumovsky families mentioned above were alive when the court's judgment was pronounced in November 1791 and most of them were living in Vienna at the time. The reputation they enjoy in music history as patrons had had its beginnings in connection with Mozart and it would grow with their deep involvement over many years with **Ludwig van Beethoven**. Prince Lichnowsky took Beethoven to live at his palais in Vienna not long after the composer arrived in Vienna in late 1792, and he remained at the Lichnowskys until May 1795. The Lichnowskys, Countess Thun, and Count Razumovsky were all among the subscribers for copies of Beethoven's Opus 1, three trios for piano, violin, and violoncello, dedicated to Prince Karl and published by Artaria in 1795. The Lichnowsky connection with Beethoven evidently continued through Prince Karl's death in 1814 and beyond. Thayer notes that as late as 1823 Count Moritz Lichnowsky was "among the friends who were offering Beethoven advice in the handling of his affairs." (The suggestion that Prince Karl Lichnowsky and Beethoven had come to an irreparable parting of the ways in 1806 over an altercation at the Prince's summer place in Silesia receives no support in Thayer, who treats the incident as a passing storm.)

I dwell on the closeness and the continuity of the Lichnowsky-Thun-Razumovsky link with Beethoven to illustrate that Beethoven, from 1792 on practically to the end of his life, had had ample opportunity in informal, unguarded discourse to have learned that Prince Karl had at one time sued Wolfgang Mozart for not paying back money owed him. Like Mozart earlier, Beethoven too had made a trip to Prague with Prince Lichnowsky and, like Mozart, he too had found himself lending money to Lichnowsky. At least that is the import of a letter Beethoven wrote from Prague to his brother in Vienna on 19 February 1796, saying ". . . P. Linowski will probably soon return to Vienna; he has already gone from here. If you need money you may go to him boldly, for he still owes me some." Preoccupation with financial matters was a subject that came to take more and more space in Beethoven's correspondence and in the Conversation Books by which his associates communicated with the increasingly deaf composer. In short, there were sufficient occasions over the years for Beethoven to comment on the fact that Mozart had suffered legal difficulties at the hands of their mutual patron, if he had known about it.

There is another angle to the Lichnowsky-Beethoven relationship that merits mention in our considerations. As the mantle of Mozart settled more and more on the younger man, Beethoven was drawn into the musical and opera worlds that Mozart had once inhabited. And there were numerous Viennese musicians whose professional lives brought them into contact with Beethoven as they had with Mozart. Two obvious names in this regard would be **Johann Georg Albrechtsberger** and **Antonio Salieri**. It was Albrechtsberger (1736-1809) who took over Mozart's post at St. Stephen's in 1792. In 1794 and early 1795, while living at the Lichnowsky palais, the young Beethoven devoted several months to the study of counterpoint under Albrechtsberger's instruction. In this period, Beethoven also had lessons in composition from Salieri (1750-1825), an essentially informal arrangement that lasted over many years. Beethoven's Opus 12, a set of three violin sonatas, is dedicated to Salieri. Although both musicians outlived Mozart by many years, remaining in Vienna all the while, nothing is known from either the writings of Albrechtsberger and

Salieri or subsequent biographical works on them of anything indicating that they were aware of a Lichnowsky lawsuit against Mozart in 1791.

— — —

Looking out at the society of greater and lesser nobility surround the Lichnowskys, let me offer four examples that help to illustrate the extent of the web of relationship linking Mozart and Lichnowsky with their contemporaries in the years before and -- especially -- after Mozart's death. These names too are taken from that list of subscribers to the concert series in the Trattnersaal appearing in Mozart's 1784 letter mentioned above:

Baron Gottfried Bernhard **van Swieten** (1733-1803); diplomat; devoted to the cultivation of older music. Founder of an association to promote the performance of oratorios by Handel and Bach. (Other association members included the Princes Esterhazy, Schwarzenberg, and Kinsky, and the Counts Czernin, Harrach, and Zinzendorf.) In the years 1788/90, van Swieten engaged Mozart to make arrangements of Handel oratorios and lead their presentation by the association. Van Swieten took care of Constanze and the family when Mozart died; arranged a performance of the Requiem in 1793 as a benefit for Constanze. Befriended Beethoven when he first came to Vienna; his Symphony No. 1 in C, Opus 20 is dedicated to van Swieten.

