

A note of introduction: Die Zauberflöte – its music and the many guises of its performance – is something we often learn in early childhood and enjoy into old age. It is the same for persons around the world. It is truly "Mozart's legacy to mankind." Reason enough, therefore, to appreciate Peter Branscombe's guidance to the intellectual background and the writing of it that brought the opera into being.

Peter Branscombe *DIE ZAUBERFLÖTE*

THE INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND: FREEMASONRY

VIENNA IN THE REIGNS OF JOSEPH II AND LEOPOLD II

TEN YEARS SEPARATE THE LIBRETTI of Mozart's two full-length German operas. Not the least interesting point of contact between them is their attitude towards punishment. In *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* the bloodthirsty Osmin threatens Belmonte and Pedrillo with all manner of tortures, and Konstanze's second aria shows her preparedness to endure the torments she can expect if she continues to oppose the Bassa's desires. If in the end the tribulations of the lovers are replaced by jubilation when the Eastern despot proves to be more generous than Belmonte's father, the happy outcome owes more to the spirit of the Enlightenment, and to operatic *bienséance*, than to psychological realism. Certainly it would be misguided to look for a comment on contemporary reality in such a context.

Largely owing to the vigorous campaign of Joseph von Sonnenfels, which in its crucial final stage was supported by Joseph II himself, torture had been abolished in 1776, and after 1781 the death penalty was maintained only for high treason. All the same, cruel and public punishments were frequently meted out under Joseph II. The morality of *Die Entführung* reflects a pre-Josephist outlook. *Die Zauberflöte* is a late flowering of the spirit of the Enlightenment; Sarastro promulgates the message that humane values must prevail, that love should triumph over vengeance. In the finale to Act I, Monostatos is sentenced to seventy-seven strokes with the bastinado for threatening Pamina's virginity. That this punishment was commuted is made clear by Monostatos' monologue in II, 7 (though the point is generally misunderstood, even when the lines in question are not cut), and the ineffectiveness of the threat is demonstrated by his further attempt on Pamina in II, 7 and 10, this time augmented by blackmail; Sarastro's reaction is to dismiss (banish?) him: 'Geh!'¹ The toleration of Monostatos in Sarastro's temple, and the physical punishment to which he is sentenced, point to an inconsistency that is more likely to strike a modern spectator or reader than it would have done Mozart's contemporaries.

--GIVEN HERE ARE TWO CHAPTERS, 2 AND 4, FROM "W.A. MOZART, *DIE ZAUBERFLÖTE*", BY PETER BRANSCOMBE, © CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS 1991. ISBN 0 521 31916 1.

- -ENDNOTES BEGIN ON PAGE 25.

The paradoxes of life in Vienna during the reigns of Joseph II and Leopold II were unusually strong. On the one hand, Joseph's desire for change encouraged hopes of freedom of all kinds; on the other, the forces of reaction had begun to halt, indeed to reverse his enlightened policies by the middle of his sole reign. Well before the death of Maria Theresia in 1780 Joseph as her oldest son and co-regent had begun to introduce large-scale reforms in religious affairs and court ceremony, and to the military, judicial and educational systems, the economy and the constitution. But opposition from the landed aristocracy and the Church, the provincialism typical of most areas of the empire, crises in Hungary and Belgium, as well as the external threats posed by Prussia and Turkey, dissipated his energies so that he managed to see few of his plans through to their successful realization. The contradictory nature of the decade of Joseph's sole rule is nowhere more clearly seen than in the field of censorship. In 1781 strict control over publications was relaxed. In that year, Gottfried van Swieten - well known for his connections with Haydn and Mozart - was appointed President of the Commission for Education and Censorship in addition to his post as Keeper of the Imperial Library. His influence with the emperor was strong enough to withstand the opposition of Cardinal-Archbishop Migazzi to the flood of anti-clerical pamphlets and regularly published critiques of the sermons preached in Vienna's churches; and the emperor often showed himself remarkably tolerant of criticisms directed at himself and his policies.

The rise to prominence of the businessman and publisher Georg Philipp Wucherer in 1785 may be seen as marking the turning-point in the history of the freedom of the press and of the publishing and book selling trade in the Josephist era. Wucherer was enterprising enough to specialize in subversive literature, whilst attempting to ingratiate himself with Joseph by presenting him with special copies of unimpeachable publications. In 1786 he was attacked by Johann Rautenstrauch, writer and Freemason, for piracy, profiteering and unpatriotic bearing. Wucherer not only exchanged blows with Rautenstrauch, he also became 'diocesan', or chief representative in Austria, of the German Union, a secret society with leanings towards Illuminism, and which aimed to secure a monopoly in the book trade. It is hardly surprising that Count Pergen, the newly created Minister for Police, and his deputy, Court Councillor Beer, ultimately persuaded Joseph to banish Wucherer – though early in Leopold's reign Wucherer exploited the anti-Josephist backlash and set up business again in Austria, until Pergen was able to bring about his second expulsion. It has not been established whether Wucherer owed his success to Masonic support, or that of the Hungarian aristocracy opposed to Joseph; but his case showed how difficult it had become for the emperor to sustain a liberal outlook. The increase in cheap newspapers and the ever-increasing flood of critical pamphlets led directly both to the promotion of the police department to full ministerial status, and to the Patent of January 1790 which formalized the strict reintroduction of censorship – so that the democratizing tendencies of Joseph's first years as sole monarch were

finally countermanded. An early sign of this reaction was the emperor's Patent of December 1785 which severely curtailed the activities of the Freemasons.

FREEMASONRY IN VIENNA

MASONRY HAD BEEN INTRODUCED to Vienna in 1742, when the lodge 'Aux Trois Canons' was constituted under the auspices of a lodge in Breslau. Although Franz Stephan von Lothringen, from 1745 Emperor Francis I, was admitted a Freemason in 1731, there is no evidence that he took any practical part in the rise of the craft in Austria, though it was probably he who prevented the publication in Habsburg lands of the papal bull condemning Freemasonry in 1751, and he may also have provided the Masons with a meeting-place. Certainly the distrust and disapproval of Maria Theresia is well known, and it was 1770 before the first comparatively long-lived Viennese lodge was inaugurated, 'Zur Hoffnung' ('Hope'), which from 1775 was known as 'Zur gekrönten Hoffnung' ('Crowned Hope'). The number of lodges, and their size, grew rapidly. 'Zu den drei Adlern' ('The Three Eagles') was founded in 1770; it gave birth to the lodge 'Zum Palmbaum' ('The Palm-Tree') in 1776; the two were united in 1781. 1771 saw the foundation of 'Zum heiligen Joseph' ('St Joseph'), constituted under the Grand Lodge of Berlin, which was dissolved in 1785, as was the other lodge under foreign patronage, 'Zur Beständigkeit' ('Constancy'), which was formed in 1779 under the aegis of 'Zu den drei Schlüsseln' ('The Three Keys') of Regensburg, to which Schikaneder briefly belonged. The most influential of all the Viennese lodges, 'Zur wahren Eintracht' ('True Concord'), was formed in 1781. The last two of Vienna's St John lodges, 'Zu den drei Feuern' ('The Three Fires') and 'Zur Wohltätigkeit' ('Beneficence') were founded in 1783.

The situation was complicated by the foundation in 1784 of the National Grand Lodge of Austria and by the existence of further lodges that observed other rites: from 1772 until 1778 'Zu den drei Schwertern' ('The Three Swords ') was Rosicrucian (also Rosicrucian was 'Zur Liebe und Wahrheit' - 'Love and Truth', 1790); and from 1784 'Zu den sieben Himmeln' ('The Seven Heavens ') observed the rites of the Asiatic Brethren. It was to control the dissipation of Masonic activity that some of the leading Masons favoured regularization. Joseph II was not himself opposed to Masonry, and he was kept closely in touch with affairs by Johann Baptist, Prince Dietrichstein, Provincial Grand Master, and Leopold, Count Kolowrat-Krakowsky, Deputy Master of 'Eintracht' and Supreme Chancellor. It became clear, however, that the price for official recognition and protection of the Masons would be high; Kolowrat reported to 'Eintracht' in August 1785 that the emperor would require lodges to register with the police, to reduce their number, and to supply full lists of members. This was merely an informal preliminary formulation of the imperial edict promulgated on 11 December 1785, in which Joseph recognized the Order, but also ended its brief period of intellectual and artistic splendour.