Prince Johann Adam **von Auersperg** (1721-1795); maintained his own private orchestra and theater, where Mozart led a performance of *Idomeneo* revised for the occasion on 13 March 1786. A member of van Swieten's association for oratorio performance. (There were in fact five members of the Auersperg clan on Mozart's list of subscribers.)

Countess Maria Carolina **Apponyi** (1756-1825); her husband, Count Anton Georg Apponyi (1751-1817) was an active Mason and a member of van Swieten's association; Joseph Haydn dedicated quartets to him. Thayer writes that, once when they were together at Prince Lichnowsky's, Count Apponyi invited Beethoven to compose a quartet for him.

Count Karl **Zinzendorf** (1737-1813) was a widely travelled court official, a member of van Swieten's association, but first and foremost an indefatigable diarist (some 60 volumes are preserved) of life and times in imperial Vienna. The entries touching on Mozart and his compositions alone span 42 years (from October 1762 to April 1804, in the O.E. Deutsch collection of documents relating to Mozart).

If we take the years 1790-1792 as most relevant to our investigations, the record shows that in 1790, there are three entries in the diaries which relate to Mozart (the Count had been to see *Figaro* and *Cosi*). In 1791, there are four (having to do with *Tito*, *Entführung*, and *Zauberflöte*); the last of these is on 6 November 1791. (There are two other 1791 entries to be found in the Mozart literature, from 5 and 6 December, but these do not in fact mention Mozart; they are the Count's habitual observations of the weather and have entered the Mozart canon because of their connection to the controversy over whether the consecration of Mozart's body took place on 6 or 7 December.) In the next

year, 1792, there are no Mozart-related entries. The series resumes in 1793 with three entries, the first coming in January when Zinzendorf makes note that pressing social obligations had forced him to miss van Swieten's benefit presentation of the Requiem for Constanze. (We learn, by the way, that Constanze paid a call on Count Zinzendorf on 30 March 1795 to invite him to attend the concert performance of *Tito* that she was sponsoring the next day, which he did.) So far as I am aware, the pages of this chronicler of society life in Vienna throughout the last decades of the 18th century and into the 19th contain no mention that could be construed as suggesting Prince Lichnowsky's lawsuit against the composer of all those operas that the Count had been to see ever came to his attention. If it is there, it has not surfaced yet.

— — —

Finally, a brief note of one other link between Mozart, the Lichnowskys, and their social, cultural, and professional milieu: **the Masons**. Mozart became a member of Viennese Freemasonry in December 1784. At the time, one of his lodge brothers was Prince Karl Lichnowsky. In the reconstitution of the lodges in Vienna following the Emperor's ukase of December 1785, Lichnowsky ended up in one lodge, Mozart in another. But even there the Mozart-Lichnowsky tie was to continue. From 1789 until the lodge was dissolved in 1793, Count Joseph Thun-Hohenstein, Lichnowsky's brother-in-law, was a member of Mozart's lodge. Tradition has it that Mozart conducted his new "*Kleine freymaurer=kantate*" at the dedication of the new premises of his lodge on Friday, 18 November 1791. This would have been nine days after the Lower Austrian Court had communicated its adverse judgment to the *Hofkammer*. If Mozart knew about the judgment at this time, would he have mentioned it to the brothers gathered for the dedication? Or could some of them already have known about it (Count Joseph Thun, for example) and brought the subject up? And if not then, then in the talk among the brothers in the weeks and months after the unexpected death of Brother Wolfgang, whose passing was formally observed with a memorial speech at a meeting of the lodge in April 1792?

The literature on Mozart and the Masons is extensive and I am familiar with only a fraction of it. Nowhere have I found any mention of Brother Karl's lawsuit against Brother Wolfgang. Philippe A. Autexier's survey of Mozart and Freemasonry in "The Mozart Compendium," edited by a prominent student of Mozart and the Craft, H.C. Robbins Landon, and published in 1990, mentions Lichnowsky only in connection with his having belonged to Mozart's lodge in 1784. In Paul Nettl's study, "*Musik und Freimaurerei: Mozart und die Königliche Kunst*," published some fifty years ago, the name of Prince Karl Lichnowsky does not even appear.

IV.

Some working concept of the nature and extent of the interrelations that existed between the Mozarts, the Lichnowskys, and their respective circles of friends and associates in the decades from roughly 1780 to 1830 is necessary for considering how it could happen that neither Lichnowsky's lawsuit nor the court's ruling against Mozart ever entered the written record drawn upon by biographers of Mozart (and others) for the last 200 years. Every effort to understand how Mozart and Lichnowsky might have experienced the court's decision in November

1791 and reacted to it must ultimately deal with its (apparently) immediate and total disappearance from the historical record until 1990.

What follows is an effort to lay out a range of possibilities for further analysis of these two interlocked issues: the fact of the Lichnowsky legal action and the court decision against Mozart, and the fact of its absence from the written record.

Possibility No. 1: The entry in the *Hofkammer* correspondence ledger is a forgery, a hoax. There was no Lichnowsky lawsuit and there was no judgment against Mozart.

Comment: This neatly takes care of why the matter was never heard of before late 1990. It is exceedingly unlikely, however, that Walther Brauneis and his co-workers at the *Hofkammer* archives would let themselves be duped by such a forgery; the ledger entry as reproduced with the Brauneis article in the *Mitteilungen* appears genuine. Conclusion: we can rule this Possibility out. The ledger entry is valid and the issues remain.

Possibility No. 2: Lichnowsky institutes his lawsuit and the court proceedings take place -- without publicity. The court reaches its judgment on or before 9 November 1791. Because the ruling foresees impoundment of wages, the court notifies the *Hofkammer* which administers Mozart's salary. For a reason not know, there is no further communication of the judgment to either Mozart or Lichnowsky, and neither they nor their families and friends ever learn of it.

Comment: Common to this and the remaining Possibilities is the assumption that Lichnowsky could have brought his suit against Mozart and the proceedings of the court could have taken place without the matter becoming public in this phase (whether the assumption is tenable is something I presume could be tested against historical accounts of Viennese legal practices in K.u.K. times.) The assumption granted, then this Possibility would tend to account for the hole in the historical record. For a reason why the court's judgment might not have been communicated, see Possibility No. 3. Although there is no evidence, direct or indirect, that Lichnowsky and Mozart were notified on the court's judgment, it would seem likely that they were (or put another way, it would seem unlikely that they were not).

Possibility No. 3: Let us sketch this one out in some greater detail:

--At some point, say, the end of 1789 or early 1790, Mozart signs a note borrowing money (1,000 or 1,250 fl.?) from Lichnowsky, to be paid back in twelve months.

--The due date passes with no action by Mozart to pay off the note.

--Early in 1791, Lichnowsky brings suit in the Lower Austrian Court to force payment.

--Court hearings on the matter begin in late spring or early summer. Mozart now takes strenuous efforts to make arrangements to pay off the debt. (Could this be what lies behind Mozart's reference to "my business"

and to "bringing my affairs in order" as well as to Baron Wetzlar and Goldhahn in his letters of June/July 1791?)

--In July or so, Mozart succeeds in his efforts and reaches an accommodation with Lichnowsky. (On 9 July, he had written Constanze that "in a couple days, the business must be over. Z [= Wetzlar?] has given me his solemn and serious promise of that." And that is the last we ever hear of some troubling, unfinished "business" in the extant letters of Mozart written before he died six months later.)