The tone of the 'Masonic Patent' (terms like 'trickery' and 'extortion' occur) makes it clear that the emperor was disturbed both by the spread of Masonry to the smallest towns and to aristocrats' country seats, and by the excesses and favouritism that unsupervised secret societies could nourish. He allowed the Masons to continue their activities because of the good they did, but he also announced his intention 'to take them under the protection and guardianship of the state'. He made four specific provisions: only one lodge in the capital of each province, which must announce to the police details of forthcoming meetings; two, or even three, lodges to be permitted in Vienna, but none in smaller towns, in rural areas, and in castles; the Master of each lodge to provide the governor of the province with a list of members for transmission to the central administration, such lists to be updated each quarter, and any change in the mastership to be reported; finally, this restructuring of the lodges would exempt them from further inquiries, and permit 'this Brotherhood, which consists of so many honest men who are known to me, truly to show itself useful to its fellow-men and to learning', whereas irregularly constituted lodges and gatherings were to be abolished. The provincial governors added the inducement that anyone reporting an offence would be rewarded with one third of the fine imposed, would be exempt from punishment, and his identity would be kept secret. The decree, published in the official *Wiener Zeitung* on 17 December, took effect from 1 January 1786.

The Masons wasted no time in effecting the reorganization demanded, though it caused grief and considerable ill feeling. The Grand Master of the Grand Lodge, Prince Dietrichstein, seconded by Ignaz von Born, the Grand Secretary, supervised the task, though not without adding to the sense of betrayal and alarm already felt. Of the eight existing lodges, 'St Joseph' and 'Constancy' elected to close completely (though 'St Joseph' reopened in 1790). The remaining six lodges reformed as two: 'True Concord', 'The Three Eagles' and 'The Palm-Tree' reconstituted themselves under Born's leadership as the united lodge 'Zur Wahrheit' ('Truth'), which opened on 6 January 1786; the other three - 'Crowned Hope', 'Beneficence' and 'The Three Fires' - formed the united lodge 'Zur neugekrönten Hoffnung' ('New-Crowned Hope') under Tobias, Baron Gebler. Since the maximum size of a lodge was to be 180 members (a figure not strictly adhered to), a large number of Masons, perhaps more than 600, were excluded, or would have to wait for vacancies.

Comparatively few records survive of Masonic activity during the following years. Many of the leading figures – including Dietrichstein and Born – ceased to be active Masons within months of the imperial edict. The high summer of Austrian Masonry was over, but it remained an important force in cultural and intellectual life until it was driven to suspend all its activities in December 1793 under Francis II.

The limited quantity of documentary evidence, far from acting as a warning to scholars, has encouraged speculation, some of it wild, about the activities of the Viennese Masons, and of Mozart in particular, during the years leading up to the composition and performance of *Die Zauberflöte*. Fortunately, additional evidence has been brought to light in recent years. Else Radant's discovery of a list of members of the lodge 'Zur [neu-]gekrönten Hoffnung' for 1790² filled an important gap; and Philippe Autexier unearthed a number of documents about Vienna's Freemasons and suggested a revaluation of more familiar material.³

THE LODGE 'ZUR WAHREN EINTRACHT' AND IGNAZ VON BORN

TWO OF VIENNA'S LODGES deserve to be singled out: 'Zur gekrönten Hoffnung', distinguished by the number of leading aristocrats and persons from the world of the arts among its members, and 'Zur wahren Eintracht'. The latter was founded on 12 March 1781 by a small group of Brethren from 'Hoffnung', adherents of the Zinnendorf observance. Under its first Master, Ignaz Fischer, the new lodge grew in size, but it attained notability only in the autumn of 1781, when the famous African prince, Angelo Soliman, himself only recently entered as Master, proposed that Born should be incorporated. Born was passed to the Second Degree on 19 November and raised to the Third Degree two days later; on 9 March 1782 he was elected Master of the lodge by a large majority.⁴

Ignaz von Born (1742-91) was one of the outstanding men of his era. His reputation as a scientist, civil servant, enlightened thinker and man of letters would have kept his name alive even if he had not been Vienna's foremost Mason, a member of the Bavarian Order of the Illuminati - and frequently mentioned in the context of *Die Zauberflöte*. As a young man he was for some months a novice in a Jesuit seminary, before studying first law and then mineralogy in Prague. In 1776 he was summoned to Vienna to take charge of the imperial natural history collection, and in 1779 he was appointed Court Councillor in the Department of the Mint and Mines. His highly anti-clerical views inform a brilliant satirical attack on monasticism (the *Monachologia*, published in Latin in 1783, then in German editions and translated into several foreign languages, including English. The German translation gave the author's name as Ignaz Lojola Kuttenteitscher: 'Cowl whipper'.) This brought him notoriety which did him little harm before the tide turned against liberalism in the second half of the decade, but it is unlikely that the authors of *Die Zauberflöte* intended to honour him directly in the figure of Sarastro at a time when Masonry and the spirit of the Enlightenment were already under threat. Furthermore, Born's total withdrawal from the Craft in August 1786, within a few months of his accepting office as Grand Master of the newly formed lodge 'Zur Wahrheit',

certainly damaged the cause. In addition, the antifeminist line of Born's essay 'On the Mysteries of the Egyptians', though it accords with Sarastro's early pronouncements, is alien to the new spirit of sexual equality that informs the Act II finale ('a woman who is not afraid of night and death / is worthy, and will be initiated').⁵

But this is to anticipate. In 1784 we find 'de Born' as one of the subscribers to Mozart's Lenten concert-series and at about the same time, the first volume of the *Journal für Freymaurer* was published, its first item being Born's paper on the Egyptian Mysteries with which he had inaugurated the lodge's new research programme. The *Journal*, though intended only for Masons, was printed in a run of 1,000 copies. A more specifically scientific journal published by the lodge under Born's editorship was the *Physikalische Arbeiten der einträchtigen Freunde in Wien* ('Physical works of the Friends of Concord in Vienna'). Born's supreme achievement as a scientist was his perfection of a new amalgamation method for the extraction of precious metals. He was raised to the nobility for this, and at the celebration on 24 April 1785 a grand concert was held at the 'Crowned Hope' lodge, at which Mozart's cantata *Die Maurerfreude* was first performed. Born was also honoured by foreign academies.

Vienna's intellectual elite was strongly represented in the 'Eintracht' – the poets Blumauer, Alxinger, Ratschky, Retzer and Leon, the dramatist Major-General Ayrenhoff, the leader of the Austrian Enlightenment, Joseph von Sonnenfels, a number of prominent surgeons, philosophers, lawyers and academics, the famous traveller Georg Forster, the publisher Artaria, Haydn, and several of Austria's most powerful aristocrats.

MOZART AS MASON

ON 5 DECEMBER 1784 the secretary of the lodge 'Zur Wohltätigkeit' circulated to the Viennese sister lodges the name of 'Kapellmeister Mozart' as a candidate for initiation. On 14 December, at 6.30 o'clock, the attendance register for the lodge records that 'Wenzel Summer, Chaplain at Erdberg, and Mozart, Kapellmeister' were duly initiated. The Master of 'Wohltätigkeit', Otto, Baron von Gemmingen-Hornberg, was an old acquaintance of Mozart's from Mannheim in 1779, and the author of the drama *Semiramis* which Mozart planned to set to music as a melodrama. The lodge was a small one, and it used the same premises as 'Zur wahren Eintracht' at the house 'Zum roten Krebsen' ('The Red Crayfish') on the Kienmarkt. It was as a 'Visiting Brother' that Mozart next appears in the Masonic records, attending a meeting of 'Eintracht' on Christmas Eve. At the same lodge, on 7 January 1785, at the request of 'Wohltätigkeit', 'Brother Wolfgang Mozart' was passed to the Fellow Craft Degree. We do not know when he became a Master – records of attendance for most of the lodges survive only fitfully – but he must have been raised before attending the Master Lodge at 'Eintracht' on 22 April (on which occasion the signature of his father, then only a Journeyman, was crossed out as ineligible).

Haydn should have been initiated at 'Eintracht' on 28 January, and Mozart was present for the ceremony. However, Haydn did not receive the notification in time, and when he was admitted, on 11 February, Mozart was unable to attend - not only had his father arrived that day, it was also the first of his six Friday concerts at the 'Mehlgrube' casino.

Though there are good grounds for agreeing with Einstein's judgment that Mozart's adagios for winds including basset-horns, K 410 and 411 (484d and a), which probably date from 1782-3, are Masonic in mood, and perhaps also in purpose, the earliest undisputed work for the Craft is the song 'Gesellenreise' ('Fellow Craft's Journey'), K 468, written on 26 March 1785 in readiness - it is assumed - for his father's forthcoming passing to the Second Degree. On 20 April he completed *Die Maurerfreude* (K 471) in honour of the special celebration of Born's ennoblement, to be held at the 'Gekrönte Hoffnung' on 24 April. Apart from Mozart's cantata, sung by Valentin Adamberger (who had created the role of Belmonte in *Die Entführung* three years earlier), music by Paul Wranitzky was also performed on this occasion. The cantata was published in full score in August, for the benefit of the poor, in a handsome edition for which all responsible were Masons, and whose illustrated title page positively proclaims its Masonic nature. Mozart's next, and most widely known, Masonic composition, the *Maurerische Trauermusik* (Masonic Music of Mourning) was written in July. It was given on 17 November 1785 at the Lodge of Sorrows for two prominent Masons, and parts for double bassoon and two further basset-horns were added for a later performance.

Four days before Mozart took part in an especially grand Masonic concert at the 'Crowned Hope' on 15 December, the imperial edict was published which led to the reorganization of the Craft. From this time forward, little evidence survives of lodge meetings and Masonic activities. Certainly Mozart does not seem to have written music for any Masonic occasion between the three-part choruses with organ, 'Zerfliesset heut, geliebte Brüder' ('Dissolve this day, beloved brothers') and 'Ihr unsre neuen Leiter' ('O ye, our new leaders'), K 483 and 484, which he wrote for the opening and closing ceremonies of the first meeting of the newly formed lodge 'Zur neugekrönten Hoffnung' on 14 January 1786, and the summer of 1791 (with the possible exception of two further and lost choruses, which may, however, have been written in 1785).

Mozart maintained contact with his Masonic friends and colleagues during the intervening years, but it is only over the last months of his life that he again composed Masonic works. The 'Little German Cantata' *Die ihr des unermesslichen Weltalls Schöpfer ehrt* ('Ye who honour the creator of the boundless universe'; K 619) of July 1791 is not strictly a Masonic work, though the man who commissioned it and wrote the words, Franz Ziegenhagen, was a Brother in Regensburg. *Die Zauberflöte*, too, is not a Masonic work since it was written for performance in a public theatre. There

is, however, no doubt about the last work Mozart was to complete, and to direct: *Eine kleine Freymaurer-Kantate* ('A little Masonic Cantata'; K 623) is what he entitles it in the *Catalogue* on 15 November 1791, and despite its name it is considerably the longest of his Masonic works. Mozart fell ill two days after he conducted the first performance of the cantata on 18 November at the ceremony of inauguration of the new temple of 'Zur neugekrönten Hoffnung'; he died seventeen days later. The cantata was published by subscription 'in order to assist his distressed widow and orphans'; it appeared in November 1792. At the end of April the dramatist Karl Friedrich Hensler delivered a Masonic Oration in memory of Mozart at a Lodge of Sorrows held by the 'New-Crowned Hope'.

SCHIKANEDER AND FREEMASONRY

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE FOR LODGE MEMBERSHIP and attendance at meetings of 'Zur Wahrheit' and 'Zur neugekrönten Hoffnung' becomes erratic and scarce after the reorganization of Vienna's lodges at the end of 1785. This makes it difficult to state firmly that a particular individual was a Freemason at a particular time. Emanuel Schikaneder is a case in point. It is known that he petitioned to be admitted to membership of the lodge 'Zu den drei Schlüsseln' ('The Three Keys ') at Regensburg on 4 July 1788, and the tone of the letter makes it plain that he was not already a member of the Craft. That his application was successful is clear from an excerpt from the lodge's minutes for 4 May 1789, requesting him to absent himself from meetings at the forthcoming Festival of St John and for the following six months, owing to unpleasant rumours about his private life – and his self-aggrandizement.⁶

Although Schikaneder wrote a letter of apology, in which he looked forward to being welcomed back at meetings in due course, he moved to Vienna within a matter of weeks, to take over the direction of the *Freihaus-Theater auf der Wieden* (he was performing there by mid-July), so his appeal to the Regensburg lodge will have been at best inconclusive. There is no evidence that he was ever a member of one of the Viennese lodges; certainly his name does not appear (as Mozart's does) among those of the 212 members of 'Zur gekrönten Hofnung' (*sic* the 'neu' had by then been dropped from the title) in 1790.⁷

The claim that he was the author of the text of Mozart's *Eine kleine Freimaurer-Kantate* (K 623) cannot be sustained if he was not a member of 'Gekrönte Hoffnung', since the first edition, published early in 1792, indicates that 'its words are the work of a member of the same'. A variant of the text was published in another edition in 1792 in honour of Emperor Franz II, with text by 'G...e'. This may well have been Gieseke (he appears as 'Giesege Karl Ludwig actor First Grade', i.e. Entered Apprentice, in the 1790 list of members of the lodge). This is not to claim that Gieseke necessarily wrote the original words of the cantata; Franz Petran, the poet of *Die Maurerfreude* and in 1790 still a member of the lodge, is another obvious candidate.

Given the persistent claim that Gieseke was the author of the libretto of *Die Zauberflöte* it would be a posthumous compensation if his name could convincingly be linked with that of Mozart as author of the *Kleine Freimaurer-Kantate*.

As for the authorship of the libretto of *Die Zauberflöte*, the fact that Schikaneder probably did not belong to a Viennese lodge is of little importance. His experiences at lodge meetings in Regensburg during the months of his membership would have provided him with a knowledge of the workings of the Craft sufficient to enable him with Mozart's help and advice to fashion the libretto of the opera. Certainly a copy of the solitary 'private' Masonic source of the opera, Born's essay in the first volume of the *Journal für Freymaurer*, would not have been hard to come by in the Vienna of 1790-1, and even if Mozart did not have one of his own, copies would have been available in the lodge library.

THE WRITING OF "DIE ZAUBERFLÖTE"

THE TRADITIONAL STORY

SO LITTLE IS DEFINITELY KNOWN about the history of the composition of *Die Zauberflöte* that the proliferation of legend is not surprising. Even basic facts are disputed – who wrote the libretto, when and in what circumstances Mozart was commissioned to set it to music, how it was staged, and how received. We cannot rely on the statements made in the early biographies of Mozart, for though in broad agreement with each other, successive writers tended to take over, and embroider, the comments of their predecessors. Before attempting to establish the facts I shall set out in chronological order the biographical information provided by contemporaries and near-contemporaries that forms the basis for the traditional story.

Friedrich Schlichtegroll's short monograph, *Mozarts Leben*, published in book form in 1794 following its appearance in 1792 in his *Nekrolog auf das Jahr 1791*, singles out 'die Zauberflöte' among Mozart's operas as a work that 'received such excellent and general approval that it was performed a hundred times within a space of twelve months' - a powerful exaggeration, but not grossly out of keeping with what Schikaneder was to claim in a year or two. Schlichtegroll had little information about Mozart's years in Vienna and would have been wiser to omit the precise reference to the success of the opera. Franz Xaver Nemetschek (Niemetschek) in his revised and extended *Lebensbeschreibung des K. K. Kapellmeisters Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart* ('Biography of the Imperial and Royal Kapellmeister ... '), which was published in Prague in 1808 eleven years after the first of its three previous editions, contents himself with the lapidary statement: 'He wrote *Die Zauberflöte* for the theatre of the well-known Schikaneder, who was an old acquaintance of his' (p.48). Later in the book, however, after mentioning *Die Entführung* and *Der Schauspieldirektor* among the German Singspiels, he asks:

What shall I say about the *Zauberflöte*. Who in Germany does not know it? Is there a theatre in which it was not performed? It is our national piece. The applause it received everywhere – everywhere, from the court theatre to the wandering troupe in a small market town, is as yet without parallel. In Vienna in the first year of its existence alone it was performed more than a hundred times. (p.113)

Information of a different kind is vouchsafed by the musical journalist Friedrich Rochlitz. His series of articles in the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* in 1798 entitled 'Verbürgte Anekdoten aus Wolfgang Gottlieb Mozarts Leben, ein Beytrag zur richtigern Kenntniss dieses Mannes, als Mensch und Künstler' ('Authenticated anecdotes from the life of W. G. M., a contribution to the more correct knowledge of this man, as human being and as artist') contains lively, interesting, though unreliable material. It is clear from her letter to Breitkopf & Härtel of 10 October 1799 that Constanze Mozart had a high regard for Rochlitz ('please give my kind regards to the intelligent ('geistreichen') Herr Rochlitz, whom I regard as the future biographer of my late husband... '), and she seems to have encouraged her second husband, Georg Nikolaus von Nissen, to rely heavily on the anecdotes that Rochlitz published in the *AMZ* (themselves based extensively on her oral testimony).