--The legal proceedings are dormant at this point because of summer recess. They resume in the fall and end in early November, when the court rules as reflected in its 9 November notification to the *Hofkammer*. Lichnowsky and Mozart are routinely notified although the matter is now passé so far as they are concerned.

Comment: This Possibility seems more likely than the one where the judgment is not further communicated, but both require some sort of *deus ex machina*, such as a prior settlement between plaintiff and defendant. Does this exist in the references to his "business" in Mozart's letters of June/July 1791? (Some sort of prior settlement could account for why the action levied in the court's judgment -- impoundment of wages amounting to 1,435 Gulden -- does not appear in the debts listed against Mozart's estate, and also why Count Starhemberg and the *Hofkammer* officials could totally ignore the financial implications of the court's decision as they considered their recommendation to the Emperor on Constanze's petition for a pension (see *PL Newsletter No. 1*.) This Possibility essentially turns the lawsuit and the court's judgment into a non-event so far as the principals are concerned and thus helps to account for the absence of Fact One from the historical record.

(This scenario envisions Mozart floating a loan from Lichnowsky, and not losing a thousand Gulden or so to him by gambling. The reason for this choice is partly because I have the impression that gaming debts in imperial Vienna were not justiciable, but I do not know this for a fact. For the analysis here, the question of how Mozart came to owe Lichnowsky money is a lesser consideration.)

Possibility No. 4: This is essentially the one that Brauneis and others have raised up to now:

--Mozart borrows money from Lichnowsky, signing a note with a promise to repay the debt at some future date.

--The repayment date passes with no action by Mozart.

--Lichnowsky institutes his suit in the Lower Austrian Count and judicial proceedings occur.

--The court reaches its judgment in November 1791 and Lichnowsky and Mozart are duly informed.

--For Lichnowsky, the outcome is of no particular importance (he does not need the money; the case won and his point made, he is not inclined to push it; besides, Mozart takes sick and dies only days later). Because his legal and financial matters are not things he normally discusses with his wife or others, only his administrator is privy to what has transpired -- and he does not talk out of school.

--For Mozart and Constanze, on the other hand, the outcome is staggering. The fact of being sued for indebtedness by a Prince is bad enough, but losing the suit and with it half of Mozart's salary for almost the next two years makes the matter a social and financial catastrophe of such proportions that the only way to deal with it is to hide it as completely as possible -- from Sophie and the other sisters and their husbands, from van Swieten, from Puchberg, from everybody, and they do. After Mozart dies, Constanze not only keeps the secret but she carefully never even alludes to it in any way that raises suspicion in almost fifty subsequent years of correspondence and collaboration on Mozart biographical works.

Comment: This Possibility seems plausible down to the point where it begins to grope for reasons why -- if this is what happened and how it was perceived, especially by the Mozarts -- the other family members and friends and associates of the two principals did not also, in time, learn of the matter. Having won his suit, what would keep Lichnowsky from mentioning it in his circle, to Prince Auersperg or Count Apponyi, for example, and what would keep them from casually passing it on to others? Or would Lichnowsky have been so satisfied with the outcome but so indifferent to its practical effect on his life that he promptly forgot about it? As for the Mozarts successfully hiding such a traumatic development, that is certainly possible but it strikes me as unlikely. It seems to me that there is a discontinuity between an interpretation that the lawsuit and the judgment were an overwhelming event in Mozart's life, one even implicated in his early and unexpected demise, and the fact that it went unknown and unsuspected for 200 years.

Possibility No. 5: As before, with Occam's razor:

--Lichnowsky brings his lawsuit, judicial proceedings take place, in early November the judgment against Mozart is made, and Lichnowsky, Mozart, and the *Hofkammer* are all notified.

--The reactions of Lichnowsky and Mozart (and Constanze) Constanze are as described in Possibility No. 4, with this difference: neither family makes any particular effort to cover up the fact of the lawsuit or the court's decision. Family members and friends hear about it and, as scandal will, knowledge of what happened between Lichnowsky and Mozart makes its way among their acquaintances and beyond.