Rochlitz claimed personal acquaintance with Mozart from the time of the latter's nine-day-long visit to Leipzig in May 1789, and it is readily demonstrable that, apart from minor changes and transpositions, Nissen's account of the commissioning and composition of *Die Zauberflöte* is taken straight from Rochlitz's articles (part 11, col.83 to part 17, col.147). In a later section of the 'Anekdoten' (part 19, cols.148-9) Rochlitz talks of the physical and mental strain to which Mozart was subject during the composition of the opera ('... he, to whom day and night were one when his genius took hold of him, sank into frequent exhaustion and semi-unconsciousness that lasted for minutes at a time'), and says that his increasing debility permitted him to conduct the performances on only about ten occasions,¹ whereafter, when he could no longer even attend performances in the theatre, he listened to the music in his imagination, with his watch at his side.²

By the time the first full-length biography appeared, in 1828, the bare 'facts' put forward by Niemetschek had been both supplemented by research, and embroidered with further anecdotes and rumours. Nissen did not live to see the publication of his mighty work, *Biographie W.A. Mozart's*, which runs to nearly a thousand pages. Two dozen of them are devoted to *Die Zauberflöte*, and they are introduced by a passage that takes Niemetschek's bare statement as its starting-point:

He composed the *Zauberflöte* for the theatre of Schikaneder, who was an old acquaintance of his, at the latter's request, to rescue him from his straitened circumstances. The poetry is by Schikaneder himself, who in this way was dragged to immortality by Mozart's coat-tails ... (p.548)

Nissen goes on to tell the tale, uncritically repeated so often since, of Schikaneder's wretched financial position, occasioned 'partly through his own fault, partly through lack of public support. Half in despair he came to Mozart, told him of his circumstances, and concluded that only he could save him.' There then follows what is presented as if it were the verbatim dialogue between theatre director and composer, depicting Mozart as a generous and helpful friend, Schikaneder by contrast as an exploiter of Mozart's good nature in that he failed to allow him to draw the sole benefit of sale of the score to other theatres. When Mozart discovered that his opera was being performed without a single copy having been obtained from him, his only comment was 'The rascal!' ('Der Lump! '), and that was the end of the matter. Even here, though, there is no hint that the text was not Schikaneder's own work – that particular refinement, to deprive him posthumously of the authorship of his one masterpiece, was not to see the light of day in book form for several more years yet.

As usual, the truth is impossible to establish, and it was assuredly less colourful than these legends suggest. If one considers the salient points in these accounts, it is easy to disprove some of them. Nothing is known about the finances of Schikaneder's theatre, in that no account-books survive. But there is some evidence to suggest that he was in financial difficulties in 1791. In the two years since he took over the *Freihaustheater auf der Wieden* he had built up a talented ensemble and developed a popular and successful repertory. He commissioned *Oberon* from Wranitzky, already a promising composer, in 1789; in June 1790 the theatre was granted an Imperial and Royal Privilege (licence), and in the following year Emperor Leopold II attended a performance with his son and heir on 3 August. These facts do not suggest that Schikaneder was hard up (though, like any other theatre director, he was doubtless hoping that his new opera would be a box-office success). The last point from Nissen's account – namely that Schikaneder cheated Mozart of his agreed proceeds from the sale of the score to other theatres – is easily disproved. The earliest performance of the opera outside Schikaneder's theatre did not take place until nearly ten months after Mozart's death, and there is no evidence that copies of the score were in circulation while Mozart was still alive.

The next stage in the growth of the web of legends surrounding the opera is reached some time around 1840. An incomplete and undated letter by Ignaz von Seyfried to Friedrich Treitschke comments on a manuscript which the latter had sent him, in or about the year 1840. Presumably this manuscript was the draft of the anecdotal story that Treitschke – one of the librettists of *Fidelio* – published in the second number of *Orpheus. Musikalisches Taschenbuch für das Jahr 1841*, edited by August Schmidt. The story, entitled 'Die Zauberflöte. - Der Dorfbarbier. - Fidelio. Beitrag zur musikalischen Kunstgeschichte' ('... Contribution to the history of the art of music'; pp. 239-64 of the almanac), creates a typical late-Romantic fictional framework for some interesting, even valuable, comments about the three

operas. Three friends meet in a tavern and agree to entertain each other with musical reminiscences. Friedrich, who speaks about *Fidelio*, is Treitschke himself; his companions are named Ernst and Adam. It is Ernst who, with help from Friedrich, tells of the origins of *Die Zauberflöte*. 'Help me, friend and Brother, or I'm lost!' are the opening words of this part of the story – reputedly Schikaneder's words to Mozart, begging him to take on the task of writing the opera that will save him from bankruptcy. The poet hands over the first act of the libretto for Mozart to begin work on, saying he will complete the rest of it shortly, even though the rest of the plot is not yet clear. Mozart good-naturedly agrees. We read of the change of plan following the première of *Kaspar der Fagottist*, of Schikaneder's hospitality to Mozart, his enthusiasm for Tamino's aria and dissatisfaction with the first two attempts at setting 'Bei Männern',³ his prompting of the final version ('he warbled a simple, almost commonplace tune. "You'll have it", replied Mozart'), as well as many details, some of them differing from more familiar depictions, but neither the better nor the worse for that.

The suggestion that on his return from Prague in mid-September Mozart still had to compose Papageno's songs, the second finale, and orchestrate the whole score, as well as compose the Priests' march and the overture, is certainly unacceptable (see below, pages 20-5). But details about the early performances, box-office receipts, and the rival productions at the Court Opera and the Theater an der Wien in 1801 and 1812, as well as about Goethe's sequel and his correspondence with Wranitzky, ring true (though they could as easily have been taken from already-published sources as go back to oral traditions about the earliest years of the opera's existence). There is no question of Treitschke's having had first-hand knowledge of the events of 1791, when he was fifteen; he did not come to Vienna until about 1800.

Equally, Seyfried (whose comments Treitschke solicited) can have no claim to speak with authority about the prehistory of *Die Zauberflöte*, whatever he may later have said. He, too, was just fifteen at the time of its première, and even if he had been a piano pupil of Mozart's (we have no evidence one way or the other), it is unthinkable that a fourteen-year-old would have enjoyed Mozart's friendship and the freedom of Schikaneder's theatre, let alone been entrusted with conducting rehearsals. Seyfried joined the Theater auf der Wieden as second kapellmeister in 1797; any information he was able to supply about that theatre in its earlier years was based on nothing more than oral tradition.

The 'facts' that Seyfried put forward in his letter to Treitschke are: that Schikaneder got to know Mozart, and later his business associate Zitterbarth, through the meetings of a Masonic lodge devoted to dining; that Gieseke introduced Schikaneder to *Dschinnistan*; that Mozart usually worked at the opera 'in Gerl's lodgings, or in Schikaneder's garden, just a few steps from the theatre'; that Seyfried 'often ate at the same table [as Mozart and Schikaneder], and took many rehearsals in the same salon, or

to be more exact, wooden hut'. He also repeats the tales about Schikaneder's reliance on his prompter⁴ for help with the versification, and about the changes to the story of the opera necessitated by the production of *Kaspar der Fagottist*; and he states that Henneberg, the young kapellmeister who took over the musical direction from Mozart after the first two or three performances, rehearsed the opera from the short score while Mozart was in Prague for the coronation. He also reports that the overture's parts 'came wet to the dress rehearsal' and that Mozart on his death bed attended performances of the opera in his imagination. There is nothing here that we can take at face value, even if some of the details sound plausible.

In 1849 – 58 years after the first performance of the opera – Julius Cornet published his account of Gieseke's claim to the authorship of *Die Zauberflöte* in his book *Die Oper in Deutschland*. We read that the libretto was the joint product of Schikaneder and Gieseke; the latter supplied 'the outline of the plot, the division into scenes, and the naïve and well-known rhymes. This Gieseke... was the author of several magic operas, including the *Zauberflöte* (after Wieland's *Lulu*), which Schikaneder merely altered, cut, and added to, taking to himself the title of its author.' There follows a description of Gieseke's reappearance at a Viennese tavern, many years after he had left the city:

One day in the summer of the year 1818, an elegant old gentleman in a blue coat and white cravat, and wearing a decoration, sat down at the table in the tavern in Vienna at which Ignaz von Seyfried, Korntheuer, Julius Laroche, Küstner, Gned and I met for luncheon each day. His venerable snow-white head, his meticulous way of speaking, and his whole bearing, made a favourable impression on us all. It was the former chorus-singer *Gieseke*, now a professor at Dublin University; he had come from Iceland and Lapland straight to Vienna to present to the Imperial Natural History Museum a natural history collection formed from the plant, mineral and animal kingdoms. *Seyfried* was the only one to recognize him. The old gentleman's joy at being in Vienna and at the Emperor Francis's recognition (he gave him a really valuable gold snuffbox shining with solitaires and filled with brandnew Kremnitz ducats) was the recompense for many years of privations and suffering. On this occasion we learnt so much about the old days; among other things we learnt that he (who was at that time a member of the banned order of Freemasons) was the real author of the "*Zauberflöte*" (although *Seyfried* already had a suspicion of this). I relate this according to his own statement, which we had no reason to doubt. He gave us this explanation when I sang the cavatina interpolated into 'Der Spiegel von Arkadien'. Many thought that the prompter *Helmböck* had been Schikaneder's collaborator. But in this also Gieseke disabused us; Gieseke attributed to Schikaneder only the figures of Papageno and his wife.⁵

This report has much to answer for, but the demonstrable inaccuracies in points of detail probably count for less than does the fact that Cornet did not publish his account until almost all those who could have confirmed or denied it were dead, and that no one else (except in imitation of Cornet) made the same claim for Gieseke's authorship.⁶

By the time of the first centenary of Mozart's birth, and the appearance in that year of the first volume of Otto Jahn's *W.A. Mozart*, the traditional picture of the events and personalities surrounding *Die Zauberflöte* is complete. The authoritative nature of Jahn's great work, enhanced by the revised editions undertaken by Jahn himself (1867), by Hermann Deiters (1889-91 and 1905-7), and especially by Hermann Abert (1919-21; seventh edition 1955), is reflected in its continuing profound influence on Mozart studies. In many points of detail about *Die Zauberflöte* it is misleading, or quite wrong, even though a number of details have been corrected by successive editors. The shortcomings of Jahn's presentation are doubtless part and parcel of the romanticizing tendencies of his age. Lucid scholarly comment is awkwardly accompanied by gossip and rumour, much of it an elaboration of dangerously late and unauthenticated material. To the by now well-established tales of Schikaneder's penury, Gieseke's crucial role in the writing of the libretto, and the hasty revision of the work's plan owing to the success of *Kaspar der Fagottist*, for instance, are added new and colourful details — that Schikaneder's desperate plea to Mozart was made early in 1791 ('7 March is even given as the date'),⁷ that Barbara Gerl, the original Papagena, had at least a hand in persuading Mozart to take on the commission, and that Mozart uttered the warning to the actormanager-poet: 'If we have a disaster it won't be my fault, for I've never composed a magic opera before.'⁸ We learn further of Mozart's being put to work in the little wooden hut near Schikaneder's theatre, and of the life of excessive drinking and roistering that he led under the influence of his librettist. Few of these numerous anecdotes have the ring of authenticity, and there seems to be no basis for the innuendoes that link Mozart's name with those of various women. Indeed, he could not escape the charge of hypocrisy were it otherwise, if we bear in mind the letter to Gottfried von Jacquin of 4 November 1787 in which, lightly yet firmly, he claims some of the credit for his friend's abandonment of his 'former rather restless way of life' and 'the pleasures of a volatile and capricious love'.

THE EVIDENCE PROVIDED BY CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

The compositions of 1791

WHAT CAN TAKE THE PLACE of the traditional stories about the origins of *Die Zauberflöte*. The short answer is that very little clear evidence survives. My method shall be to create the context of Mozart's musical activities in the first nine months of 1791 against which to view the composition of the opera, then to examine the references to the opera in Mozart's letters and other writings, and finally to propose corroborative (or contradictory) evidence adduceable from the first edition of the libretto and from the autograph score.

It is unlikely that the details of Mozart's contract with Schikaneder (if there was one) will ever be known, or when he began to write the score. The *Catalogue*, though its entries occasionally need to be treated with circumspection, provides a clear outline of Mozart's compositional activity.⁹ His principal product in the early weeks of 1791 was the series of dances for the carnival season required of him by the terms of his court appointment. He wrote his last three songs, K 596-8, on 14 January. The Allegro and Andante for mechanical organ, K 608, was entered on 3 March, an aria for bass voice, obbligato double bass and orchestra (K 612), followed on 8 March; in the same month he entered the set of keyboard variations on the song 'Ein Weib ist das herrlichste Ding auf der Welt', K 613, from *Die verdeckten Sachen*, the first sequel to Schikaneder's *Der dumme Gärtner*. The String Quintet in E flat, K 614, is dated 12 April; there are fragmentary movements for string quintet, K 515a and c, which, the paper suggests, may well date from this period. Under 20 April is entered a (lost) final chorus (K 615) for Sarti's opera *Le gelosie villane*.

Thereafter some falling-off in Mozart's productivity is apparent. The 4th of May saw the entry of the Andante for mechanical organ, K 616; there is also a related fragment for the same instrument, K 615a (on which leaf there are several sketches for *Die Zauberflöte*; see Tyson 1987, p. 17). Nineteen days later Mozart recorded the completion of the 'Adagio und Rondeau für Harmonica, 1 flauto, 1 oboe, 1 viola, e Violoncello'; here, too, there are related fragments, K 616a for the same combination, K 617a for glass harmonica solo. The motet 'Ave verum corpus' (K 618) was written at Baden near Vienna, on 17 June, and in the following month (no precise date is given) Mozart entered the incipit of his 'Little German Cantata', K 619. Apart from the three large-scale works that occupied him during his last months – *La clemenza di Tito*, *Die Zauberflöte* and the Requiem – and the Clarinet Concerto and Masonic Cantata of October and November, we now know that Mozart also wrote the incomplete 'First' Horn Concerto (K 412 (386b) + 514) at some time during 1791.

How is the writing of *Die Zauberflöte* to be fitted into this period of varied activity? – The legend that Schikaneder came to Mozart to commission the opera on 7 March is presumably not unconnected with Mozart's known concerns of that period. The bass aria 'Per questa bella mano' was written for two members of Schikaneder's company, Franz Xaver Gerl, the future Sarastro, and Friedrich Pischelberger, the orchestra's principal double bass player; and the keyboard variations of the same month, based on a tune by Gerl or Benedikt Schack (the first Tamino), also belong to the ambience of the Freihaustheater. Since Mozart must have received the commission to write *La clemenza di Tito* some time in July, and probably not before the middle of that month, and the opera was given as part of the coronation celebrations in Prague on 6 September, he can have had little time to work on the German opera during those few summer weeks. At least we know from Tyson's paper studies that no part of the

Requiem was written down until after Mozart's return from Prague in the middle of September, though the commission, surely in fact as well as in legend, predates the journey to Prague.

Mozart's letters

THE *CATALOGUE* LACONICALLY DATES *Die Zauberflöte* 'im Jullius', with just two further items listed for 28 September, two days before the première. For information about the progress of the composition we are almost solely reliant on the letters which Mozart wrote to Constanze during the summer months of 1791 when, carrying their sixth child – the second to survive infancy – Franz Xaver Wolfgang, she was taking the waters at the spa of Baden bei Wien, whither she had travelled on 4 June.

The series of letters reveals quicksilver changes of mood and subject-matter. The predominant impression the reader obtains is of Mozart's loneliness, which can be seen as much in his affection and concern for his greatly missed wife as in the restless chronicle of his daily activities. Anxiety about his financial situation, and frustration at the problems he was experiencing in trying to finalize arrangements with an unidentified man for a large loan, strengthen still further the impression of particularly difficult working conditions. Mozart disliked sleeping alone in the apartment, even eating alone; he stayed with his old horn-playing friend Joseph Leutgeb for the first couple of nights after Constanze's departure, dined with Süßmayr one day and Schikaneder the next, travelled out to Baden to see Constanze and his son Carl at the weekends when he could, went to the theatre – and got on with the new opera. His first reference to it – and chronologically this is the earliest surviving indication of its existence – occurs in the undated letter to Constanze which from internal evidence must have been written on 11 June: 'From sheer boredom I have written an aria for the opera today – I got up at 4.30...' We have no way of knowing which aria this might have been; on the basis of what we know of Mozart's normal procedure when composing an opera, we would be inclined to assume that work must by then have been far advanced, since Mozart normally wrote the ensembles first and the arias later. This assumption seems to be borne out by the closing lines of this letter: 'I'm dining with Puchberg today – I kiss you 1,000 times and say in my thoughts with you: Death and despair was his reward.' This quotation of the close of the whimsical little duet for the Priests (no. 11) confirms the impression that Mozart had already composed much of the opera; further, it helps answer those who claim that the Masonic element was only introduced into *Die Zauberflöte* following the change of plan said to have been necessitated by the success of *Kaspar der Fagottist*. For the Perinet/Wenzel Müller Singspiel was given for the first time on 8 June, and by an interesting coincidence it was because he was about to go to a performance of this very work that Mozart told his wife he was obliged to write his letter in a hurry ('it is 6.45 – and the coach [to take him to the Leopoldstadt] leaves at 7

o'clock'). His letter of 12 June (it, too, has to be dated from internal evidence) continues the story of his frustrations of the previous day, when he waited in vain for the acquaintance who had promised to come and settle details of the loan, which caused him to miss dinner with Michael Puchberg, and in the evening he was even more depressed to receive a mere note of good intentions from the rich acquaintance. It was in the hope of cheering himself up that he took himself off to the Leopoldstadt Theatre for Perinet's new Singspiel.