Comment: This is the simplest description of what might have happened. The problem lies in explaining then how such a socially interesting event (lawsuits by Princes against prominent opera composers were not an everyday occurrence in imperial Vienna) simply disappeared from the written record, any written record, and was never picked up and recorded in the myriad letters, diaries, newspapers, and biographical and autobiographical works from which we

ultimately have come to draw our knowledge of Wolfgang Mozart, especially in the last Vienna years.

Perhaps there is an answer to this that lies in the nature of Viennese society under the Habsburgs. Could it turn on the fact that the plaintiff was Prince Karl Lichnowsky? Some comments.

Perhaps the very fact that a Prince had initiated the court action and won led to caution and self-censorship on the part of all concerned, particularly in the months and years immediately following the judgment (and Mozart's death). Then, with time (the argument would go), the event was simply forgotten.

--In 1798, Franz Xaver Niemetschek (1766-1849) published the first Mozart biography of any significance. Commenting on it a year later, he said that Constanze had loaned him "a host of notes and letters to use in writing the biography" but that "I was unable to use it all, partly because it concerned persons still living. . . ." (my emphasis).

--On the other hand, such a consideration would hardly seem to inhibit what Count Zinzendorf would find interesting for his private diaries, especially in a bit of scandal involving two persons well known to him -- and, as mentioned above, there appears to be no pertinent reference in his diaries although there are Mozart-related entries that bracket the period of the judgment and Mozart's death.

In 1814, Prince Karl Lichnowsky died. By 1835, Emperor Francis II, who had replaced his father Leopold II in 1792, had also died. And by 1848, Prince Metternich had fled to England and his system of civil discipline in the Austro-Hungarian Empire had collapsed.

In the late 1840s, Otto Jahn (1813)-1869) had begun the work that would lead to publication in 1856 of the first volume of his comprehensive four-volume biography of Mozart. At the same time, Thayer was preparing a biography on Salieri (published finally in America in 1864) and starting the research for his biography of Beethoven that would begin to appear in 1866. Both Thayer biographies necessarily contain frequent references to Mozart; the Beethoven biography opens with a detailed setting of the Viennese social and musical scene in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, with both Mozart and Karl Lichnowsky figuring in the narrative.

Whatever the constraints that may have influenced the early biographers of Mozart, there seems to be no reason why Jahn or Thayer and other later biographers would not have included a mention of the Lichnowsky lawsuit and its outcome in the accounts of Mozart's life if they had come across it in their research. That they did not is evident not only from the absence of any direct mention of the subject, but also from their handling of the Lichnowsky-Mozart relationship. Where the Prince appears in relation to Mozart, it is almost invariably as the piano student and patron of the composer, as a friend from the circle of Countess Thun, as the one that Mozart accompanied on a trip to Berlin in 1789; there are no qualifying clauses or adjectives intended subtly to convey that the author was aware of another dimension in the relationship but had chosen not to mention it.

V.

What can be done to secure a better grasp on the facts in the case of Lichnowsky vs. Mozart and the reasons why it went unknown for two centuries? Here are some thoughts on lines of research to pursue.

--The Lichnowsky archives: In his *Mitteilungen* article, Walther Brauneis speaks of "the Lichnowsky archives at Schloss Hradec in Czechoslovakia." He says they were badly damaged in 1945 but an examination of them might "offer some slight chance of casting light on. . .this legal action." This is a lead that certainly should be followed up. (Brauneis also footnotes a 1967 typescript in the *Archiv des Tschechischen Musikfonds* in Prague, "Mozart, Beethoven a Lichnowski," by Jaroslav Celeda, that sounds relevant but which he was not able to see in November 1990.)

--Late 18th century legal practice in Vienna: How do the legal reforms of Joseph II and the legal practices of the times bear on an understanding of the Lichnowsky lawsuit and its outcome? Legal historians who have studied the legal history of Joseph II and his successors should be brought into this problem.