There are no further references to the opera until the postscript of Mozart's letter to Constanze which cannot be assigned a more accurate date than late June/early July: 'My greetings to Snai [= Süßmayr] – tell him I'm asking how he's getting on – like an ox, I suppose, – he's to write away busily so that I get my things.' In his playful way Mozart is asking his wife to make sure that Süßmayr is getting on with the copying-out of the short score of *Die Zauberflöte*. This interpretation is confirmed by Mozart's next letter, which he dated 2 July: 'Please tell Süßmayer the Stupid boy he is to send my particella ['Spart'] of the first act, from the Introduction right up to the *Finale*, so that I can orchestrate. It would be good if he could put it together today so that it can leave by the first coach tomorrow early, then I shall get it promptly at noon.' In his letter of 3 July Mozart acknowledges safe receipt of the finale (and of some clothes he had asked for), which suggests that Constanze must have sent off the last number of Act I before she received her husband's request. He repeats his injunction to Süßmayr and mentions that he had lunched with Schikaneder the previous day.

A small detail in the letter of 3 July justifies the speculation that by this time Mozart was far enough advanced with the drafting of Act II to have begun to concern himself with the scene of Papageno's attempted suicide. The words of the bird-catcher's forlorn cries for his absent Papagena read in the libretto: 'Papagena! Herzenstäubchen! / Papagena! liebes Weibchen!' ('... dove of my heart ... dear little wife'); Mozart inverted the epithets, and then revised the order of the two lines, in his autograph score. Why, one may ask. — In his letters to Constanze of 1789 and 1790 (most recently in early November 1790) Mozart had several times addressed her as his 'Herzensweibchen' ('little wife of my heart'); the letters of summer 1791 begin with variants of 'Ma très chere Epouse' and 'Liebstes, bestes Weibchen'. I suggest that the return to the compound 'HerzensWeibchen' in the letter of 3 July may well be attributable to his having been prompted by Schikaneder's formulation in the libretto, which he slightly altered as an affectionate encoded tribute to his wife.

Hints about the progress of work on the opera continue to occur in the letters of July. On the 5th: 'Süßmayer really must send me Nos 4 and 5 [presumably Tamino's aria and the first of the Queen — unusually, Mozart's numbering begins with the overture] of my manuscript – also the other things I requested.' In a second letter written on the same day he acknowledges receipt of 'the latest packet' – the particella of Act I apart

from the finale, for which he had thanked his wife on the 3rd. On the 7th he expresses his sense of deprivation, of emptiness, without Constanze: '... even my work gives me no delight because, accustomed to break off now and then and exchange a few words with you, this pleasure is now alas an impossibility – if I go to the piano and sing something out of the opera, I have to stop at once – it arouses too much emotion in me ...' In a jocular postscript to his letter of 12 July to his friend, the schoolteacher and choirmaster at Baden, Anton Stoll, he forges Süßmayr's handwriting and asks Stoll to send 'what Herr von Mozart asked you for, that is – the Mass and the gradual by Mich[ael] Haydn, or no news of his opera'. (Incidentally, the last phrase of the postscript, 'Also ein Mann hält sein Wort' – 'thus a man keeps his word' – is perhaps an echo of the famous comic touch in *Kaspar der Fagottist* where the child playing the good spirit, Pizichi, assures the comic servant: 'Und ein Mann hält Wort'; III, 10.)

The correspondence now ceases, as Mozart brought his wife and their six-year-old son Carl back to Vienna in mid-July in anticipation of the birth of the baby on the 26th. Around 25 August, Mozart, his wife and Süßmayr left for Prague (taking neither of the children with them); they arrived there on the 28th, and returned to Vienna about the middle of September after the production of *La clemenza di Tito*. It is generally accepted – though there is no firm evidence either way – that Schikaneder's kapellmeister, Johann Baptist Henneberg (who was appointed in 1790, at the age of only twenty-one), supervised the rehearsals of *Die Zauberflöte* during Mozart's absence in Prague, and took over the musical direction of the opera after Mozart had conducted the first two performances.

The *Catalogue of all my Works*

THE MOST RELIABLE, IF NECESSARILY CRYPTIC, INFORMATION we have about the factual details of the opera is provided by the entries in Mozart's *Catalogue*.¹⁰ These read, literally translated:

[1791] In July

Die Zauberflöte. - performed the 30th September.

- - - - - a German Opera in 2 Acts. By Eman.

Schikaneder. consisting of 22 pieces. – *Ladies*. – Mad^{selle} Gottlieb.

Mad^{me} Hofer. Mad^{me} Görl. Mad^{el} Klöpfler. Mad^{selli} Hofmann.

Men. Hr. Schack. Hr. Görl. Hr. Schikaneder the elder. Hr. Kistler.

Hr. Schikaneder the younger. Hr. Nouseul. – Choruses.

On the opposite page Mozart notates in short score the first four bars of the *Introduzione*. There follows the entry for *La clemenza di Tito*, dated the 5th of September, the eve of its première. Then comes:

the 28th September.

to the opera *die Zauberflöte* - a Priests' March and the Overture.

Again, the opening bars of each are notated on the page facing, in that order.

These entries repay careful examination. '22 pieces' is correct, if one includes the overture as no. 1 (as Mozart did); and the Priests' march which, though composed only at a very late stage, was planned from the beginning, as the libretto makes clear. Mozart's indication of a total of twenty-two musical numbers does not necessarily exclude the problematical duet for Tamino and Papageno, which could have been removed to make way for another number, or a late addition to the score could have been numbered, say, 11^{1/2}.

The singers named cover the rôles of Pamina, Queen of Night, Papagena, and the First and Second Ladies; and of the men, Tamino, Sarastro, First and Second Priests, Papageno and Monostatos. The full cast (or almost the full cast) is contained on the playbill for the first night.

The first edition of the libretto

THE FIRST EDITION OF THE LIBRETTO is probably second only to the autograph score in importance; it is also an unusually elegant production, with its two fine engraved illustrations and decorative title page. Ignaz Alberti, a Master Mason in Mozart's lodge, printed the libretto, and he was also responsible for the depictions of a temple interior and of Schikaneder as Papageno ('I. Albert sc.' is the legend on both). Since the libretto was already on sale by the time of the first performance, as a note on the playbill indicates, neither illustration can be claimed as an actual representation of the first staging. Too little is known about book production in late eighteenth-century Vienna to enable us to state how long before publication, in this case how long before the première, the final manuscript would have had to be handed to the printer. What we can say is that, since the printed libretto in no. 1 has Tamino 'victim of the cunning serpent' rather than 'of the fierce lion', the autograph score with its alteration of 'dem grimmigen Löwen' to 'der listigen Schlange' pre-dates the printer's copy of the libretto.

It is unlikely that we shall ever be able to estimate precisely when Schikaneder delivered the manuscript to the printer, but we can profitably ask what the relationship is between the text of the first edition of the libretto, and that found in Mozart's autograph score. The latter, not surprisingly, contains none of the ample dialogue, nor even cues immediately preceding the musical numbers. For this reason, and also because there are no additional markings, we can reasonably assume that the autograph was not used for the musical direction of the performances (and that the score that was so used, perhaps the one copied by Süßmayr in June/July, and since lost, would have contained the definitive text as performed at the première, including for instance the wind chords at the start of the duet no.7).

Detailed comparison of the text Mozart entered in the autograph with that of the first edition of the libretto reveals some fifty variants.¹¹ Many of these points are trivial, yet the pattern that emerges suggests very strongly

that Mozart took from the libretto many suggestions for musico-dramatic effects. It is impossible to say to what extent Mozart influenced the text in the first place, that is, before the complete version was prepared from which he and the printer independently worked. It is safe to assume, however, both from what is known of Mozart's past practice in his collaborations with Varesco on *Idomeneo* and with Stephanie on *Die Entführung*, and from the superior theatrical qualities of the libretto of *Die Zauberflöte* to Schikaneder's other libretti (as well as from Schikaneder's later tribute to Mozart for his share in the planning of the opera), that the composer's influence was considerable, and probably crucial. As an instance of Mozart's observance of the librettist's instruction on a musical matter we may cite the directions appended to no.4, the Queen's first aria: *Recitativ* (the first four lines) – *Arie* (the next twelve lines) – *Allegro* (the last four lines). Mozart, in fact, precedes the recitative with an orchestral *Allegro maestoso*; and the tempo for the closing fast section is *Allegro moderato*. Conversely, one could argue that this instance points to the libretto's taking account of Mozart's score; and certainly the fact that the bulk of the opera was sufficiently complete for Mozart to enter it in his *Catalogue 'im Jullius'* would have allowed time for the printer to incorporate the textual changes that the composer made. Correlation suggests very strongly, however, that no account was taken, in the preparation of the printed libretto, of Mozart's textual changes. Indeed, as we know from the Mozart family's correspondence at the time of the preparations for *Idomeneo*, and as abundant contemporary evidence corroborates, divergences between sung text and printed libretto were considered unimportant.

The autograph score

THE FIRST EDITION OF THE LIBRETTO, then, can provide little or no evidence to help our inquiry into the chronology of the opera. What of the autograph score? We should perhaps remind ourselves that this treasure (restored in 1977 to its home in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, after its wartime removal to a place of safety, and postwar reappearance at Kraków) was, when Mozart completed the composition, not a single large volume, but a series of separate items, capable of being reordered, added to or subtracted from. Each of the individual pieces, all of them except for the overture numbered by Mozart, and almost all of them also foliated by him, was probably stitched or conveniently gathered for ease and safety of handling; in the late 1970s the nineteenth-century binding was detached so that the facsimile edition (Bärenreiter, Kassel, 1979) could be prepared; the score has since been rebound.

In recent years there have been three differing approaches to study of the autograph score. A two-part article by the editor of the opera for the *Neue Mozart-Ausgabe*¹² studies Mozart's orthography in great detail, though the author is not primarily concerned with the dating or ordering of the various numbers in the autograph score. And Karl-Heinz Köhler¹³ contributes a valuable study that applies the methods he illuminatingly brought to bear on the chronology of the autograph of *Le nozze di Figaro*. Most recent, indeed not yet published, is Alan Tyson's analysis of the paper-types and the make-up of the autograph.¹⁴

Karl-Heinz Köhler's article proposes a precise chronological order for the composition, based on four 'objective criteria': watermarks; rastration; the 'colour values' of the inks (nine in number) used for the first phase of composition, which established the 'contours' of the opera; and the 'colour values' of the inks (eight in number) used for completing the compositional process (instrumentation, marks of expression, etc). From analysis of the interrelationship between paper-type and the 'contour inks' Köhler distinguishes the following chronological order of Mozart's work for Act I (including one number from Act II):

1, 3, 4, 8 (to the end of scene 18, bar 440), 10 (Sarastro's first aria: Act II), 6, 7, 5, 8 (from bar 441 to end), 2

Köhler prefaces his proposed order of composition for Act II with a comment on the 'far more complex compositional process':

12, 11, 18, 21 (first and third sections), 14 (first part), 20, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, overture ('contour'), overture (trombone parts), 1 (timpani part), Act I ('filling out' ['Füllwerk']), 21 (fourth = last section), Act II ('filling out'), then, to complete the composition, 14 (second part), 21 (second section), 8 (wind and timpani parts), 12 (wind and timpani parts), 21 ('filling out' of last section), 9, overture ('filling out'), 9a (threefold chord)

Köhler identifies eleven phases of the compositional process (some of the distinctions here are not immediately clear):

- (1) The serious parts of Act I and Sarastro's first aria in II, which are concerned with Tamino's actions, or with his characterization.
- (2) The comic plane, especially Papageno, but including ironic portrayal of the Priests - the close of no.12, and no.11.
- (3) Interruption of (2) in order to characterize the serious aspects of the Priests; then back to (2), especially to Papageno, and his forthcoming union with Papagena.
- (4) The Queen's second aria (written during continuation of work on phase (2)).
- (5) Serious scenes connected with the forthcoming trials of Tamino and Pamina.
- (6) Outline ('contour') of overture, with its 'seven points of thematic reference': Sarastro, Priests, Tamino, Papageno, Queen, Ladies and allegorical rôle of the flute.
- (7) Filling out of Act I.
- (8) Composing of closing scenes of Act II finale.
- (9) Filling out of Act II; completion of Queen's second aria and of Act II finale.
- (10) Filling in gaps in the score and continuation of the filling out of the Act II finale.
- (11) Completion of remaining parts of the composition: Priests' march, filling out of overture, and threefold chord.

Alan Tyson has identified eleven paper-types in the autograph; in addition there are three further leaves of which two contain the trombone parts for the overture, and the third – with its ten staves the only leaf in the entire score to depart from Mozart's normal choice of twelve-staff paper – contains the threefold chord. A comparison with the autograph scores of Mozart's other late operas reveals that there are seven paper-types each in *Le nozze di Figaro* and the original 1787 version of *Don Giovanni*, two main types in *Così fan tutte* (just twelve leaves are on other types), and five in *La clemenza di Tito*.

The unusually large number of paper-types in the score could be attributed to several factors: Mozart was in financial difficulties and may have been unable or unwilling to purchase a large quantity of paper at one time; or perhaps his movements between Vienna, Baden and Prague (though he certainly had his hands full enough with *Tito* during his weeks in the Bohemian capital to have pushed the German opera to the back of his mind) encouraged him to have small quantities of paper with him; or – and this factor excludes neither of the previous ones – perhaps the nature of the work, with large stretches of spoken dialogue separating almost all the musical numbers, lent itself to piecemeal composition whereby Mozart would use whatever paper lay to hand (no fewer than fifteen of the twenty-one numbers are contained on six or fewer leaves, taken from nine paper-types).

Table 1A

Paper-types in the autograph score of *Die Zauberflöte*

For ease of reference the paper-types are numbered (Roman numerals) according to the order of their first occurrence in the score; the musical numbers (Arabic numerals) run from 1 (introduction) to 21 (Act II finale). One large sheet of paper, folded into four quadrants and cut, yields two bifolia or four leaves.

Type I	Overture (complete); no.16 (complete); no.17 (complete); no.19 (complete); no.1 (trumpet and timpani parts for bars 40-6)
Type II	No.1 (apart from an inserted single leaf - see Type III; and the trumpet and timpani parts - see Type I); no.3 (complete); no.4 (first sheet = bars 1-56)
Type III	No.1 (inserted leaf with a bridge passage to replace the deleted cadenza; Tyson (1987, pp.21 and 345 n.18) suggests that this leaf is from the sheet on two leaves of which the 'Ave verum corpus' was written on 17 June 1791, which implies that Mozart was already revising no.1 at this time.
Type IV	No.2 (complete); no.4 (second sheet = bars 57 to end); no.8 (complete); no.10 (complete); no.12 (first three bifolia = bars 1-103); no.21 (two sheets, the first of which has a leaf inserted in the middle = bars 57-80, 92-134, 179-243)
Type V	No.5 (three of four sheets = bars 1-177, 242 to end); no.13 (first bifolium = bars 1-41 [81]; no.15 (complete); no.21 (last two sheets and bifolium = bars 736 to end)

Type VI	No.5 (fourth sheet, inserted in middle of third sheet = bars 178-241)
Type VII	No.6 (complete); no.7 (complete); no.21 (inserted single leaf = bars 81-91)
Type VIII	No.9 (complete)
Type IX	No.11 (complete); no.12 (last sheet = bars 104 to end); no.14 (complete); no.18 (complete); no.21 (four sheets and three bifolia, covering four separate passages in the Act II finale = bars 1-56, 135-78, 244-438, 501-61)
Type X	No.13 (third and last leaf = bars 42 [82] to end); no.20 (apart from glockenspiel part, see Type XI); no.21 (three sheets and one bifolium = bars 439-500, 562-735)
Type XI	No.20 (glockenspiel part - one leaf); no.8 (flute, trumpet and timpani parts - one leaf); no.12 (flute, trombone, trumpet and timpani parts - one leaf); no. 21 (flute, trombone, trumpet and timpani parts - two leaves)

Sketches and fragments survive for the following numbers:

Overture	(Mozarteum, Salzburg: copy of lost original; Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin: Type I paper - one leaf)
No.8	(Uppsala, University Library: Type V paper - one leaf; Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin: Type V paper - one leaf)
No.9	(New York, Pierpont Morgan Library: Type I paper - one leaf)
No.11	(Uppsala, University Library: Type V paper - one leaf, containing also the sketches for no.8 and for no.21)
No.21	(Uppsala, University Library: Type V paper - one leaf, containing also the sketches for no. 8, and for no.11; Type X paper - one bifolium, containing sketches in score)

Analysis of the paper-types of which the autograph score is made up permits one to draw certain conclusions about the order in which at least parts of the opera reached their definitive form. If one begins at the end, as it were, and considers first of all the two items that Mozart entered in his *Catalogue* right at the end of the period of composition, two days before the first night, one finds that the Priests' march, no.9, is written on paper (Type VIII) that Mozart used for most of the solo arias in *La clemenza di Tito* (Tyson 1987, pp.52-4); and the draft for the march (which obviously precedes the fair copy) is on a paper-type that Mozart used only after his return from Prague in mid-September.¹⁵ This paper-type also occurs in the Masonic Cantata (K 623; dated 15 November 1791), and in sketches for and the autograph score of the Requiem. In *Die Zauberflöte* it is used both for sketches for the overture and for the overture itself, and in nos.16, 17 and 19, as well as for the trumpet and timpani parts of no.1 (Mozart preferred twelve-staff paper – though he complained to his father about its shortcomings on 20 July 1782 in the context of having the score of *Die Entführung* copied – but it did have the disadvantage that extra sheets had to be used in heavily scored music for winds and timpani).