--The Zinzendorf diaries: How well have these been combed for references to Karl Lichnowsky? Is it worth looking again at the years from 1790 to 1792, say, to see if there is in fact something related to the lawsuit and its result?

--Contemporary newspapers and journals: It is hard to find something if you are not looking for it. Before the discovery of the *Hofkammer* ledger entry, researchers scanning the newspapers of Mozart's time -- such as the *Wiener Zeitung*, *Der heimliche Botschafter* (Vienna), *Zeitung für Damen und andere Frauenzimmer* (Graz), and the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* (Berlin) -- did not have the Lichnowsky court action in mind and may have overlooked relevant reports just because there was no direct reference to Mozart.

--The Hofkammer archives: Having found the 12 November 1791 entry that brought the Lichnowsky suit to light for the first time, Walther Brauneis no doubt searched hard for anything else he could find in the *Hofkammer* archives that might be connected with it. So far, he has reported nothing more. Is the work to be done in going through these archives finished?

A closing note from the Editor:

My appreciation to those who wrote in connection with the second issue of the Newsletter.

Now as before, the pages of the Newsletter are open to anyone who wants to comment on the contents of this issue or on the subject matter in general, advance alternate hypotheses, raise new ideas about where to go from here, or offer evidence or considerations not previously encountered or discussed in the case of Lichnowsky vs. Mozart.

Bruce Cooper Clarke

An Annex to **The PRINCE LICHNOWSKY Newsletter**, Issues No. 3 & 4

Prince Karl Lichnowsky: The Case of the Movable Birthdate

When was Prince Karl born -- in 1756, 1760, 1761? Was he the same age as Mozart, or four or five years younger? At first, the answer seems to depend on where you look.

In the commentary section (Volume VI) of the collected Mozart family letters published in 1971 by the International Stiftung Mozarteum of Salzburg, on page 376 in connection with Letter No. 1089, the following appears: "Karl Lichnowsky (1756 bis 1814). . ."

If you turn to the 1988 issue of ISM's annual journal, the *Mitteilungen*, there is an article by Heinz Schuler with this on page 30: "LICHNOWSKY von Woszczyc, Carl Alois Johann Nepomuk Vincenz Leonhard Graf (später Fürst), geb. 21.Juni 1761 Wien, gest. 15.April 1814 ebenda" (meaning he was born in Vienna and died there too).

In a later (1990) *Mitteilungen* article, on page 24, Heinz Schuler identifies Prince Karl as a "Schüler und Logenbruder" of Mozart and gives his vital dates as "(9.September 1760 -- 15.April 1814 Wien)."

In the Brockhaus Riemann Musiklexikon (B.Schotts Söhne, Mainz, 1989, Vol.3 L-Q, page 39) under Lichnowsky, you find: "Karl Alois Johann Nepomuk Vincenz Leonhard, Fürst. Bruder von Moritz Graf L., *21.6.1761 Wien, +15.4.1814 ebd. . ."

There is an additional piece of information we can apply to the question. The 1990 article by Schuler in which the 1760 date appears also contains the following on the mother of Prince Karl: "Maria Carolina Vincenz von LICHNOWSKY, born Countess Althann, 15 September 1741 in Vienna -- died 30 October 1800 in Vienna, on 27 May 1757 married to Prince Johann Carl. . ."

Assuming these dates for the birth and marriage of Karl's mother are correct (and they seem to be), then it would appear that the date of 1756 found in the Commentary volume is wrong. In 1756, Karl's mother would have been only 15 years old and still a year or so away from her marriage to Prince Johann Carl. This does not help us choose between 1760 and 1761, but the added authority of the Brockhaus Riemann Musiklexikon suggests that the latter -- 21 June 1761 -- is the more likely. (Schuler's article with the 1760 date contains many different brief biographical sketches and "9 September 1760" could simply be an undetected copying error.)

BCC