From this information one can deduce that the final revision of the introduction (no.1) was not carried out until shortly before the first night, and that, despite the impression created by the entry in the *Catalogue* that the opera lacked only the two purely instrumental numbers which were added at the last minute, no fewer than three vocal numbers were also written, or at least only attained their final form, in that hectic period (perhaps less than a fortnight in duration) after the return from Prague: the terzetto for the Three Boys ('Seid uns zum zweiten Mal willkommen'), Pamina's aria, and the much-discussed terzetto for Pamina, Tamino and Sarastro ('Soll ich dich Teurer nicht mehr sehn?').

Useful confirmation that the Act II finale was probably completed before Mozart's journey to Prague is provided by the existence of sketches for *La clemenza di Tito* (now in Uppsala, in the University Library) on paper that contains drafts for no.21 of *Die Zauberflöte* (Tyson 1987, p.332, n.9).

Working on the assumption that Mozart normally used up his supply of one paper before turning to another, we can readily see from the list of paper-types in the autograph score which parts of the score, being written on the same paper-type, probably date from the same compositional stage. What this list does not reveal is that single sheets of paper, divided into bifolia or single leaves, are shared between the following numbers of the score, which posits a closer temporal or thematic link between them. The following instances occur:

Table 1B

Type IV	No.8, the last three bifolia, matches no.12 (first three bifolia)
Type IX	No.11, second and third quadrants, matches no. 18, first and fourth quadrants
Type V	No.13, fourth and first quadrants, matches no.15, third and second quadrants
Type X	No.13, third leaf, probably matches no.21, bifolium containing bars 562-97
Type IX	No.14 matches three separate bifolia in no.21, covering bars 135-78,244-66 and 405-38
Type I	No. 16,first bifolium, third and second quadrants, matches no.17, second bifolium, fourth and first quadrants
Type I	No.16, second bifolium, fourth and first quadrants, matches no.1, inserted leaf with trumpet and timpani parts, second quadrant

On the basis of the evidence now available there is a considerable measure of agreement between Köhler and Tyson about the ordering and interrelationship of numbers within the score, though the picture may well be modified in the light of the detailed reports that we may expect from both authors. It will be interesting to see whether Köhler can, for instance, equate his claim about the order in which the four sections of the Act II finale were composed with the layout of the score — the fact that no new section of the finale begins on a new leaf implies that at least in outline the entire number

was composed consecutively (that Mozart *thought* in shorter units is suggested by his careful counting of the number of bars, the figures – ranging over his sixteen sub-divisions between 129 and [5] – being inserted before changes in tempo or time signature (rarely at a modulation or change to recitative)).

It is hoped that this survey of the evidence provided by nineteenth century commentators, the casual remarks in Mozart's letters, his entries in his *Catalogue*, the first edition of the libretto, and the results of the analysis of the paper-types of the autograph score, will leave little room for doubt that the opera was substantially complete before the end of July 1791, that rather more than has generally been thought had still to be written (or revised) after Mozart's return from Prague in mid-September – and that study of the autograph and its paper-types permits insight into the sequence in which the opera was written.

~~~~~

#### ENDNOTES

##### **The intellectual background: Freemasonry**

1. One could see in Sarastro's response to Monostatos' threat to Pamina's virginity in II, 11 an example of Leopold II's desire 'to lead criminals back to their duty by a more lenient treatment, rather than to harden them against all decent inclinations by excessively severe penalties'. See Ernst Wangermann, *From Joseph II to the Jacobin Trials* (London, 2d ed, 1969), p.91, citing F. Hegrad, *Versuch einer kurzen Lebensgeschichte Kaiser Leopolds II* (Prague, 1792), p.170.
2. Published as an appendix to H. C. Robbins Landon's study, *Mozart and the Masons: New Light on the Lodge 'Crowned Hope'* (London, 1982), pp.65-72.
3. Philippe A. Autexier, *Mozart & Liszt sub Rosa* (Poitiers, 1984) and 'Mozart a-t-il écrit un opéra maçonnique?', *Chroniques d'histoire Maçonnique*, vol.34, no.1 (1985), pp.11-17.
4. For details of Born's life and career, see Dolf Lindner, *Ignaz von Born: Meister der Wahren Eintracht. Wiener Freimaurerei in 18. Jh.* (Vienna: ÖBV, 1986).
5. Born was married; his daughter Maria was spoken of as 'beautiful and stimulating', and as 'an excellent pianist' (Joachim Hurwitz, 'Haydn and the Freemasons', *Haydn Year Book*, vol. xvi, p.34).
6. Paul Nettel, *Mozart und die königliche Kunst. Die freimaurerische Grundlage der 'Zauberflöte'* (Berlin, 1932), pp.87-91, and *Mozart and Masonry* (New York, 1957; reprint 1970), pp.61-2.
7. See the appendix to Robbins Landon's study (cf. note 2, above).

### The writing of *Die Zauberflöte*

- I. There is no reason to think that Mozart departed from the then normal practice of conducting the first two or three performances of a new opera himself.
2. Cf. the memoir of Ignaz von Seyfried: Deutsch, *Dokumente*, p.472 (English edition p.556).
3. A variant of this rumour is recorded by I. F. Castelli (vol. ii, p.236), where the duet that Schikaneder was dissatisfied with is identified as that between Papageno and Papagena; see also J. C. Schikaneder's reminiscence, Deutsch, *Dokumente: Addenda*, p.100.
4. Treitschke names the prompter as Haselböck (in Seyfried's letter the spelling is Haselbeck). In fact, as Deutsch points out (*Dokumente*, p.472; English edition p.556), Joseph Anton Haselbeck was one of Schikaneder's theatre poets; Christoph Helmböck (whom Cornet names as the prompter - see below) was the property man (*Dokumente*, p.475; English edition p.560). Many of the numerous minor discrepancies in identification and fact are elucidated in Deutsch's notes.
5. Deutsch, *Dokumente*, p.475; English edition p.560.
6. Furthermore, Cornet had the reputation of being a thoroughly unreliable, boorish, even malevolent character; see Ferdinand, Ritter von Seyfried, *Rückschau in das Theaterleben Wiens seit den letzten fünfzig Jahren* (Vienna, 1864), p.41.
7. For the fallacious notion that the opera was already well advanced by September 1790, see Peter Branscombe, 'Die Zauberflöte: some textual and interpretative problems', in *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 92d session (1966), pp.45-63.
8. Quotations are translated from the revised second edition (Leipzig, 1867), vol.ii, p.465.
9. Alan Tyson's study of paper-types warns us, for instance, against inferring from the date '5.Januar 1791' that the B-flat Piano Concerto, K 595, was actually composed, rather than completed, at about this date. Alan Tyson, *Mozart. Studies of the Autograph Scores* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1987), pp.33, 135 and 156. This volume, and several personal communications from Dr Tyson, have provided the basis for the evidence of dating put forward in this chapter.
10. *Mozart's Thematic Catalogue. A Facsimile. Introduction and transcription by Albi Rosenthal and Alan Tyson* (London: The British Library, 1990).
11. These divergences are examined in P. Branscombe, 'Die Zauberflöte' (1966).
12. Gernot Gruber, 'Das Autograph der "Zauberflöte". Eine stilkritische Interpretation des philologischen Befundes', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* 1967, pp.127-49, and *Mozart-Jahrbuch* 1968-70, pp.99-110.
13. Karl-Heinz Köhler, 'Zu den Methoden und einigen Ergebnissen der philologischen Analyse am Autograph der "Zauberflöte"', *Mozart-Jahrbuch* 1980-83, pp.283-7.
14. I should like to express my particular thanks to Alan Tyson for his generosity in making available to me his as-yet unpublished analysis of the paper-types that make up the autograph score.
15. Personal communication from Alan Tyson.